HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 26 October 1983

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

QUESTION TIME

HOUSING TRUST PROJECTS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Housing immediately ask the Building Workers Industrial Union to withdraw threats of industrial action and coercion against the Housing Trust design and construct project at Paradise? In a letter dated 20 September 1983 the General Manager of the Housing Trust advised all builders carrying out Housing Trust design and construct projects that he had been instructed by the Minister to insist on unionisation of all subcontractors engaged by the builders from the sixth call.

Some builders who have received this letter have told me that this amounts to nothing less than compulsory unionism: it is not supported by the subcontractors they engage, and it will increase building costs significantly. I am further advised that the instruction is already causing difficulties to Prominent Homes Pty Ltd, which is building 16 design and construct units on a site at the corner of Silkes Road and George Street, Paradise. This project is part of the Housing Trust's fourth call of tenders for design and construct projects, whereas the building industry has been proceeding on the basis that the Minister's instruction on compulsory unionism does not apply until the sixth call of tenders, which is not expected to be made until the first half of next year.

The union has also directed the company to change its supplier of ceiling fixings, because the union alleges that the company's present supplier does not employ union labour. To comply with this direction would cost the builder an extra $3 500 and, because it has a fixed-price contract with the Housing Trust for completion of the project, the company would have to bear this additional cost.

If the carpenters employed on subcontract do not agree to join the union, and the company does not change its supplier, by 5 p.m. today, the union says that it will picket the building site and stop the work there. It has been put to me that this threat represents another extension of the web of compulsory unionism creeping across the building industry in South Australia, and that it is pure industrial blackmail. As the Minister of Housing has responsibility for the Housing Trust's design and construct programme, it is open to him to take immediate action to prevent the union proceeding with these threats.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This question is rather surprising. I dealt with this aspect of Labor policy in the Estimates Committees when the member for Light, rather dismally, put the views of the Opposition. I made the point then that there had been a complete backdown by the Leader of the Opposition since he claimed at one time that the cost would be about 30 per cent. Since then, he has reduced that figure, as has the Secretary of the Housing Industry Association (Mr Don Cummings). I am not aware of the situation to which the Leader is alluding, and I would have thought that, if there had been a problem for builders, they would have consulted either me or the Deputy Premier, who is the Minister of Labour. It seems that certain sections of the building industry are going to the Opposition on these matters. If I may make one point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is starting to exceed Standing Orders. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Leader talks about compulsory unionism, but this is not compulsory unionism: it is preference to unionists.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Blackmail!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is not blackmail.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If members opposite talk to—

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —members of the Master Builders Association, they will find that those association members support this Government's stand. Only the H.I.A., which does limited work in the design and construct programme, is making all the hoo-hah, and the honourable Leader should take that into account.

URANIUM DEBATE

Mr GROOM: Will the Premier say what action he has taken to inform the Prime Minister regarding the debate that took place in this House yesterday and the amended motion that was carried without dissent? On page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Bannon Government beats bid to press Hawke over Roxby', the following reports appears:

> The Bannon Government yesterday thwarted attempts to exert pressure on the Federal Government over the Roxby Downs issue after a prolonged tactical battle in State Parliament.

In view of the contents of the Premier's speech yesterday, this report is extraordinary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the private discussion between the Premier and the member for Torrens will cease. It is highly out of order and highly rude to the honourable member for Hartley.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand that the Premier has exerted great pressure on the Federal Government over the Roxby Downs issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is now exceeding Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We will see whether or not our representations are successful, in view of the fact that it has been confidently announced and it is expected that there will be some sort of inquiry into the Roxby Downs project. From the moment when that matter was raised last week I have made representations to the Prime Minister. He and several of his colleagues have been presented with information and material that I hope will have some effect on the decision that they will eventually make. Following my conversation with the Prime Minister yesterday evening, I understand that a final decision has not been made by Cabinet at this stage on the various options that have been proposed (despite the speculation in the press, and the best efforts of members opposite to whip them up into something).

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has been called to order once: I hope he will take some notice of that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Prime Minister has been made aware of the substance of the motion passed by this House yesterday. The extraordinary petulance of members opposite simply indicates the destructive way in which they are approaching this sensitive and important issue. That is

certainly not the way my Government is handling the matter. The Prime Minister has been fully apprised of the views that were expressed in the debate yesterday, and he is well aware of them. Those views will be communicated to members of Cabinet and to others who are involved in this discussion.

I can assure all honourable members that the Federal Government is in no doubt as to the views of the South Australian Government and, indeed, of the South Australian Parliament. I suggest that the best way in which this matter can be served would be for the Opposition to cease the sort of destructive politicking around the issue in which they are indulging and to try to make some constructive contribution in support of the efforts of the Government on this project, which, after all, they claim to have all the knowledge of and all the carriage of. I expressed clearly in debate yesterday the Government's attitude to the matter, and the Federal Government is fully aware of it. Grandstanding flights to the Eastern States, and so on, are not necessary in a situation where the Federal Government and Cabinet are discussing the position and where they are fully apprised of our views.

HONEYMOON MINE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say how many jobs the Government has found for those people who were thrown out of work as a result of the Government's decision to close down the Honeymoon uranium mine? During the examination of the Estimates a little over a week ago the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated a recognition of the fact that the Government had thrown people out of work as a result of its decision to close down the Honeymoon uranium mine, and he told the Committee that the Government had sought to find alternative employment for people thus thrown out of work. I am aware of one professional man, with a young family and with some of his children attending secondary school, who is still unemployed as a result of the Government's action.

The member for Todd indicated to the Committee that two of his constituents had come into his electorate office, one of whom is a widow with a family and who formerly worked in the office associated with the Honeymoon mine venture. She is now unemployed and on a pension. The other constituent he referred to is a young man with a young family, who is the sole breadwinner of his family and who also is unemployed as a result of the Government's action. I would like the Minister to tell us how successful he has been in finding work for people who were thrown on to the unemployment lines as a result of the present Government's decision.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There seems to have been some amplification since the Estimates Committee incidents to which the Deputy Leader referred, the circumstances of which he has further outlined today, associated with people he says were thrown out of work by the actions of the Government. My recollection is that there are circumstances additional to those he has outlined today. I certainly recall the member for Todd's citing two cases which had come to his attention and of which gave specific details. I have, as I indicated in the Estimates Committee at the time, had no quarrel with the fact that, as a member with direct knowledge of cases that had been brought to his attention, he chose the vehicle that he did to raise the matter. I think the honourable member for Todd would agree.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You said you'd try to find work for the people.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member has been here as long as I have. He realises that he can have a bit of latitude. I think he has had about nine questions already. I will try to answer the original question.

Mr Oswald: Why don't you just say you've done nothing?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Because I do not say that I have done nothing. That might be the attitude of the honourable member, but it was not my attitude from the beginning. First, let us recognise that I did not say in the Estimates Committees what the honourable Deputy Leader said today. I did not use the words that he has put forward in that sense. He can look them up until the cows come home.

I said that the Government was concerned with employment and unemployment and was concerned to do something about it. I then said that, when it was put to me by the proponents in respect of those projects that people were to lose their employment, I did what I could, which was to make an offer to them. If names and categories of employment were put forward I would ensure that they would be made available to the Public Service structure in South Australia to see whether—

Mr Lewis: You can't find jobs—

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There you are. The Deputy Leader has asked me what I am doing about it, and here is the member for Mallee suggesting I should not have tried to do something about it. I will not accept that attitude. I do not accept that the Government threw those people out of work. As I said in the Estimates Committee it is up to the proponents, who employed the people concerned, to decide what action they will take in that circumstance. No-one has suggested to me that that is the only activitivy, for example, that the proponents were involved in. I do not suggest that it was an easy situation. I believe that fairness should apply in this matter. The Government's policy was well known in general and when it was elected by the people it followed that policy. No member on the other side has been able to suggest otherwise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The statement in the election campaign was about proposals other than Roxby Downs. Here we had the Opposition yesterday in some way saying that we should be working harder on Roxby Downs, and now apparently we have a different proposition. We should be supporting every activity in the State which could even cut across the future of Roxby Downs. There is no sense at all in that sort of comment that is coming forward.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Are you saying that Honeymoon was a competitor? What nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to resume his seat. I will not tolerate a slanging match like this, particularly when the question involves people who I presume, from the nature of the question, may be suffering great hardship.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Mr Speaker, that is the very point that I was trying to establish. It may be a great game of semantics between the two sides of the House to determine who should have done what, but I did something positive. Let everyone in this House understand that. It was put to me that some people were surplus to requirements. One avenue available to me was to say that if certain information could come forward I would put that before the Public Service authority in this State to see whether some of those people at least could be placed. That is the action I took.

VEGETATION CONTROL

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say what was agreed at the dinner attended last

night by the Premier, the Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, and representatives from United Farmers and Stock-owners? The media treatment of the United Farmers and Stock-owners press release on the measure seems to be extremely confused—

Mr Gunn: Like the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Eyre to come to order, and I also ask the honourable member for Brighton not to comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Brighton has the floor.

Ms APPLEBY: The media treatment of the United Farmers and Stockowners press release on the matter seems to be extremely confused, suggesting on the one hand a rather radical departure to the planning system, as presently operated, and on the other merely a commitment to examine certain propositions. In view of the interest amongst conservationists and primary producers in this whole matter, would the Minister care to elaborate?

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. Acting as I am in this instance in response to an earlier occasion on which I sought information as—

The SPEAKER: Order! I could not catch the honourable member's first few words. Would he repeat them?

Mr LEWIS: They relate to the point that the member is asking the Minister for an expression of opinion, and such a question asked by me earlier this session was ruled out of order. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to give your considered opinion on the question on this occasion.

The SPEAKER: I rule that the question is in order, and I overrule the point of order. The honourable Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can confirm that last evening the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture in another place and I attended a dinner with three representatives of the U.F. & S. A variety of matters was canvassed, one being vegetation retention control. At that meeting it was put to me and my colleagues that the statement I had made on Monday afternoon in relation to shopping centres and economic viability ought to be taken on board in relation to this area of planning control. I pointed out to the representatives of the U.F. & S. that the two were not strictly comparable because on the one hand one was looking at the competitive interests of various private enterprise concerns, large and medium-size shopping centres, small corner shops, and so on, and the way in which the planning system should treat that and, on the other hand, simply a collision, if you like, between the desires of particular landowners to do certain things and the withholding of permission for those things to occur which, of course, is a quite normal aspect of the planning system.

However, I did indicate, as did my colleagues, that it seemed reasonable that we should examine the proposition put by the U.F. & S., to the extent that I can be very specific to the House that, in any planning application, farm viability should be a factor taken into consideration. It was finally agreed that the U.F. & S. would put a written submission before the Government and that we would examine it. I did not listen to the pertinent radio station this morning—perhaps it was the impertinent one that I listened to—but in any event, it appeared from my radio station that the U.F. & S. was announcing that the Government had agreed to adopt farm viability as a criterion, and further that it would review those applications rejected to date. I immediately rang Mr Andrews and secured an agreement from him that that was not what was agreed. I secured an agreement from that gentleman that the U.F. & S. would, in any subsequent bulletin released to the media, correct that impression which had been abroad. I understand that in a subsequent press conference that impression that had been abroad was quashed by a statement from the U.F. & S.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier defer for at least two months the date from which the new financial institutions duty will apply? When he introduced the Budget, the Premier announced that this new tax would apply from 1 December. However, the necessary legislation has yet to be introduced, albeit the knowledge was given to the House earlier this afternoon that that will take place tomorrow and it is unlikely to be passed by this Parliament until at least the end of the first week in November. A number of financial institutions have stated that the delay by the Government in finalising the rate of the duty and other details, including exemptions, will pose significant problems to them if the tax is to be effective from 1 December.

This is because computer programmes will have to be written and administrative arrangements made to pass on the charge to customers. The Opposition is aware that the introduction of this tax in Victoria and New South Wales last year caused widespread confusion and alarm, particularly among small depositors and investors in banks, credit unions and building societies. A decision by the Government to defer the commencement of f.i.d. in South Australia until at least next February would help to avert a similar situation in this State, having regard to the present time schedule of implementation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not prepared to defer the introduction. The introduction of this duty is part of a package of revenue measures which are necessary for the Government and the programmes in this State. It was announced as part of that package as long ago as August and, if it is to be deferred by some months, I would be very interested in suggestions from the Opposition as to what changes we should make in terms of the level of services in schools, hospitals, and so on, which necessarily would result from having to alter those financial projections. The legislation has not been delayed by the Government; in fact, it is absolutely on the time table that I announced to the House some months ago—a time table that involved, most importantly, consulting with the financial institutions about the shape of the legislation and the administrative arrangements that would be necessary.

That process has been taking place and has taken place strictly to time table, that is, consultation was commenced in September in which I took part. Treasury officers have received submissions and were in discussion with the various financial institutions about the duty until the end of September, early October. Then the drafting of the legislation and the fairly complicated administrative arrangements, and so on, have to be put into the legislation. Consultation with the other States about the practicalities involved have all been going on since that time, and the legislation is ready, on time table, to be introduced tomorrow. However, I make clear too that financial institutions will not be disadvantaged by any period of operation of the Bill because transitional provisions will be provided in the legislation and will be able to adequately pick up any problems that may arise. That is something of which we are conscious and have discussed with the financial institutions, so I can assure the honourable member that he need have no fears on that score.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare inquire whether the Attorney-General believes that all mem-

bers of this Parliament have now complied with the requirements of the pecuniary interests register? It has been put to me that literary contributions of social or political significance can come from unexpected sources. My drawing this question to the attention of the House is based partially on an item which came to my attention and which appeared on page 32 of yesterday's *News*, namely, the comic strip 'Hagar'.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I must admit that I do not read the comic strips in the *News*, but perhaps I should. I will most certainly refer the question to the Attorney-General for his consideration.

PATAWALONGA OUTLET

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Following the offical opening of the O'Sullivan Beach boat harbor, will the Minister of Marine give an assurance that he will take steps immediately to provide a safe, navigable all-weather channel for small boats using the Patawalonga outlet? Before the last State election the then Government gave an undertaking that following the completion of the O'Sullivan Beach boat ramp urgent steps would be taken not only to solve the problem of continuing silting up of the Patawalonga entrance but also to investigate the provision of additional marina facilities at the site, bearing in mind, of course, the important contribution that such facilities would make to the tourist industry; and also to address the urgent and serious problem of launching an access for sea rescue craft. The matter is still urgent and will remain so, as was evidenced by the petition presented in this House yesterday by the member for Morphett.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am a little surprised at the question from the member for Torrens, who was the former Minister of Marine. The problem of the sand bar at the Patawalonga has been with us for 15 years.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Yes, but we gave a commitment that we would do something about it.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There is no easy solution to the problem. The sand bar has been dredged in the past by the former Government and the previous Labor Government before that, and as fast as the sand is removed it goes back. There is no immediate solution. At the moment the Department of Marine and Harbors does not own any equipment suitable for carrying out this particular work, and it would be very expensive to hire suitable equipment. The Department is looking to see whether it is possible to purchase a new dredge in the future but much consideration is required regarding the possibility of whether finances are available in the current economic climate to purchase a new dredge.

I cannot give any guarantee as the member requests, but I am quite prepared to take this up with my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, as the Coast Protection Board comes under his jurisdiction. I will have discussions with him to see whether there is any way we can move quickly towards solving this problem. We are aware of this long-standing problem and we are aware of the concerns of the organisation to which the honourable member referred. His Party had an opportunity to do something about it when it was in Government, and it was not able to do anything. We have the same problem, and it is under consideration at the moment. We will remedy the position as soon as it is possible to do so.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Labour state the Government's policy regarding the streamlining of the Workers Compensation Act? During the past few months constituents have complained to me about being unable to obtain workers compensation insurance cover from insurance companies. Also, I understand that premium rates charged by some insurance companies have escalated by as much as 300 per cent.

I know that the Minister is considering the recommendations of what has come to be known as the Byrne Report following the previous Liberal Government's failure to come to grips with this important matter. Some employers have told me that, when being told by insurance companies that insurance is not available, one of the reasons given is the imminent socialisation of the workers compensation industry. I have heard some ridiculous and nonsensical—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and I ask him to refrain from doing so.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I assume that the honourable member's constituents have been referring to statements I made as reported in the press and over the radio recently regarding my visit to New Zealand to investigate what seems to be an excellent way of dealing with workers compensation. True, there is a single insurer in that system, as there is in Canada and also in Queensland, which, under the control of Bjelke-Petersen, one could hardly call a socialist State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It may go back a long way, but the current Government has been in power for 25 years and has not tried to change it. From his previous comments, I thought that the member for Davenport was not too opposed to this. All Governments around Australia, of whatever political persuasion, have for a long time been most concerned about the escalating premium costs of workers compensation with no consequent relief to the employer or consideration other than monetary for the injured employee. The Government in South Australia is concerned that fair monetary compensation is made for work caused injuries but, importantly, much more emphasis must be placed on the rehabilitative process.

The Byrne Report was commissioned by me as Minister in a previous Labor Government. The report was presented to the Minister of Industrial Affairs in the Liberal Government but not acted on by him. What I did was resurrect that report, having additional copies of it printed and circulated for the public to see what an excellent job had been done by the committee. In its deliberations, some members of the committee visited Canada and New Zealand and commented very favourably on the systems in those places. For insurance companies and others to try to portray the genuine efforts of this Government (and I might say in direct contrast to the absolutely negative efforts of the previous Minister) in the area of workers compensation as the socialisation of workers compensation is scandalous. It displays an absolute ignorance of the real situation and the real efforts being made to assist employers and employees in this very difficult area. I expect to be in a position next year to determine the acceptability or otherwise of the single insurance authority.

Great interest has been generated since I instigated a public debate on this matter about six months ago following the resurrection of the Byrne Report. The 200 copies of that report that I had printed have almost all been taken by people interested in the revival of that report. For instance, South Australian lawyers, who would not be happy about the change in direction if the Government adopts that report finally, have sent representatives to New Zealand to have the legislation there examined. The metal trades section of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has sent or is sending someone to investigate the system there. Whether we like it or not, all Governments around

Australia, whether Labor or Liberal, are concerned about the high cost of workers compensation. Indeed, I am so concerned about it that I am worried lest the system collapse. Almost daily, someone is in trouble over workers compensation premiums. This should not be a Party political matter: it should be dealt with on the basis of all Parties going down the one road to solve the serious problem that is emerging not only in South Australia but all over Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Would you—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member is embarrassed because of what he did not do, that is all right with me. The leading political Parties in New Zealand support this scheme, which has operated there since 1973. The architect of that scheme is willing to visit South Australia and to inform the public of this State what benefits have resulted from the scheme. Further, Geoffrey Palmer, who has written an excellent book on this subject is willing to come out. I recommend his book to the Deputy Leader, but whether he has read it I do not know. However, I commend it to all members as compulsory reading.

PLANNING APPROVAL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning still of the opinion that section 50 of the Planning Act should be revoked in relation to a shopping development at Renown Park, and what does the Minister see as being the main objectives of that section of the Act? Last week we learnt that the Minister had wanted to revoke section 50 of the Act but that there had then been a change. We learnt that the Minister had been rolled by Cabinet when he put the matter before it and that that action would not be taken. Therefore, it is important that we know, following this situation of the Minister's being rolled by Cabinet, his attitude to the matter referred to and also to section 50 of the Act.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First, I think that the honourable member meant to say 'invoke' and not 'revoke' section 50, since obviously that could only happen by vote of this House and another place. Secondly, the honourable member makes certain assumptions which he would find would not be borne out by the written advice which I gave to Cabinet, were he privy to that advice. Certain people, who believed that they would be seriously affected by the Renown Park proposal following the Planning Commission's having concurred with the approval given by the Hindmarsh council, came to me and put a proposition to me that the Government should somehow intervene in this matter.

The only piece of machinery that was available to the Government was that involving an intervention under section 50, which is well understood by the honourable member because, of course, he was the Minister who was in charge of the introduction of that legislation. I felt that it was my duty to place before my colleagues a paper setting out the pros and cons of using a section 50 invocation in this matter. I placed that paper before my colleagues and, on the basis of the advice in that paper and the discussion that was held around the Cabinet table, we decided that section 50 was not an appropriate mechanism to use in this case.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: So, you changed your mind.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I should add that nonetheless the Government was concerned with the fact that on three, if not four, occasions similar calls to Government have been made to somehow involve itself in the planning process in these sorts of circumstances. One of those related to an approval at Berri for a shopping centre, and another to an application by Costain for a development at Victor Harbor. I understand that there is a possibility of something like this also occurring in relation to an application for a development at Murray Bridge which has yet to be finalised. I am not sure of the exact status of that application. In pointing out to my colleagues the pros and cons of a section 50 invocation, I had to make clear that really we were dealing in a wider fishpond than simply the Corporation of Hindmarsh, and that indeed similar sorts of calls had been made previously.

In the light of this, we agreed that a section 50 invocation was not appropriate to the application in question. Nonetheless, we believed that the situation was sufficiently serious to warrant looking at the matter on an overall basis. The honourable member would be aware of the complementary decision that was taken by Cabinet, which was that we would ask a committee representing the Department of State Development, my own Department, and local government to look at this whole matter of economic viability. That investigation is proceeding, and it is to be hoped that as a result of those deliberations there may be some modifications to planning law which will enable Government to have some more direct control in these matters without having to use the sledgehammer mechanism of section 50 (I think the honourable member would agree that that is probably a reasonable sort of description of that).

This is not a new problem: the honourable member had to grapple with this problem at about the time of the Norwood by-election, as I recall. This issue was a factor in the successful return of my colleague the member for Norwood at that by-election. It is by no means a new problem, but the various matters taken into account in those days do not really seem to have affected (in fact, seem to have assisted) planning authorities in coming to decisions. There seems to be general agreement at present such as our concern for a further examination of the problem.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Deputy Premier indicate what is the cost of industrial accidents in South Australia and how that figure compares to the cost of industrial disputes? In a recent article in *The Australian* the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Willis, indicated that more productivity was lost through health and safety problems than through strikes. The article further states:

> 'Conservative estimates suggest that $6 billion a year is wasted through loss of production and other costs as a result of occupational injury and ill-health,' said Mr Willis. 'About 300 people are killed each year in work-related accidents and a further 150 000 persons are injured at work each year.'

Can the Deputy Premier provide the House with comparable figures for this State?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member was good enough to tell me yesterday that he would ask this question. I know that he has had an intense interest in workers compensation, safety, health and welfare matters, so it is no surprise that he is asking this question. I cannot really put it into costs, but I have had the figures taken out in relation to actual time lost. They are quite surprising, even to one who has had some experience in this matter.

The days lost due to industrial disputes in 1979-80 were 116 400; those for industrial accidents and disease for the same year were 520 000. In 1980-81 time lost through industrial disputes in South Australia was 72 000 days, and the staggering figure for industrial accidents and disease was 565 000 days, which I do not think anyone in this House would be delighted about. In fact, I am sure that they would share my feelings on the matter. In 1981-82 days lost through industrial disputes were 143 200, and for 1982-83, 110 600, which has reduced somewhat.

The figures for time lost through industrial accidents for those two periods are not yet available. My source for those figures is the A.B.S. Industrial Disputes catalogue No. 6322.0 in the first instance and, secondly, the A.B.S. Industrial Accidents—South Australia, catalogue No. 6301.4 and Department of Labour Estimates. The figures for 1979-80 and 1980-81 show that the ratio of days lost through industrial accidents to days lost due to industrial disputes is more than 4:1. This sort of relationship has existed for many years with the time lost through industrial accidents far exceeding the time lost through industrial disputes.

The figures reveal an alarming situation and, as I said, I do not think anyone in this House would show cause for joy about them. I am sure members will be alarmed. The situation more than justifies the action I have taken recently in setting up a steering committee to advise me: it is being headed by Dr John Matthews, and has been broken into three separate parts. I expect an interim, if not a final, report from that committee early in December. I hope that next year we will be able to introduce legislation that will overcome those stark and dramatic figures that I have presented.

TOURISM FIGURES

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Can the Minister of Tourism say whether his Department has analysed the recently released Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on tourist accommodation for South Australia for the June quarter showing that room occupancy rates in motels and hotels and stay occupancy rates in caravan parks are down compared to the same quarter in 1982? If it has, what factors does the Department consider to be responsible for the downturn, which continues the trend evident in the March quarter?

The main features of the bureau's information show that room occupancy rates in licensed hotels with facilities averaged 45.5 per cent for the three months ended 30 June 1983, compared with an average of 49.6 per cent for the corresponding quarter in 1982. It should be noted that during the same period the number of hotel guest rooms increased by 504 to 3 298. Room occupancy rates in motels, etc. with facilities, averaged 54.5 per cent for the June quarter 1983, compared with an average 57 per cent for the June quarter 1982. Caravan parks had site occupancy rates averaging 16.8 per cent for the June quarter 1983. This was a slight decrease from the average 17.5 per cent for the June quarter 1982. The downward trends continue, as experienced in the March quarter, and should be a matter of serious concern to the Government and the industry, especially in view of marketing initiatives, results of which should have been reflected in the June quarter figures.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am aware of the figures that the honourable member has read to the House. The Government is having those figures researched now, and I do not have a report back from the Department on them. I have just returned from Sydney, where bookings for bed nights in South Australia have increased by 164 per cent: in New South Wales, and especially Sydney, there has been an enormous increase in bed nights sold in New South Wales for South Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There is nothing to be achieved by any point-scoring across the Chamber between the shadow Minister and me, or her colleague. I will have the information researched. Any downturn in visitor nights in South Australia is a matter of concern to me, the industry, and the Government, because I am firmly convinced that South Australia has a good tourist product, and one that has been promoted well. There is much enthusiasm within the tourist industry, and anything that would tend to dampen that enthusiasm would have bad effects on South Australia and on the public. I appreciate the honourable member's question, and I will obtain a report.

PHOTOGRAPHIC PRODUCTS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate urgently which photographic products are being offered for sale in South Australia that do not carry Australian agents' guarantee and, if necessary, take action to warn the public? It has been brought to my attention, through an article in the *Advertiser*, that cameras and photographic material are being offered for sale that do not carry Australian agent guarantees, and consequently faulty workmanship is not covered for replacement or parts if the products being sold are found to be faulty. It was raised in a commercial advertisement in the *Advertiser* and, in an article attached, a particular photographic retailer states:

> The cameras did not carry Australian agents' guarantee cards and were not covered for faulty workmanship or parts.
>
> Dealers who sold the cameras would personally guarantee them but could not offer guarantee cards.

As a consequence, those products are not guaranteed for any faulty workmanship.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the member for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I will be pleased to refer his question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs for his attention.

RURAL ROADS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport acknowledge that State Government funds for rural arterial road grants for local councils have been slashed by 37 per cent this year, and what action will the Government take to reduce the number of retrenchments by councils due to the financial problems caused by this cut in funds? Rural arterial road grants to councils in 1982-83 were $1.8 million, although for the financial year 1983-84, the amount is only $1.13 million, a cut of $670 000 or 37 per cent. I understand that some councils have expressed grave concern to the Minister and the Premier. I will read three extracts from a letter from the District Council of Elliston to the Premier. The first quote is as follows:

> Council has budgeted $150 000 in line with assertions given by the Minister of Transport at a deputation held in Adelaide on 13 April 1983 that the grant to this council for 1983-84 would be the same as the previous year, which incidentally has been the policy of the former Government for several years. The comments contained in your letter to council dated 15 August 1983 also served as an indication to council that it was to expect a grant at least equal to that of the previous year.

The Minister and Premier apparently had indicated to councils that they could expect the same grant as last year. The second quote from this letter to the Premier (and I wonder whether the Premier has even had the courtesy to reply to it, let alone solve some of the problems caused by the cut) is, as follows:

> This council has, for example, this year budgeted $150 000 as its grant to enable continued sealing works on the Lock-Elliston section of the Cowell-Elliston main rural arterial road and any reduction in that amount by your Government will directly result in the retrenchment of employees and a scaling down of council's road making plant.

The third quote from this letter, which is a scathing attack I might add on the Government, is as follows—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is commenting.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The third quote from the letter is as follows:

Council has in the past few weeks purchased a multi-tyred combination roller and has also called tenders for the purchase of a new grader. The roller has cost council $24 500, and was purchased almost exclusively to be used on construction work on the Lock-Elliston Road.

I understand that other councils are in exactly the same sort of position as is the District Council of Elliston.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: This question is one that concerns me and the Government, and needs full explanation and understanding. Overall, the picture for road funds for South Australia for 1983-84 is quite good. Total funds for roads in this State have been increased from $145 million last year to $183 million this year, representing an increase of more than 23 per cent. The increased funding for this financial year under the A.B.R.D. programme accounts for a proportion of that total increase. However, in addition, normal funding has been increased from $137 million last year to $150 million this year, as the honourable member mentioned, which is an increase of about 9 per cent.

Because of the State's budgetary problems, several economies have had to be made in allocations and these have been decreases in direct grants to councils for roads in the rural arterial category. I point out that grants to councils fall under a variety of categories. Some moneys, such as those available for local roads, are distributed to councils on a formula basis, and councils can predict with some certainty what their levels of funding are likely to be from year to year.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: If the honourable member will listen, he might better understand the whole road-funding programme.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The rural arterial road grants are allocated on a needs basis, and councils have been continuously reminded that they cannot assume that they will get the same amounts in this category from year to year. In fact there has been a rather disturbing tendency in some councils to overspend their grants in one year by completing projects in the hope that they will be able to recoup that expenditure from subsequent grants. It has been pointed out to the councils involved that this is a risky procedure.

In the rural arterial category, although direct grants to councils have been decreased, an increase has occurred in money allocated for specific works programmes. About $1.8 million was allocated to rural arterial road grants last year, but this financial year the allocation has been reduced to $1.13 million. Increases in money allocated to specific work have meant that the total sum available for roads in the rural arterial category has been increased from $3.9 million last year to $4.1 million this year. The specific works allocations are devoted to rural arterial roads maintained by the Highways Department. However, the works involved would be carried out principally by the local councils.

It can be seen that, despite the necessary cuts in expenditure, basically the same sums are available for rural arterial road works that will be performed in the main by the local council work force. I am well aware that some councils might have difficulty in supporting their road construction work force in the current tight financial climate. However, that situation affects everyone, including the Highways Department's own work force, and we have tried to be as even-handed as possible in the allocation of these moneys bearing in mind at all times that we are trying to spend money on projects that have the highest priority.

I remind the House that we have been making substantial efforts to ensure that the work force in both the public and private sectors will benefit from this money. Although some complaints have been received from the construction industry about the amount of work available to the private sector in roadworks, it is worth pointing out that a massive increase has been made to the total money available for contract work on this State's roads. In the last financial year $27.6 million was spent on contracts for roadworks and in this financial year the total will be more than $54 million, which is an increase of nearly 100 per cent. As we demonstrated when we awarded one contract to the Kadina council, we are prepared to allow public sector bodies, including local government, to tender for some of these roadworks. I am working strenuously towards making sure that every avenue is explored to increase the level of funding in this area.

S.A. SENIORS WEEK

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport outline details of S.A. Seniors Week, to take place later this month, and what input his Department has made in the organisation of this major event for elderly citizens?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Seniors Week will be held from 30 October to 5 November. It has been organised by the South Australian Council for the Ageing with assistance from the State Government, my Department, 'Life. Be In It', and private organisations. Programmes for that week are aimed at showing elderly citizens the importance of retirement activities. South Australia has more than 400 000 people in the over-50 years age group and I believe it is important to provide many activities for this section of the community.

I assure the member and the House that it will not be a week of only serious discussions and workshops. The programmes and activities will provide fun, fellowship and enjoyment as well. Events will include sport, dancing, a Melbourne Cup luncheon, displays, historic walks, festivals and tours. Activities during the week will be held not only in Adelaide but throughout the State. A staff member of the Department of Recreation and Sport has been actively involved in preparing the activities for Seniors Week. He was a member of the organising committee and helped considerably with the South Australian Council for the Ageing in preparing events for the week. I hope that the events will achieve the success they so justly deserve.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

IDENTITY CARDS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, all Australian citizens over the age of 18 years should be issued with identity cards to give a greater opportunity to control tax evasion, exploitation of social security and welfare benefits, detect illegal immigrants and control under-age drinking in licensed premises.

Ten years ago I would have been totally opposed to the concept of universal identity cards. I am promoting such a concept today because it will give the House an opportunity to discuss something which has been talked about by sections of the community for many years now and which a significant number of people in Government agencies believe to

be desirable. Many people in private enterprise believe it would be desirable, particularly those who operate licensed premises where there is an age limit on persons who may be served with alcoholic beverages. Also involved are people in betting rings where gambling is allowed. This motion will allow us to find out the thoughts of individual members about the use of identity cards, and I hope that some rational discussion will result in ideas that could be implemented by Governments, even if the end result is different from that of an overall identification requirement.

The problem of identification is particularly pertinent in relation to the withholding tax recently implemented by the Federal Government. This is a bad tax, and its administration is another cost on individual businesses; it is an unfair tax in some instances. For example, I am led to believe that, if a contract is worth $14 000, if the major part of it is for material, and if the labour costs less than $1 500, the contractor is obliged to pay 10 per cent of the total contract price as a withholding tax. Such a case would be a person supplying their labour to a project. The tax would be as much as the labour content, so that contractor would be working for nothing until the end of the financial year, when the Taxation Department reviews the tax paid during the year. That is totally unfair, even though it is using the worst possible example. If we could have some method of identification so that the person who employed another would be obliged to inform a Government department that he had paid X dollars to that person, it would remove the necessity for this withholding tax.

There are many areas of taxation in which an identity card would be of advantage to someone employing people wanting to work on a cash basis, whether on fruit-picking or in the building industry, where workers demand cash payments and not a weekly pay rate. There are multitudes of areas in a cash economy where, if we make the penalty high enough, the person paying out the cash would be obliged to inform a department of the payment or face a penalty himself. Then, less tax would have to be paid by the legitimate taxpayer who has tax taken out of his salary or wage each week and who cannot dodge taxation as can some business men and women. I do not suggest that all business people exploit the tax system, but some do and we have read about them in recent times. So, if the Government wants to consider identity cards or Parliament thinks them desirable, such cards would be of benefit in that regard.

All of us have read about people who exploit the social services system. Today, it is a simple process for a person to register for social security benefits under various names. For example, within the past 18 months a resident of one of the Eastern States was receiving not one or two benefits each fortnight, but as many as seven unemployment cheques. No-one picked up the exploitation until the person died, when it was found that the seven cheques for that person had not been collected. A method of identification would eliminate that problem for the Social Security Department.

We know that people enter Australia legally and we could give them identification cards on arrival. We know that young men and women enrol for elections at the age of 18 years and we should be able to ascertain through the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages whether such persons were born in Australia, have entered the country legally, have entered it illegally, or are using a false name. That is the extreme to which we should go to eliminate this area of exploitation. If this area or most of it were eliminated, many millions of dollars would be saved each year that could be made available to genuine and honest disadvantaged people who claim only the one social security benefit.

Mr Ferguson: It would give a lot of work to the printers.

Mr EVANS: I shall come to that point later. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, have often expressed concern about the way in which some hotels and other licensed places exploit the young and allow the law to be abused in the matter of under-age drinking. Hoteliers have difficulty in proving the exact age of some persons entering their premises. When Parliament first discussed the reduction of the age of majority from 21 to 18 years, I was one of those ultra-conservative troglodytes that opposed the move. In fact, when in 1969 my Party introduced the measure, which also enacted the licensing system under which owners of licensed premises would pay for the liquor licence, I opposed the lowering of the minimum age from 21 to 18 years.

I moved an amendment to make the minimum age 20 years. Many people disagreed with my arguments for the amendment, but I appreciated the statement by Cyril Hutchens, a respected member of the Labor Party, who said, 'Stick to your guns, Stan. The age of 18 is too young.' I was grateful when the minimum age of 20 was enacted by one vote. Indeed, from 1969 to about July 1970, when the Government had changed, the minimum age for legal drinking was 20 years. I said then that, on average, a young man went out with a young lady two years younger than he and that, if the minimum age were fixed at 18 years, some girls of only 16 years would enter hotels. Further, if the rules were bent and a young man of 17 entered the hotel, the girl with him might be only 15 years of age, and I said that we were making a burden for the future. That argument was ignored or rejected by most members in 1970, whereas now most members admit in private that we have a serious under-age drinking problem. The police and the community have a problem that could be solved, in part at least, by the use of identity cards. We may have been foolish enough to reduce the minimum age for drinking to 18 years. There is some supervision but the law said nothing about drinking in a public place.

What a person does in a private place, such as the home or the home of a friend, has nothing to do with the general public unless a nuisance is created. So, I do not comment on what people do in their homes or on other private property in respect of the drinking of alcohol. However, we need to look at the law under which a person just over 18 years of age can buy as much alcohol as he wishes and then go to the beach or a public park and invite other people of any age to have a drink and give them as much alcohol as they like to consume.

Surely we should be looking at this under-age drinking in public. Indeed, it should be just as serious an offence for an under-age person to drink in public as it is in a licensed place, because at least there is control in a licensed place. At that time I said that the cost of employing young people would rise dramatically and that, lacking experience, they would have difficulty in obtaining employment because they would have had no experience and would be entitled to full adult wages in many areas. People said that that was a joke and that it would not occur, but now young people are not getting experience because they are too dear to employ. That is not their fault: it is the fault of this Parliament, of the Commonwealth Parliament and of the Arbitration Court which fixes the rates of pay.

A young man came to me wanting a job. He was an apprentice carpenter and cabinetmaker under the Master Builders' Association scheme whereby he could be lent out to various contractors with the M.B.A. holding the indenture. I tried to get him a job with a shopfitter, telling him that the lad was available and well advanced in his apprenticeship. However, the shopfitter told me, 'Sorry, Stan. I'd like to give him the job but he is too expensive. I will have to have a 16 or 17 year-old lad to make it a viable proposition.' That occurred only because we changed the law in the early 1970s to recognise that at 18 people were more mature than they were at the turn of the century. That trend has occurred

in nearly every country in the world, yet in the United States people are advocating the legal age of 20 years at which people can consume alcohol. So, there is a need for people to carry proof of their age in those circumstances.

Nowadays, some young people are lowering their age for the purposes of obtaining a job. Young people of 19 years, knowing that they have been priced out of the market because of decisions made in this Parliament and the Arbitration Court, are saying that they are only 16 or 17. However, if there is a subsequent argument with the boss, and if they have signed no document attesting to their age, they can go along to the Industrial Court and say that they have been underpaid, and the employer must make up the balance. It then becomes a matter of who is telling the truth in regard to the age of such people, and in those circumstances an identity card would be beneficial.

While the Fraser Government was in office, two amnesties for illegal migrants were declared. It was deemed that illegal immigrants in this country who had no criminal record in their country of origin and no health problems would be allowed to stay in Australia. When this first occurred in 1975, 5 000 people gave themselves up under the amnesty and applied for permanent residence in Australia. I spoke to five Asians who had worked in a catering business: their employer knew that they were illegal immigrants and exploited them by paying them something like half the award rate of pay, because he knew that they could not afford to squeal.

If a large penalty were applicable to employers who did not notify the authorities about people who did not have identity cards and employed such people regardless of that fact, we might succeed in making it less easy for people to reside in this country illegally—people who currently obtain employment here (even though they might be exploited by an employer) and who have an opportunity of obtaining permanent residency or a way of staying here on a long-term basis while receiving a full rate of pay for any work that they might do.

Many people might consider that it does not matter if 4 000 or 5 000 illegal immigrants come into Australia every few years. At a time when very strict controls are placed on the number of people coming into a country for many and various reasons, and at a time when there is a high unemployment rate and attempts are made to find work either for people born within the country or for legitimate immigrants, a significant number of illegal immigrants must cause concern. This is particularly so if they are prepared to work for lower rates of pay in their attempt to find security which they could not find in their homeland. So, there is a need for some form of identification of prospective employees.

At the moment, we virtually have an identity card system about to come into operation. What is Medicare if it is not very close to a system whereby the majority of Australians will accept an identity card? Although such cards will not have photographs on them, it is the first step down the road to the vast majority of Australians being registered on a computer. No complaint has been made by people in the community about that, except by those who see the service as being expensive and involving a cost which taxpayers must pay in the long term. There has not been much objection to the system of issuing cards to people to enable them to receive a service, and that involves a form of identity card.

Over the years the argument against identity cards has been that such a system interferes with the rights of the individual and that such a procedure could be considered to be something imposed by a police State. That has been the main objection. I must say that for many years I have been an advocate of that point of view. However, more and more people have come to me over the past few years expressing the view that identity cards should be issued. That is the reason for my raising the matter here. How many people complain about having to have a card to prove that they belong to a golf or football club, the R.S.L. or service groups, some of which have identification badges? Some members of unions carry tickets to indicate that they belong to a certain union. Why should Australians not carry a card indicating that they are proud to belong to Australia, one of the greatest and most free places in the world, which offers many benefits to individuals and families?

People should be proud to carry a card to indicate that they are Australian, and it would be beneficial to be able to readily identify oneself. I carry virtually nothing to identify myself; I do not carry a driver's licence or any other bits of paper. The only thing I carry around is a few notes in case I want to buy something. On many occasions I have found that it would have been an advantage to have had an identity card on me to identify myself when wanting to purchase something from a store, for example. On occasions I have had to tell an assistant that the only way I could identify myself would be for that person to telephone my office. On such occasions when I have been unable to identify myself through having no identification papers with me, it has caused embarrassment.

People purchasing goods use bankcards as a form of identifying themselves. No objection is made to using bankcards to obtain the benefits of trading within Australia. Therefore, I put the argument, as others have put to me, that people should not be concerned about having an identity card to prove that they are an Australian citizen and to enable them to gain the privileges and benefits available within Australia. Such a system would also make it more difficult for people wanting to exploit the system, whether they be business men exploiting the taxation area or people exploiting the social security benefits area. Quite often it is not the under privileged people who deliberately exploit that area. Further, people have difficulty in controlling licensed premises in regard to proving the age of patrons. All those areas would be benefited by individuals having identity cards.

The member for Henley Beach referred to the cost of implementing such a scheme and to the fact that it would not be cheap. I am not arguing with that. However, I doubt whether such a system will be implemented. Most politicians would not have enough intestinal fortitude to stand up and say that it would be a good thing in the long term, because in the main a large section of society objects to such a system. Politicians are mainly concerned with winning the next election and with retaining their seat in Parliament. We are all in that boat: that is our game. However, it is unlikely that a proposition such as the one I have outlined would be accepted because of that percentage of society which sees it as being an infringement of their rights.

The cost factor would have to be considered. Maybe one way of doing it would be to issue new enrollees on the electoral roll with identity cards. A photograph would have to be taken and the details entered on a computer. It would take time to apply this procedure to everyone involved, but it could be used as a means of beginning to pick up some of the problems that exist at present. If it is going to be implemented in one fell swoop, as with Medicare, it will be costly, involving paperwork, and so on, but if the Government, the Parliament and the people in Canberra think it is a good idea I believe that the scheme should be accepted and considered to be worth while. What we would save over the years from exploitation of taxpayers' money would soon make up for the cost of implementing such a scheme. I hope that the House will consider the proposition, and that members will not set out to play politics and say that

it will infringe people's rights, or attack the matter on a Party political basis.

Members should consider the motion to see whether there is some merit in moving in this direction, at least to some degree, so that we can have a rational debate on the subject over the next few weeks. If we decide that it is a good proposition, we can give an indication to the Parliament in Canberra that within this State there is some support for this proposition to be implemented by the Parliament. If it is rejected, that is an indication that the majority of our Parliamentarians will not accept it. I ask members to consider the motion seriously as a method of solving some of the problems that now exist, saving taxpayer's money, and enforcing some of the laws with which we are having difficulty.

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

CEDUNA WATER SUPPLY

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Minister of Water Resources and the Engineering and Water Supply Department should immediately take steps to provide reticulated water schemes west of Ceduna to all the communities that are without reticulated service, and that such a scheme be phased in over the next three financial years.

This is the second time that I have been forced to move this motion in the House. I am not doing it because I want to delay the House in other important matters, but I have reached the stage where I consider that for a considerable time people in isolated communities have not received a fair allocation of the resources of the State and Commonwealth. Those people are taxpayers and are entitled to what most communities would take for granted, that is, reasonable access to reticulated water schemes. The situation west of Ceduna has been one concerning my constituents in that part of the State for many years.

I raised the matter at some length during the deliberations of Estimates Committee B, when the Minister indicated to me that, out of the 34 deferred schemes listed in order of priority, the Ceduna-Koonibba scheme is No. 32, involving an estimated capital cost of $3.3 million. Looking at that list, I believe that Parliament should be able to appropriate funds to commence construction of a large number of those schemes immediately. I have been told by the Minister and by others that the resources are not available. It would appear to me, having been in this House for a number of years, that resources can be found when Governments get into trouble. If there are popular schemes which a large number of people desire, it is amazing how the funds can suddenly appear. But, if one is dealing with relatively small isolated communities, one has to go to great lengths to get justice for them, whether it involves electricity, transport, water or rates.

I could then go into great detail about Commonwealth facilities, where the same situation applies. In relation to these projects I believe that the Government should be providing at least $5 million to $6 million each year to make a start. I do not say that that money should all go on one project, but five or six should be commenced immediately. This would employ people and have a long-term beneficial effect on the people in whose areas the projects are located. The argument about money does not stand up to scrutiny. I have selected quickly from the Auditor-General's Report a number of organisations which have been subsidised by the State.

I turn to page 300 which, referring to the Jam Factory Workshop, reveals a significant deficit in its operations of $463 000 compared with $369 000 in 1981-82 and $343 000 in 1980-81. That money was found: there was no problem about that, and we know there will be a larger deficit every year. Let us turn to another organisation. In connection with the North Haven Trust we see a deficit of $866 000 for 1983, compared to a deficit of $658 000 in 1982. That already adds up to $1 million. The Parks Community Centre received a grant from the State Government of $1.56 million, and there was no problem in finding that.

Mr Lewis: That's the Regency white elephant.

Mr GUNN: Yes. Then we have the regional cultural centres, which are white elephants of the highest order. If ever politicians have blown out their chests (I make no apology for saying this) in providing facilities which only a small section of the community is going to use they have done so in this matter.

Mr Ferguson: What does Murray Hill say about that?

Mr GUNN: I am not concerned about Murray Hill: he can sit in one of the nicest parts of Adelaide, with every facility he wants. It is all very well to build a facility at Whyalla and call it the Eyre Peninsula cultural centre. If all the people on Eyre Peninsula living outside Whyalla were asked whether they wanted the money spent on a regional cultural centre or water schemes and roads I believe that they would choose water schemes and roads. Admittedly, the Whyalla cultural centre will be a very nice facility, and a number of people will get a great deal of enjoyment out of it, but it will be at tremendous cost, and only a small number of people at Whyalla will use it.

Just look at the costs involved. The total debt servicing of these schemes is shown as follows: South-East, $2.9 million; Northern, $2.67 million; Eyre Peninsula, $1.1 million; and Riverland, $350 000 at this stage. The Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre involves long-term liabilities, it would appear at this stage, of $2 million. Regarding the State Transport Authority, page 480 of the Auditor-General's Report states:

> The operating shortage, before applying the annual contribution from the State of $64.9 million, was $75.0 million—an increase of $11.8 million. In addition to the contribution of $64.9 million, the State—
>
> applied $3.5 million grants for urban public transport projects towards operations; and
>
> remitted loans to the Authority totalling $12.61 million.
>
> Traffic receipts which increased by $6.9 million to $34.9 million, covered only 30 per cent of total operating costs.

The Minister of Water Resources tells us from time to time that the return on investment for the schemes in question is not high enough, but the Government is getting only a 30 per cent return on the State Transport Authority operations, and that is only one organisation. I could go on through the Auditor-General's Report selecting a number of other organisations. I am fully aware, as are my constituents, that the E. & W.S. Department country areas run at a loss, but what about the Festival Theatre?

I refer to comments about the Festival Theatre in the Auditor-General's Report. To ensure that people are not confused, I am not attacking the Festival Theatre. Occasionally, I enjoy going there, but I cannot see why it should continue to be subsidised when there are other important areas in the State requiring Government funds. In the Auditor-General's Report the significant reference to the Festival Theatre is that its operating deficit for the year was $4.3 million.

Mr Lewis: That would provide a lot of water.

Mr GUNN: As my friend for Mallee says, that would provide a significant reticulation scheme in my district. That figure represents an increase of $343 000. I have mentioned at random organisations funded by the State Government that operate on a deficit. I hope that when the Minister replies he is able to say that the Government has

a long-term strategy to overcome these problems. They have not just arrived on the Minister's desk; they have been around for a long time. People in isolated country areas are entitled to receive justice, and I could refer at some length to problems of electricity and roads. It is no good people saying that funds cannot be found. I have been able to demonstrate that for some organisations funds can be and are being found. If one goes through the Auditor-General's Report—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You find a few that are politically convenient.

Mr GUNN: As the member for Alexandra pointed out, it is politically convenient to continue to pour good money into what would seem to be white elephants. Among various other organisations the State Government found $25 million for the Monarto white elephant and then threw away another $17 million or $18 million on the Frozen Food Factory. We were attacked as a Government because we wound up those white elephants. Heaven help us: the money would have been found had they been allowed to drift on like a rooster with its head cut off.

There has been Redcliff, the Land Commission, and other areas where huge amounts have been invested, and there have been no significant or tangible benefits for the people of this State. This situation greatly concerns me. I have the responsibility to represent the people of this State, and I would be failing in my duty if I did not continue to raise these matters at length in Parliament. I will not be satisfied until I see some justice. The Government should be providing funds to help people obtain reasonable schemes. I do not know how the Government arrived at its priorities, but when one looks through the 30 or so schemes one can see the priorities.

Some areas would be fortunate enough to have underground water or be in the high rainfall areas, but people west of Ceduna, like those at Coober Pedy, do not have underground water suitable for drinking, so it has to be carted or they have to erect tanks, and that is not satisfactory in the country west of Ceduna. In many cases when tanks dry out water has to be carted long distances because of the lack of underground supplies. The only answer to the problem is to extend the pipeline with an adequate reticulation scheme.

I commend the motion to the House, and I hope that the Minister can respond to it soon. I know that he is aware of the problems, but we have been discussing these matters for far too long. I want to see adequate funds allocated for some of these projects, especially the one that I have mentioned. People near Terowie have complained regularly to me about these matters. People from Coober Pedy put forward a proposition to the Minister that they believed would help: it would be expensive, but it would be a great improvement on what they have now. The same applies to the people around Venus Bay, who would like a reticulated scheme there. I could go on listing others, but I believe that the time has come to take action. Therefore, I call on the Minister and members of the House to support my endeavours to achieve for these people a decent and reasonable water reticulation scheme.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In seconding the motion and supporting the remarks made by the member for Eyre, I note that the motion on the Notice Paper is broad in its reference, broad enough for me to refer to water reticulation on a wider span than that specifically applying to the member's district. It is true that moneys are available from time to time via the Government to projects that politically suit the Party in office. I do not wish to canvass at great length the examples that demonstrate that point but I draw the Minister's attention to the urgent need for reticulated water supplies to isolated areas in the State. I cite the case of American River and the Dudley Peninsula, on Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My colleague, the ex-Minister of Water Resources (now spokesman for the Liberal Party on that portfolio), reminds me that had we been successful in securing at least a base to receive royalties from Roxby Downs and other like centres around Australia, that sort of royalty would be available for funding these essential services.

Returning to the American River and Dudley Peninsula plight, this Government will be faced with the same cost and subsidy requirements in that region whilst it is in office over the next few years as we did when in Government between 1979 and 1982. During that time the Tonkin Government was faced with a call for subsidy for the cartage of water to these centres, and, in the circumstances, we had no alternative but to uphold that request. It cost the Government then, and it will continue to cost Governments of the future, an enormous amount to supply urgent services to those areas during the dry months, particularly in the dry if not drought years. It is pouring good money after bad to pay people to cart water from one part of their region to another and to do so repeatedly, as indeed residents of those areas have had to do as individuals at their own expense since the settlement of those regions.

The American River situation is a disgrace about which none of us can boast any appropriate attention. I say none of us, because Governments of the past of both political persuasions have ignored one of the oldest established tourist centres of South Australia, that of American River. They have sought on the one hand to promote through the avenues available to them tourists into that region, and on arrival of those tourists they have found themselves many times (particularly the tourist operators servicing those visitors) in an embarrassing situation of being without either adequate of quality water.

It has been reported several times in this House, and indeed it is well known in the community, that water from the sea has been scanty, with limited supplies available to those hotel and motel operators on site. Indeed, on occasions, through the toilet systems of those facilities, sea water, direct from the American River inlet, has been pumped for the purposes of flushing. In these times—in 1983 going towards 1984—in a year of extreme effort to promote tourism, it is egg on our face, on all of our faces, to sit back here and talk about investing or spending public money in some of the ventures that we have been guilty of, and ignoring the real and demonstrated need of people in the areas to which I have referred.

The same situation applies to the Dudley Peninsula and those residents of the Penneshaw township where they depend on a farmer's dam to provide a water supply to the township and the growing tourist development region adjacent to Penneshaw. I think that, although the matter has been drawn to previous Ministers' attention and clear cases have been demonstrated and acceptance of the need has been forthcoming from both Liberal and Labor Ministers of the past, the present Minister would be hailed highly if he were to apply himself seriously to this question and, thereby, head off a call that will come (there is no question about it) next summer and/or the summers to follow to the Minister of Agriculture and other authorities for assistance to cart water to those communities.

I refer to a reticulated system from the Middle River water pipeline system to American River, either via the short route, that is, from Cygnet River to American River over the upper reaches of the American River inlet and on to Penneshaw, or via what has been described as the long route, from the Parndana township extension via the Rowl

Hill Highway, through the district of MacGillivray, to American River, on to Penneshaw.

I do not wish to canvass the details of the situation at Kangaroo Island in the eastern sector of the community and the real needs to have access to a reticulated water supply from the high rainfall extensive catchment areas available in the western sector of that community. However, I support the motion by the member for Eyre, place on record yet again the situation that applies in that community, and plead with the Minister to at least treat it fairly in the allocation of funds for what could clearly and honestly be described as essential services, so that an appropriate amount of funding is made available and identified and indeed extended to the project that I have outlined.

The subject that I raised this afternoon is one that was raised by my predecessor, the Hon. David Brookman, in this House, from indeed this position in the House, as long as 16 years ago. I am aware of the persistent efforts by that honourable gentleman to have this matter accepted by the Government during the period that he was in this House. I am aware of the efforts that have been made through my electorate office to the respective Ministers of Water Resources since that date, and I do not propose to relax at all in continuing to draw this matter to the attention of the House.

I cite it as an issue to which attention has been given not only by the persons I have mentioned but indeed persistently given throughout the period for longer and to a greater extent than any other issue that I have had drawn to my attention since becoming a member of this place. It has become like an evergreen. I suppose that every member who has come in and out of this House over the period I have mentioned would be aware of the plight of the American River community and indeed its need for access to at least a water supply, access to a supply of the kind that most other South Australians or at least most townships within South Australia have. They have none at American River and, as I indicated earlier, they have access to a farmer's dam to service the township of Penneshaw, both of which towns are among the oldest established in the State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And important tourist centres.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The honourable member for Light raises the question again of their being important tourist centres. Indeed, Ministers of the past and the present Minister of Tourism have identified Kangaroo Island in this House and publicly outside it as a tourist region of national if not international significance.

Mr Ferguson: Quite right, too.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I note the comment from the member from the other side of the House in support of that description. I am proud to subscribe to that description of the community that I represent. However, I am ashamed to face those people and admit that, neither whilst in Government ourselves nor now, we have not gone an inch down the track towards establishing or securing the funds so necessary for the projects that I have outlined. I support the remarks of the member for Eyre, and hope that the Government will treat those remarks with the seriousness and urgency that they deserve.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER AND DRAINAGE RATES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

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.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1184.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Minister's response last week to the motion I moved in the House is an appalling indictment of not only the Minister but the Government. The Minister's opening remarks were, as follows:

I do not support the motion . . .

He went on to say:

The rationale for the increases in irrigation and drainage rates is really necessary to curtail the large and increasing deficits incurred by Government over the past four years. From 1979-80 to 1982-83 the deficits on irrigation and drainage amounted to $29.6 million. Even with the increase of 28 per cent, irrigators are being asked to pay only 26 per cent of the total cost of services provided.

The Government is claiming that irrigators are paying only 26 per cent of the cost involved. The Government and the Minister seem to be of the view that the only way to correct the anomaly is by increasing charges and they have not given any consideration to reducing costs in the administration of the irrigation distribution in the Government irrigation areas in South Australia. The Minister went on to say:

Subsidies to irrigators have been increasing annually not only in absolute terms but also as a percentage of the total cost of providing irrigation and drainage.

During the period nominated by the Minister the overall increase in the water rates in the Government irrigation areas was 15 per cent. There is no way that any Government can justify a greater increase than 15 per cent, in as much as that is more than the inflation rate was at that time. If the overall costs and losses are increasing at a rate greater than 15 per cent, then quite obviously the Government must look elsewhere to find out why that is so. In relation to subsidies, the Minister said:

Low water prices that do not reflect the cost of supply slow down the structural changes made necessary by changes in the marketing environment for the produce of those irrigators.

I think that the Minister is saying that, if the cost of water does not truly reflect the value of that water, irrigators are not going to increase their efficiency. The efficiency of irrigators largely depends on the system by which that water is delivered to the irrigator. There is no way that an irrigator can effectively implement improved irrigation practices if he is operating on an antiquated distribution system. The Government and the Minister have curtailed the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas and therefore they have made it virtually impossible for half the Government irrigation areas to put into operation effectively modern irrigation systems.

During the period I was responsible for the Engineering and Water Supply Department as Minister of Water Resources, we implemented a scheme which did not cost any additional money over and above that which was being spent by the previous Labor Government, but it provided an incentive where rehabilitation had taken place to encourage irrigators to adopt modern irrigation practices and effectively use the benefits that had been provided by that new scheme.

I would venture to say that the irrigation practices in South Australia are equal to the best in the world on average, but there is no way that many of the irrigators in the Government irrigation areas can effectively implement

modern irrigation practices if the distribution system provided by the Government does not allow for that to happen. In the main, most of the private irrigation areas in South Australia have been rehabilitated. The Renmark Irrigation Trust, the Lyrup Village Association, the Pyap Private Irrigation Area, and Golden Heights are all modern irrigation distribution systems which allow for modern irrigation practices.

However, under the Government's scheme only about 50 per cent of the Government irrigation areas have been rehabilitated, and the remaining sections in part would be some of the most antiquated irrigation distribution systems in the world. There is no way that those growers can effectively implement modern irrigation practices as we know them and as are being implemented in other parts of the world.

Another part of the total cost to which the Minister referred was the $29.6 million, which is very much bound up in rehabilitation, and the fact that during most of the period that the rehabilitation project has been under way (from the early 1970s) it has been undertaken by Labor Governments. Under their policy and philosophy that work has been undertaken by Government day labour and certainly not by contract, as was done in the private irrigation areas in this State. During the three years of the Tonkin Government, in the rehabilitation that was continuing at that time in the Berri irrigation area, we issued contracts to small private companies in the area to allow them into the scheme.

Senior members of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will readily acknowledge that, as a result of some contract work being introduced into the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas, the actual pipeline laying rate within the Engineering and Water Supply Department's own workforce increased by about 95 per cent. That policy decision is a matter of decision of the Government of the day over which the Department and officers of the Department have no say whatsoever.

The irrigators of South Australia in the Government irrigation areas of South Australia have had foisted on them a rehabilitation scheme which was to be undertaken by day labour and not by contract, and which has clearly cost the Government over the years 100 per cent more than it would have cost had the work been completely undertaken by contract. This has clearly been proved by the rehabilitation work done in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area. In my opening remarks I referred to the fact that unemployment in the Riverland had increased by 100 per cent. In relation to that, the Minister said:

> I might also point out that unemployment figures are not available on a regional basis, so I suggest that the claim made by the member for Chaffey that unemployment in the Riverland has risen by 100 per cent is only his personal judgement.

I am not in the habit of making statements in this House that are not based on fact. An article in the *Murray Pioneer* of 2 August 1983 states:

> The number of unemployed Riverlanders has risen by an unprecedented 100 per cent over the past year, according to Commonwealth figures released yesterday.
>
> The shock jump in the number of registered unemployed has surprised even Renmark Job Centre manager, Dean Hancock, who warned yesterday that the situation was not going to get any better over the next few months.
>
> The figures, released by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Willis, show that a record 1 762 Riverland people were unemployed to the end of June this year compared with about 870 at the same time last year.

I do not know whether Mr Willis can be trusted, or whether the figures to which he refers are accurate, but they seem to be precise figures, because Mr Willis quoted 1,762 at the end of June compared with 870 the previous year. I do not know who provides the Minister of Water Resources with information for speech material in his response to motions and Bills before this House, but either he ought to see whether he can find someone who has more knowledge or, if he cannot do that, he would do better doing without him, because the information being provided to the Minister for his response to this motion is absolutely appalling. The Minister continued:

> The action taken by this Government in increasing the rates by 28 per cent is consistent also with the recommendations of the Tonkin Government. In the Budget review set up by the Tonkin Government when forming the 1982-83 Budget, the following recommendation was made:
>
> ... the Department should not take any action in 1982-83 which would have the effect of increasing its overall impact on the Consolidated Revenue.

That is a perfectly sensible statement for the Budget Review Committee to make, and it should have been acted on. However, the only way in which the Government has seen fit to act (and the only way in which the statement can be interpreted) has been to increase water charges. It has said that the Department should take no action in 1982-83 that would have the effect of increasing the overall impact on Consolidated Revenue.

This problem could be tackled by increasing the consumers' water rates, by reducing administrative and operating costs, or by a combination of the two. A responsible increase in the price of water would have been acceptable, especially if it had been based on the capacity of the industry to pay and if at the same time an all-out effort had been made by the Government to control the operating and administrative costs within the Department. There is nothing unique about the Government irrigation area. The system being operated by the Renmark Irrigation Trust provides the same service for irrigators as does the Government irrigation undertaking: it provides irrigation and domestic water for its ratepayers. With the same rate structure as that of the Government undertaking, the Renmark Irrigation Trust can meet all its operating costs as well as its commitment to repay loans received from the Government for the rehabilitation of its distribution system.

In the Budget debate, I said that we appreciated the fact that the Minister had taken account of the difficulty the Trust was having in meeting its total repayments this year. However, I do not doubt that the Renmark Irrigation Trust will honour its total commitment to the Government over the 40-year term for repayment of its loans. The Trust is honouring its loan commitments and has done so all along the line. The Trust is a far cry from the 26 per cent that the Government can recover on the same rate structure.

Returning to the statement by the Minister about cheaper water being no incentive to irrigators to improve irrigation practices, I point out that, in a letter to the Premier, the President of the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association makes clear that the price being paid for water by South Australian irrigators is not low on Australian standards. The letter states:

> Two of the crucial points discussed with Mr Slater were growers' lack of ability to pay and the unduly higher water rates charged in South Australia compared with those raised interstate. A trenchant example of this inequity is:
>
> 1. New South Wales (M.I.A.) grower (12 hectares) water @ 1.1c per Kl average watering 12 000 Kl per hectare p.a. = $1 584.00.
> 2. 2. South Australia Riverland grower (12 hectares) water @ 3.75c Kl total charge @ 12 000 Kl hectare p.a. = $4 500.00.
>
> South Australian growers working a reasonable sized block start nearly $3 000 behind their New South Wales counterparts.

So, any suggestion that South Australian irrigators under the Government scheme do not pay a reasonable price for water is shown by that letter to be untrue. In fact, the level of charge made in South Australia is many times higher than that made in other States. South Australian growers, on average, are certainly $3 000 behind their counterparts in other States before they start producing, yet the fruit

must be sold on the same market as that produced in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area. To try to justify the Government's inaction in this matter the Minister referred to income tax, saying:

> The point I am making is that irrigators in the Government irrigation areas are not meeting their total income tax commitments.

If the Minister were to do his homework and to see how the fruit is sold from the Riverland, the Minister would realise that it was almost impossible for irrigators not to account for their total income. Their product goes into the co-operative or proprietary wineries, and all their income must be accounted for. Any suggestion that Riverland irrigators pay only half the tax paid by the average metropolitan factory worker is false. A study would show that the income of the Riverland producer, on average, is much lower than the average income of factory workers in South Australia.

I am bitterly disappointed that the Government will not tackle this problem, and I can only trust that it will change its mind. The Minister has said that he will not withdraw the 28 per cent or have the matter investigated immediately by the Director of State Development. Such a task could be completed in two or three weeks and the Government would then know the situation. Obviously, the Government does not want to know the situation and is intent on forcing on Riverland irrigators increases of such magnitude as to increase their costs steeply and so drive many of them off their property.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September. Page 836.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have read with amazement the member for Glenelg's second reading explanation. It is my firm opinion that anyone introducing a Bill into this House and wishing it to be taken seriously should provide factual and logical justification for its introduction, together with authoritative statements to back up any argument put to the House. After having carefully read the member for Glenelg's second reading explanation, I can express only disappointment that the House was subject to the sort of mishmash of untruths such as those put forward by way of argument by the member. This thinly veiled attack on the trade union movement seems to be justified by (if one can accept the member's arguments) only two arguments. The first argument put forward by the honourable member was that trade union members do not know, out of sheer ignorance, that they are paying sustentation fees. I will refer to that matter in more detail shortly.

Mr Baker: Are you reading this speech?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The other argument advanced by the member for Glenelg can only be described as an insult to any Liberal Party supporter, namely, that if they did know they would not be prepared to do anything about it. Taking the first question first. The member referred to a survey taken out over six years ago, that suggested that union members did not know that they were paying sustentation fees. Since that survey was taken there have been very substantial amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act federally, and all the unions cited by the member for Glenelg in the table on page 833 of *Hansard* of 14 September 1983, have to comply with the changes that have occurred in that time to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Clyde Cameron, when he was Minister for Labour and Industry, introduced very extensive amendments to the Act that forced trade unions to substantially change their rules. In addition, Mr Tony Street introduced into the Federal Parliament in 1980 further amendments that forced every union to produce to its members and to the commission information on matters including sustentation and capitation fees, affiliation fees, levies and collections paid, salaries and other remunerations, including lump sum allowances of holders of offices falling within the definition of office in subsection 41 of the Act, employees salaries and other remunerations, including lump sum allowances, delegates fees and expenses, donations, fines and penalties, meeting expenses, office and administration expenses, professional fees and expenses, property expenses, provisions for long service leave, annual leave, and superannuation, provisions for depreciation and amortisation, other expenditure, and the unions and its branches had to show the amounts of income from entrance fees and periodic membership subscriptions, sustentation and capitation fees, levies and collections, interest, dividends, property income, donations and grants, and other income.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: If the honourable member just holds on he will get the information. It will come his way. They also had to provide information on any surplus where income for the year exceeds expenditure for the year, any deficiency where expenditure for the year exceeds income for the year, the profit or loss on sale of assets, revaluation of assets, transfers to and from special funds and/or levy accounts, and net surplus or net deficiency transferred to accumulated general funds. A statement also had to include cash on hand, cash at banks, accounts receivable, loans receivable, including loans to members and/or office holders, free payments, Government and semi-government investments, other investments, fixed assets (real estate and other), other assets and the following liabilities had to be recorded.

Mr Mathwin: You're not fooling anyone. That is the Federal body, but we are talking about the State.

Mr FERGUSON: I will supply the member in due course, if he has the patience, with all the answers to his second reading speech.

Mr Mathwin: If you can—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has spoken to this on one occasion. There is no need for him to make another speech.

Mr FERGUSON: I know the member is embarrassed by it. They had to provide information on accounts payable, loans payable, provisions for long service leave, provision for superannuation, accrued holiday pay, other accruals, other liabilities and also the following items: accumulated general funds, levies and collections (funds), special funds required or authorised by or under the rules, contingent liabilities, levies/collection assets, special fund assets. In addition the rules were changed. This is the answer to the honourable member's interjection. The Conciliation and Arbitration Act in 1980 required all unions to make sure that all of these details were sent to union members and provided to union members free of charge, all by way of a union journal, if there was a union journal, on a 12-monthly

basis, or by a printed balance sheet so that the suggestion that union members do not know what affiliations are being paid is patent nonsense and if they do not know then they can easily find out, because the Conciliation and Arbitration Act requires that unions are to provide any member at any time with those details. If the union members do not know what affiliation and sustentation fees are being paid obviously they must be blind, deaf and dumb.

The other suggestion in defence of the proposed changes by the member for Glenelg relate to what might vaguely be called stand-over tactics. He suggested, for example, that someone working at General Motors-Holden's might say to a shop steward, 'I don't really want to pay this, because I am a financial member of the Liberal Party.' It was suggested, that that worker would get a job standing on his head in the boot of the car and tightening up screws for the rest of his life or doing some other nasty little job to teach him a lesson for daring to say that he even thought about being a Liberal.

The member for Glenelg could not produce any evidence to substantiate the charges made. It is a slur on the whole of the trade union movement, and suggesting that trade union officials stand over their members to such an extent is preposterous, ridiculous and absolutely unthinkable. In due course, I would like to say something about the stand-over methods imposed by Liberal party fund-raisers. The point that I wish to make is that any union member is able to move at any time to change the rules of his own organisation. Every organisation is obliged to hold an annual general meeting, under the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and he may, by using the rule book and provided that he has the appropriate numbers, move to change the rules so far as affiliation fees or indeed any other rule is concerned. The member for Glenelg has suggested that Liberal Party members are too timid to move in this direction.

The table of unions presented in defence of the argument on page 833 of *Hansard* has been introduced mischievously with the idea of suggesting that the Australian Labor Party is flushed with funds and a false membership list has been produced with 98 Federal unions involved, and the member for Glenelg suggested:

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

The clear implication was that the total membership involved in that table is providing funds in one way or another to the A.L.P., and that suggestion is patently ridiculous. Of the 98 unions listed on pages 133, 134 and 135 of *Hansard*, 42 of the them, to my certain knowledge, are not and never have been affiliated to the Australian Labor Party, and they include such organisations as the New South Wales Police Assocation, the A.B.C. Staff Association, the Commonwealth Public Service, artisans, and many others who would never, for various reasons, become affiliated or have been affiliated with the Australian Labor Party.

All of the information on affiliation fees is avalable to any diligent person who wishes to find out. As I have said, all of this information must be published by law. Anyone with an ounce of energy can produce and find out exactly what unions are paying in affiliation fees. I must say that I found it extraordinary that the member for Glenelg, in backing up his arguments, produced a table that was more than six years old. Even in the authority that he produced, Mr Rawson, if he read the authority properly, would have backed up exactly what I am telling Parliament now and there was no need for him to utter contradictory statements. I quote from page 135 of *Hansard*, where Mr Rawson said, 'Not all unions nor even all affiliates of the A.C.T.U. and the Trades and Labor Council are affiliated to the A.L.P.' Later, Mr Rawson stated, 'Affiliations vary both from State to State and from time to time'. I would like to draw a contrast between the funds provided by way of affiliation fees to the Australian Labor Party and to the Liberal Party.

Mr Mathwin: How much are they? You said the figures were wrong.

Mr FERGUSON: If the member is patient he will hear it all. There is plenty here. I am drawing a contrast between the funds provided to the Australian Labor Party and the funds provided to the Liberal Party. Page 12 of the *Business Review Weekly* of 26 February-4 March 1983 states:

> Traditional support for the Liberals comes from the finance area. Insurance companies scared of national workers compensation schemes have paid for people to man polling booths on election day while banks try to guard against over restriction of the financial system which they believe is a Labor tendency.

Although nobody within the bank or the Party will admit it, Westpac has been the banker for both coalition Parties, and tends to be very flexible in its overdraft terms. The bank approved of a $200 000 loan to the Western Australian National Party early last year and suspended payment of the interest until July this year. What other business in Australia would receive terms like that? An issue of the *National Country Party News* described the bank's generosity thus:

> The Bank of New South Wales, now Westpac, in agreeing to the moratorium on the amounts, have shown their faith in the Party and their desire to see its continuance.

In a letter of confirmation, a bank's spokesman said:

> We trust that this will give an incentive to others to get behind the Party.

The accompanying confidential list of major corporate donors to the Liberal Party is a typical profile of the cross-section of business that supports the Party. It does not reflect necessarily current donors but merely people who have donated in recent years. The biggest segment is undoubtedly the insurance industry. It includes Larry Adler, of F.A.I., David Carter of the Norwich group, Ray Craig of the A.M.P., Lloyd Mills of Reed Stenhouse, Leon Sam Miguel of Occidental, Bert Hull of Swan, and Ron Guest of City Mutual. How many Australians realise that their insurance premium costs have increased steeply because of the donations that have been made to the Liberal Party?

Mr Deputy Speaker, over many years I have taken a deep interest in the annual report of some companies. Since coming into this House, I have been provided with annual reports from insurance companies and, after having perused them carefully, I have never been able to identify where donations to the Liberal Party have come from. I feel sure that shareholders and policy holders of banking and insurance institutions have never asked their shareholders whether they should or should not donate to the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party donations made from companies, mainly from banking and insurance, are done in deadly and absolute secrecy. I do not think that the member for Glenelg can criticise the unions and the Australian Labor Party when the source of his own Party funds are not and have not been revealed to the very people who are making those donations.

I am a very small shareholder in Elders I.X.L. I understand from reading page 11 of the *Business Review Weekly* of 26 February-4 March 1983 that the Managing Director of Elders I.X.L. is a Liberal Party 'bag man'.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know that this is upsetting the Opposition. It can hand it out but it certainly cannot take it. It does not mind thrashing the unions.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The Opposition does not mind thrashing the unions but it cannot take it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: It does not mind thrashing the unions but it does not like getting it back. The article states:

For John Elliott, the youngish articulate Managing Director of the agressive Elders I.X.L. empire, self-made pillar of Melbourne's establishment and Liberal Party 'bag man' Malcolm Fraser's snap election came as no surprise, although it did throw into turmoil his business programme for the next month.

Elliott is one of the many fund-raisers who swings into top gear to finance the campaign of both major political Parties. The treasurer of the Victorian branch of the Liberal Party, and one of the country's most astute political fund-raisers, Elliott has geared up for a December election before Malcolm Fraser's back problem torpedoed the strategy. The Liberal campaign is being organised.

and this is what I particularly want to refer to—

from the top floor of the Elders I.X.L. building in Bourke Street, as well as from a couple of suites in Melbourne's Windsor Hotel.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I inquire of you, Mr Deputy Speaker, as to the relevance of these remarks to the proposition currently before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know that I uphold the point of order. As I understand it, the honourable member for Henley Beach is referring to the Bill introduced by the member for Glenelg, which deals, amongst other things, with sustentation payments to the Labor Party. I do not uphold the honourable member's point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I expected Opposition members to try to stop this. They are not slow in trying to thrash the unions but, when it comes to being handed something back, they start jumping on top of their desks. I particularly expected the member for Mallee to interject in this debate.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know that the Opposition does not like it. I refer to the Melbourne *Age* of 12 February 1983, which states:

The Liberal Party has 30 people working at headquarters—

Mr Lewis: I do not know what that has to do with this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member will not shout me down; I will still say it. The article states:

The Liberal Party has 30 people working at headquarters, 499 Bourke Street, Melbourne, an Elders Building.

Strangely, no-one seems to know whether the Party was paying for the two floors of space. Since reading those articles, I have perused the annual general reports of Elders I.X.L., and I cannot see where free rent has been listed as being provided to the Liberal Party or, as I have previously mentioned, where donations have been listed from the Elders annual general meeting accounts. One can rest assured—

Mr Lewis: I do not know what this has to do with conciliation and arbitration legislation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Speaker, you can rest assured that I, as a shareholder in that company, have not been consulted about the way in which my money is being donated to the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The Opposition does not like it.

Mr Hamilton: It can dish it out but it cannot take it.

Mr FERGUSON: That is right. The *Business Review Weekly* dated 26 February-4 March 1983 (these are not my words but come from newspapers around Australia) listed 480 firms, including insurance companies, banks, wellknown companies, mining companies, and so on, which have donated and provided donations to the Liberal Party. I would be extremely surprised if any of these donations have appeared in the annual general reports of those particular companies. Unlike the member for Glenelg, who can search out the information about the Australian Labor Party if he has enough energy to do so, it is not possible for members on this side to find out what the secret donations are of the Liberal Party, and make no mistake: they certainly are secret. I believe that many of these companies have also donated to the Australian Labor Party, and I would hasten to add that I am a believer in the publication of donations to political Parties. I wholeheartedly support the public funding of election campaigns.

The member for Glenelg referred earlier to alleged standover tactics. However, no mention has ever been made of the standover tactics of the Liberal Party's financiers. An article appearing in the *Bulletin* on 16 November 1982, under the heading 'John Valder, the Liberal Party's financier', states:

Appointed the Party's Finance Director last December, Valder mounted a nifty fund-raising programme that bailed the New South Wales Liberals out of financial disaster. Canberra was impressed. The bag man was hailed as the Messiah. There were some ousters along the way. Some thought his style of fund-raising not so much aggressive as bullying. The response to some donations was not often the expected 'thank you' but a terse 'not enough'. Valder set a target of $3 million and then took three months to set up 25 finance committees throughout the State to tap the Liberal voters who rarely contribute to the Party.

So much for the standover tactics of the trade union movement. How about the standover tactics of the Liberal Party? It seems strange to me that on one side we have allegations of standover tactics and on the other side we have people who wish to appear like angelic choir boys who would never sully themselves through using such a tactic. It is time that both sides agreed to public funding and to the publication of all sources of finance for political Parties. In the time that I have left, I would like to make a brief reference—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am sorry if it upsets the honourable member. refer to taxation dodging by those people who are making donations to both the Liberal and National Parties. Evidence tabled on this subject recently in Canberra states:

The Chairman: I would like to ask a question about the tax position which was raised. I think Mr Evans has something to do with it. He would be aware of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr Evans: Yes. I am the secretary of the Foundation.

The Chairman: Are you? Fair enough. What I think is called the National Free Enterprise Foundation is run by the National Party in New South Wales. Are there any taxation benefits available to either of those foundations or to the people who donate to them?

Mr Evans: Yes. Currently, a contributor making donations to the Foundation, can be assessed for income tax deductions.

The Chairman: In what way?

Mr Evans: Under the Act it is assessable through advertising; you would be aware of that.

The Chairman: Yes. It is just that earlier the point was made that trade union donations were not available for tax deductions.

Senator Sir John Carrick: Yes they are.

And Sir Carrick would know that there is no such thing as taxation deductions for the trade union movement. I would hope that, when this matter is defeated in the House, if ever this matter is reintroduced (and I understand that the member for Glenelg reintroduces this Bill annually) he will put to the House a far better argument than he has put this time, that he gets his facts and figures up to date and that he does not produce statistics that are more than six years old.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): Listening to the member for Glenelg introduce this Bill, I wondered why he was doing this, and I was amazed at the inaccuracies, misconceptions and some of the attitudes expressed by him, because I would have thought that the honourable member, being a person

who came from a country where truth and such matters are paramount, would stick to truth and act as a person with some integrity. However, in this matter he is not. I have looked through his speech, and some of the things I find rather strange. He said:

. . . it is morally wrong that such a commitment should be allowed to continue and that the worker should not have the chance to opt out or to contract out.

In my career, I have had shares in companies, and I have never known a company to advise its shareholders through its annual reports of any donation that it has ever made to political Parties, although I have known that that company has made donations to a political Party. When talking about workers' funds, the member for Glenelg said:

A fairer situation would be for an employer to decide to which Party the money should go; let him share it out.

I find that an amazing comment for the member for Glenelg to make. I have been in this House for only a short time and listened to his comments about the trade union movement and, working it out on the basis of how long he has been here, I am sure the honourable member has said a lot about the trade union movement. He has even boasted of his membership of a trade union. If he understood anything about the trade union movement, he would have appreciated that, in the country of his birth where industrialisation brought about the gathering of workers into factories and the establishment of employers, trade unions were established as a response to the excess of employers. He would have understood all that.

However, what annoys the member for Glenelg is that trade unions beat the employers at their own game. They study their business practices, organise themselves better, collect money better and spend it better, and in the industrial relations field they know how to use it; that is what the honourable member is upset about. I could not work out why members opposite wanted to interfere in the role of the trade union movement by determining how political funds should be collected and how people donate money into those political funds. I want to quote what an article in the *Metal Worker* had to say about the Liberal Party in Queensland. The article is headed 'Liberals bid for control of A.M.F.S.U.,' and that is what is happening in this State. The member for Glenelg has quoted some out-of-date figures about the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, which is now the Amalgamated Metal Foundry and Shipwrights Union. If he bothered to go to the library and look at the balance sheets, he would find that there is a bundle of money there. What he is after, on behalf of the Liberal Party in this State, is details of the funds of those unions, and an effort to do this was also made in Queensland. If members opposite do not believe me, I will read some of the information to them as follows:

Senior members of the Queensland Liberal Party are waging a dirty tricks campaign against the A.M.F.S.U. They are part of a national network of outsiders attempting to seize control of the union. Prominent in the campaign in Queensland is the chairman of the Capricornia district of the Liberal Party, business man Norman Byrne. Byrne, a former motor company manager, is asking metalworkers in Rockhampton to sign a petition asking the Industrial Registrar to stop A.M.F.S.U. returning officers holding elections for 10 positions. These elections are due in the next few months. Byrne is not an A.M.F.S.U. member.

In the central Queensland town of Biloela three business men are seeking signatures for the same petition. They also are not A.M.F.S.U. members. Norman Byrne has a long history of opposition to trade unionism, and is connected with the extreme right-wing National Civic Council.

If members do not believe me, I point out that a photograph of him with Bartholomew Santamaria appeared in the Rockhampton *Morning Bulletin*. The article continues:

Santamaria has admitted the N.C.C. funded 'reform group' candidates led by Rod Kelly in A.M.F.S.U. national elections last year. Byrne, the Liberals and the N.C.C. are now supporting those masquerading as the A.M.F.S.U. Democratic Rank and File Committee for the purposes of the forthcoming State elections. These elections are for the State Presidency held by Brian Byrne. Nine National Conference delegates of the Democratic Rank and File Committee claim that the elections will be undemocratic and confined to members attending branch meetings if conducted by the union's returning officers. This is a lie.

Under union rules, these elections would be by a full and secret postal ballot of all union members eligible to vote. The ballot would not be held in the branches as claimed by the Democratic Rank and File Committee. So much for their knowledge of the union's rules! Campaign literature from the Democratic Rank and File Committee is a mixture of lies, innuendo and slander.

Its theme is that the A.M.F.S.U. leadership is somehow a threat to the Federal Labor Government. Union leaders, according to Norman Byrne and Co., aim at 'stirring dissension and destroying the kind of harmony and conciliation which the Hawke Government is endeavouring to develop'. Metalworkers will be touched to learn that the Liberal Party and people like Norman Byrne have had a change of heart and now support Bob Hawke and the A.L.P.—

They change their coat up there quickly. The article continues:

The A.M.F.S.U. and its leadership showed their support for the A.L.P. by donating $50 000 to Labor campaign funds. Bob Hawke collected the cheque in person at a meeting of A.M.F.S.U. National Council shortly before the election. Bob Hawke said then that the A.M.F.S.U. should be congratulated for giving a lead to the rest of the trade union movement in negotiations with the A.L.P. over the economic policy accord. He said: 'I applaud the remarkably constructive way in which this union has operated'. He added: 'If this union had not adopted such an approach on a prices and incomes policy it is very unlikely the A.L.P. would be going into an election with the confidence we have.'

I would like to see the supporters of the Liberal Party game enough when handing over their donations to the bagmen of their Party to be photographed and have it shown in the press. They would not do that, because the Party in this State and nationally has always opposed the disclosure of funds.

One of the things the honourable member opposite fails to understand is that there is a considerable number of unions in Australia, some of which donate to the Australian Labor Party but many of which do not. They do that by choice, and in many unions the members make up their own minds as to whether or not they will pay a political levy which is used for the political purposes of that union. The balance sheet of the union of which I am a member (now the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union), prepared for the year ended 30 September 1982 and published in the *Metal Worker* of 11 December 1982, shows that in 1982 on a national basis $236 000 was collected for the political fund of which $169 000 was spent and a considerable amount of that money went into other things. I believe as an ex-officer of that union that we judged that our union should be engaged in a political campaign in support of the members' interests and that that is where the money would come from. If members wanted to contribute to the political fund they could do so and, if they did not wish to do so, they could opt out. I never chose to opt out, nor did thousands of other union members because they realised that the only political Party that adequately represents the interests of the workers was the Party of which I am a member and for which I seek preselection.

The member for Glenelg made another reference to my union which demonstrates his total lack of understanding of the real position. Perhaps he should go to night school and learn about unions if he is to become an authority on them. From my close association with trade unions, I know that, unless one has an intimate knowledge of a trade union's workings, one should not talk about the unions because one is sure to make mistakes.

The honourable member referred to press reports concerning the membership of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union and how that membership voted in

union affairs. Would the honourable member agree that unfinancial members of his Party should be allowed to vote? Of course not. If members pay their dues they vote and, if they do not pay, they do not vote. Similarly, a trade union member who is unfinancial does not vote. That is why, when a union talks about its membership and how it votes, there may be significant differences between unions, depending on what happens in the union and how the rules governing financial ability to vote are framed.

Since I have been a member of this place, the member for Glenelg has made great play of the fact of how he, like other members on both sides of the House, donated to the cost of building the Trades Hall. As a former Secretary of the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated, I am grateful for the financial assistance given by the honourable member and other members in that way, but I point out that donating money does not entitle a person to set up as an authority on every aspect of union affairs. Merely donating money toward the cost of a building or to a society does not guarantee that a person will understand the operation of that organisation unless he or she is a member of it and actively participates in its affairs.

Many statements made by the misguided member for Glenelg were inaccurate, and some of his philosophical statements were way off beam. Indeed, he would be more fruitfully employed spending his time doing things for his constituents, such as getting the Patawalonga Basin fixed up, rather than coming into this House and bashing an organisation that has a long and proud history of defending the rights of Australian workers. By moving his motion, the honourable member is trying to bring ridicule upon organisations that have operated continuously for over 100 years. My union has operated for 131 years in Australia and 122 years in this city. It has a long history of people who have worked for the betterment of their members and who occasionally have been elected to this House to represent the political Party that looks after the interests of workers.

Members opposite should busy themselves with more important things rather than spend their time continually bashing trade unions. Then they might be able to do more for their Party. I am concerned that they get a bit upset when they find that workers organisations are operating far more effectively than employer organisations. I am quite sure that the things they have to say are very inaccurate; they are not representative of views of the people. I suppose that one can only construe from all of this that perhaps the Liberals in South Australia are going to attempt a Queensland type of takeover of the trade union movement here in South Australia, otherwise they would not be vigorously exhibiting this interest in the trade union movement. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PLANNING ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

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

(Continued from 14 September. Page 841.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I do not want to prolong my contribution to this debate. I have already spoken once before seeking leave to continue my remarks later. I canvassed one or two matters in the first part of my speech on an earlier occasion which I did not have the opportunity to elaborate on, and I think I should now take the opportunity to do so. For example, I promised the House that I would provide information as to the number of applications that have been lodged since the regulation came into force and the fate of those applications. Since the scheme came into operation there have been 700 applications for development approval, 200 of which have been approved, although one could not argue that all of those approvals are necessarily in line with the wishes of the proponent. I will enlarge further on that matter in a moment. There have been 10 refusals: of those, I believe that one appeal has been lodged with the Planning Appeals Tribunal.

In regard to my comment about there being 200 approvals, honourable members may or may not know that the power to give approval is delegated from the Planning Commission to the Vegetation Retention Unit of the Department of Environment and Planning, with an agreement, however, that anything that the unit considers to be especially controversial or on which it sees there being no possibility of agreement between the proponent and the unit, following negotiation, is referred on. If all the applications received were to be approved without modification that would involve the destruction of 420 000 hectares of vegetation, or, to put it another way 18 per cent of the State's remaining vegetation.

When I first spoke on this matter, I indicated that the basic justification for the Government's introducing the regulation was its belief that the State already had been excessively cleared, that it certainly had been cleared far more than had the Eastern States and that, indeed, what remained of the natural vegetation outside the national parks system was under threat, as was indicated by what figures that were available to us following the vegetation survey that was first carried out in the mid-1970s and the more recent surveys that have been made in specific areas of the State.

Various interpretations have been placed on the large number of applications that have been lodged. One is that, indeed, we have uncovered a very alarming situation which might not otherwise have been made clear to us: that this is a reflection of normal clearance activity in South Australia, that this sort of thing is the reason for the alarming decline which has been noted by people over a period of years, and that it is simply that we had no real way of measuring the extent to which individuals were initiating clearance, because there was no proper system of notification. That is one interpretation that can be placed on it.

A second interpretation is that this is panic application: that, in fact, in the past there has been somewhat of an indication that where people have talked about vegetation controls, even when the heritage agreements were first being mooted, there was some panic clearance, that the very mention of the term was sufficient to get people out on tractors, that the regulation denied the right to clear without approval of the Planning Commission, and that panic clearance has been substituted by panic application. I think this is closer to what might be called the U.F. & S. interpretation of what is going on. I do not think the officers of the U.F. & S. would want to use that verbiage; they would simply say that people want to know where they stand under the controls and that they are simply putting in applications now rather than leaving it for six months or three or four years, or whatever, when the situation may have changed possibly in such a way as to make approval more difficult.

I have tried to assuage fears in that matter. I do not know whether I have been successful. We know that in recent weeks there has been a reduction in the rate of applications. I have said publicly that that may well be because those people who have been particularly concerned have already lodged their applications, and the remnant, in fact, is not particularly concerned either because they have cleared all the scrub from their properties or because they have no particular ambitions in relation to the remnant scrub.

The third interpretation that has been put forward is that this is some sort of concerted campaign to try to gum up the mechanism of the planning system by the submission of an enormous number of applications in the hope that the Government will say, 'Stop, enough, this is insupportable and we will abandon the regulation'. I can assure the House that save some sort of disallowance of the regulation by Parliament, that is certainly not what the Government is prepared to do. Any abandonment of the regulation would I believe certainly lead to panic clearance in advance of some reintroduction of a regulation at some later stage. I think it is important for the integrity of the natural heritage of South Australia that the controls having been introduced should remain in perpetuity, though, of course, the mechanism may alter from time to time.

Mr Blacker: That is the only thing that is involved; it is the mechanism, and not the philosophy of having some sort of control over vegetation clearance.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the member for Flinders for that interjection. But I point out that some of the suggestions that have been put forward as to amendments to the mechanism are such as to make the regulation virtually unworkable, and in particular, I instance the matter of compensation which continues to arise. I do not see how, if we conceded the concept of compensation in relation to this planning matter, we could withstand calls for compensation applying to many other aspects of development control.

Mr Blacker: It is totally different.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Well, it may be different in degree, but I do not believe that it is different in kind. Planning bodies have to appreciate that whenever they either give or withhold planning application approval they are advantaging or disadvantaging someone.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: This a vastly different situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am sure that that is one of the reasons why the member for Murray when introducing this legislation sought to ensure that the Planning Commission was a statutory body which was quite separate from the Department and which, in the best sense, was subject to Government influence only in extreme conditions.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I certainly did not have any intention of the Planning Commission being involved in vegetation control.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I appreciate that that is one of the differences in political philosophy between the honourable member and me, but I also point out that the legislation which the honourable member introduced allows this mechanism to be utilised in a way that the legislation which it replaced did not admit. Furthermore, I see it as the only practical way in which we can get retention of vegetation.

I can find very few people who will disagree with the proposition that there has been over clearing in this State, that there are areas of the State that should not have been cleared in the past. But, when one tries to go on from that particular proposition to a practicable way in which we can have controls people then start to draw back, or at least people who are of the persuasion of the honourable member do. This is a practical means whereby controls can be exercised. It is a flexible means.

I have already pointed out that there have been 200 of the 700 applications approved. There are those in this community who will no doubt be alarmed by that trend, who would say indeed that it is unfortunate at this stage that the Planning Commission is so flexible in its administration of the regulation that it has allowed so many approvals to take place. Indeed, at this stage there have been only 10 outright refusals. I do not happen to share that viewpoint because it seems to me that probably the only way in which one can make a quantum leap in greater controls in this area would be total prohibition. I do not mean making vegetation clearance a prohibitive use within the development control regulations. That could well occur and could still allow clearance to take place. It would require the concurrence of the Minister in the approval of the Planning Commission. I did not mean that at all. I meant a moratorium, some sort of regulation which forbids the Planning Commission under any circumstances to give approval. I do not think that that is reasonable.

I can understand situations in which clearance might have to go on, but I would predicate that against a general assumption that we would accept as a community the destruction of our native vegetation in global terms has gone far enough, that in fact agricultural development has reached its natural limits, and in some places has overstepped those natural limits. There may be very little we can do about that, but nonetheless that is the state of play. Although from time to time there will be applications for development under this regulation which are approved it has to be against that background that generally the community is saying, 'Thus far, no further.' If we want further agricultural development it must be in terms of the more intensive use of the area already under agricultural use or some development for agricultural purposes of an area which has the correct sort of climate and soil conditions for agriculture but which is currently used for other forms of primary production, whether it be dairy production or other areas that are subject to pine plantation.

For the most part, of course the rainfall is far too heavy in those sort of areas for cereal crops to be planted. Nonetheless, I think generally speaking what we have is an area of the State which is under general primary production and an area of the State which is not under general primary production. I believe that we should maintain that frontier and not be pushing it out. I would accept that there are areas of the State that we have lost to primary production because of urbanisation, which is a pity. Better planning in the past would have kept those areas out of urban use and available for primary production. I think of some of the Torrens Valley which I believe we would be the better for were it still available for market gardens instead of having been sterilised under asphalt and concrete. Again, that is an opportunity that has long since gone. I do not want to go very much further.

I make the point that my concern here is not simply for what one might call a pristine view of the natural environment, simply keeping things as they are and protecting the native scrub and native fauna, even though I made much of that when I spoke previously. I have to make the point that I believe it is important in terms of cost to the community that we look very closely at the sort of wholesale clearance which has occurred in the past. I simply make two points in relation to that and I will sit down.

First, I mentioned last time the salinisation of land. I think it is important that we understand what goes on here. Evapotranspiration occurs at a much greater rate where an area is under natural scrub. The roots of the trees and shrubs work further down into the soil. It happens if it is under clover or improved pasture or under cereal crops. Where this natural vegetation cover is removed the natural capillary action that occurs in those waterlodgged parts of the subsurface produces a good deal of salt and brings it to the top.

Last time I instanced the case of the Middle River Reservoir on Kangaroo Island. I have one or two pieces of information that may be of interest to honourable members. The catchment of that reservoir, which is the island's only developed source of water, has been half cleared of vegetation. The water entering the reservoir is already quite

saline, in the range of 1 600 to 1 800 parts per million, depending on flow and rainfall that has occurred. Recent research by the Department of Agriculture has shown that the total clearance of the catchment would increase the salinity to the point where it would be unfit for consumption, something between 2 500 and 3 000 parts per million. Until the vegetation controls were introduced on 12 October nothing in terms of present structure of land ownership could prevent landholders from clearing that catchment area.

The second point I make is in relation to the turbidity of water entering streams, reservoirs and dams as a result of the clearance of natural vegetation from their catchment areas. For the same reason that I gave earlier in regard to salinisation where one has clearance of natural vegetation one has a very high level of turbidity which washes a great deal of silt into our reservoirs and dams, and leads fairly quickly to the siltation of those areas.

We have examples around the State not only from the agricultural area but from the Aroona Dam at Leigh Creek where almost certainly pastoral activity has had its impact, where there has been a great deal of siltation leading to a drastic reduction in the capacity of those reservoirs and leading in turn to the possibility of enormous amounts of public money having to be spent to duplicate that facility. So, while we are talking about economic impact, and there has been a good deal of discussion about that in the past couple of days, let us also consider the cost to the total community of over clearance in terms of the destruction of water catchment areas, the salinisation and siltation of those waters and those areas that have been set aside for the entrapment of those waters for human, stock or other purposes.

I strongly urge the House to reject this motion which would have the effect of disallowing the regulation. The effect of Government now backing away from this regulation would, I believe, be quite disastrous for our natural vegetation. It would almost certainly mean that people would very quickly get about the business of clearing because they would fear a reintroduction of the regulation at some time in the future. That would have disastrous consequences to the scrub and natural vegetation which this Government is trying to preserve and I would hope the whole of Parliament would like to see preserved.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): Because of the limited time available to me I have the opportunity to speak only very briefly this afternoon. I want to explain the attitude of the Liberal Party concerning vegetation controls. Most people on this side of the House recognise that this is the only vehicle available to us to express our concerns and our constituents' concerns about these regulations. I understand what the Minister has said about the problems that would arise if these regulations were disallowed: there would be chaos. I agree with what other speakers have said in regard to consultation prior to the regulations being brought down. Some sections of the community have been very critical because the Government did not consult prior to the introduction of those regulations. One does not have to be a Rhodes scholar to understand that if that had taken place there would have been panic clearing, which would not have been desirable, and I am sure that the majority of people would agree. They would not want to see mass clearing taking place.

I do not think that the Government has thought through the situation very clearly. There could have been much more consultation between departments, and the Government should have thought through some of the problems being experienced, and should be prepared to take those on board as they become evident. The Liberal Party is committed to the retention of our State's unique flora and fauna through the maintenance of a system of national parks and reserves and through specific vegetation retention programmes, as well as reafforestation programmes. Existing controls over native vegetation, whilst desirable in their conservation objective of retaining maximum native vegetation, may have economic effects which are inequitable to and adversely affect primary producers. Some examples have been provided by members on this side, and I intend to provide further examples when I resume the debate later. Such controls not only impose undue financial hardship and burdens on some sections of the farming community but can militate (and I suggest are militating) against long-term conservation objectives. Concern has been expressed to me by people from areas just over the Victorian border where more clearing is taking place than has been seen in recent times. There is a panic situation in case the Victorian Government brings down similar regulations.

It concerns me that this has become a situation where it is almost the metropolitan area *versus* the country. The majority of people shopping in the centre of Adelaide presently would probably think that these controls were the best thing since green cheese. I suggest that they have done little to find out about the problems caused as a result of this legislation to primary producers and landholders generally in the State. Landholders affected by these regulations quite rightly are concerned (there are relatively few of them) because they have to pay for problems and mistakes made in the past. There has been a considerable 'anti' feeling against landholders and farmers generally as a result of the concern that they are expressing about the introduction of these regulations.

Generally, farmers live close to nature and are observant; they need to be to survive. They are running a business closely tied to their natural surroundings, and their livelihood depends on the conservation of that environment, as well as its improvement. They see themselves as contributing to this country's wealth as well as making an honest living from the land. They are not mining the land as some would have us believe (at least very few of them are). Many farmers have retained areas of native scrub on their properties and will continue to do so. Many native animals and birds are protected by individual farmers on their properties. The heritage agreement scheme assisted these people, and encouraged others to follow their example. It is a pity that so many people in the metropolitan area have conjured up this attitude towards farmers, seeing them only as mining the land, destroying the land for which they are responsible and for which they have been responsible over a long period.

The Liberal Party in Government did much to encourage people to retain native vegetation. In 1980, the Government amended the South Australian Heritage Act to enable the introduction of heritage agreements between private landholders and the Government, and the aim of this voluntary scheme, which has received widespread public support not only in this State but other States as well, is to encourage private landholders to retain areas of native vegetation on their land. Heritage agreements protect the vegetation perpetually and enable the Government to provide incentives in the form of financial assistance for fencing management and revocation of some council rates.

Most people in this House know that these agreements have meant a great deal in educating people in the need to retain vegetation, and have encouraged people to do just that. It has been said by a number of people that the legislation did not go quite far enough and that more controls should have been introduced and so we see the introduction of these regulations. One could argue about that for a very long time. However, we believe that those agreements were successful in their aim to encourage and educate people about the need to retain native vegetation. The problems being experienced as a result of these regulations have been

considered, and we have brought down a Liberal Party policy on this matter. I would like to refer to it, because we aim to have a vegetation retention programme that is tied very closely to a reafforestation programme. It is quite obvious that the two need to be closely tied.

The first point I want to make is that, in regard to the clearance of native vegetation, we believe that no clearance for new land development should be undertaken without the approval of the soils branch of the Department of Agriculture. The second point is that, in broad-acre development of land deemed suitable by the soils branch of the Department of Agriculture for development, the landholder may be required to preserve from clearance up to 10 per cent of the land proposed to be developed in each separate location without compensation. The first 10 per cent must be preserved without compensation.

The Department of Environment and Planning shall be the Department responsible for delineating areas of vegetation to be retained. Where a Government agency requires further preservation of uncleared land, either the land in question will be acquired by the Government or the landholder will be compensated. We believe that that is necessary and fair, and when I speak later I will emphasise why we believe that that is the case. The only other point I wish to make is that we believe that the land involved should be fixed at Government expense, but the compensation fixing will apply only to land deemed suitable for development of agricultural pursuits by the Department of Agriculture.

We believe that to be a very fair policy that will be welcomed not only by landholders but by all those who recognise the need for vegetation retention in this State. We also strongly support a reafforestation programme, particularly for denuded areas of the State, based on the advice of the Department of Environment and Planning and the Woods and Forests Department. We intend that incentives will be provided to encourage landholders to plant vegetation and will include a provision for native species together with advice regarding the selection of species planting and maintenance.

In closing, I want to make the point that the Liberal Party is committed to a programme of vegetation retention, as I said earlier, through the maintenance of a system of national parks and reserves and specific vegetation programmes. We believe that the policy that I have just indicated will be welcomed by the majority of people in this State. I seek leave to continue my remarks later, and I will have more to say then about the support for this policy and how we have come to determine it.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 984.)

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I will not speak long in relation to this matter except to make a few points in relation to the Bill. I should say from the outset that I certainly am not unsympathetic to the general thrust of the Bill. However, it is defective in its terms and there are other problems in relation to it. In January this year the Attorney-General expressed concern about bail being granted despite strong opposition of the Crown in relation to an alleged offender charged with rape and indecent assault. There have been other matters where bail has been granted in circumstances which have raised great concern on the part of the general community. Following those types of incidents, the Attorney-General announced that a review of bail would be conducted, and that review is proceeding now.

Mr Mathwin: It might take some time.

Mr GROOM: It may take some time, but it is a very important measure, and the terms of it ought to be got straight right from the outset, because there are problems in the honourable member's Bill to which I will come in a moment. However, I want to put the attitude of this side of the House in that context. Part of that review is an examination of whether the Crown should have a right to appeal or some other means against a decision of a justice to grant bail. That review has been an ongoing process and it is true, as the honourable member says, that it may take some time. One of the major problems with the Bill is that it is defective in its terms as it has been introduced. I know that the honourable member foreshadowed some amendments, but I do not think that those amendments will remedy the problems in the Bill as it presently is, and the honourable member is aware of one of the problems I am about to raise. When one provides the Crown with a right of appeal (as the honourable member does in this Bill), the appeal does not have to be instituted until the expiration of one month. The point that arises then is what happens to the defendant at that time.

Mr Mathwin: I've fixed that—

Mr GROOM: I will come to that, but I want to tidy that up and illustrate the defects. I know that the member is aware of the problem and has taken steps to remedy it. However, I do not think that he has remedied all the problems that arise from it, and that is why I say that it ought to be dealt with in the context of a review situation, because there are a number of other factors. Once the Crown appeals, it has one month under section 172 to institute an appeal. Therefore, the question arises as to what happens to the defendant who has been granted bail. Is he then released on bail and out in the community for a further one month? That would defeat the entire purpose. I know that the honourable member foreshadows amendments pursuant to which the Crown must signal its intention to appeal and has until 5 p.m. on the following day to commence the appeal. However, there are certain problems with that because one is again met with the same problem that, when one puts it in the appeal provisions, one still has to wait until a Supreme Court judge can actually hear the matter.

Mr Mathwin: There are a number of judges.

Mr GROOM: It is the machinery to get it across to the Supreme Court judge in the first place. Supposing this scenario develops: bail is granted to an accused person; the Crown feels very strongly about it and says, 'We will appeal'; it gives its intimation by 5 p.m. on the following day pursuant to the honourable member's amendment. However, what happens to the defendant? He has been granted bail and that bail has not been revoked. Is he then out in the community still for a further one month until the appeal is heard by a Supreme Court judge?

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that the honourable member says that, but one has to have the machinery to put that into effect for a judge to be made available to actually hear an appeal in those circumstances, because I think that the honourable member must deal with section 172 (1). He has not touched on that in his Bill at all, and that section provides that one can institute an appeal within one month. I think that the honourable member should look at that section, because it still stands and has force of its own. Therefore, there are administrative problems and legal problems connected with the legal requirements of the Act whereby one still may have to wait a month before a Supreme Court judge can hear the appeal.

Those matters of procedure can undoubtedly be rectified, but I draw the honourable member's attention to those problems. When one provides for an appeal, another problem

arises; that is, once it gets to the Supreme Court judge, even if one can devise a procedure whereby it is heard immediately by a Supreme Court judge on the following day, one must bear in mind that one has the problem and, pursuant to the honourable member's Bill and proposed foreshadowed amendments, the accused still has been granted bail, and that has not been revoked.

In other words, the honourable member would need a provision for a stay of that order until such time as the Supreme Court judge could hear the case, otherwise the accused must be released pending appeal. Supposing that those problems can be solved and that one gets before a Supreme Court judge, there are other problems. If an appeal rather than a review is provided for, there is a limitation to those matters put before the justice, whereas there may be other matters that were not raised before the justice which one wants to put before the Supreme Court judge. Indeed, there is a whole series of cases on this.

It is not a hearing *de novo*: it is a hearing in a sense that a Supreme Court judge can deal only with those matters that were before the justice who granted bail. There are stringent rules about fresh evidence. An appeal has inherent problems in itself. For example, supposing the case had been dealt with in the magistrate's court, judgment delivered, and an appeal lodged, only those matters before the magistrate could be dealt with, although there may be other factors that one thinks should be taken into account or matters that were not raised before the justice: for example, when the justice decided to grant bail, the Crown might have become aware of some other matter it wished to raise. There are legal problems in dealing with an appeal.

Mr Mathwin: The Crown would know on which case the appeal was being lodged.

Mr GROOM: Not necessarily. I have been in the situation where last-minute material has been made available to the Crown, and where information is awaited from another State in respect of the accused so that the Crown may be better able to oppose bail. However, material has often come to light after bail has been granted. If that is the situation and the Crown could not put that matter before the justice when considering the bail question, one must be able to ensure that it can be put before the Supreme Court judge when giving notice of appeal. By using the appeal provisions one is limited by strict rules governing what a Supreme Court judge can deal with on appeal, but not on a review.

Mr Mathwin: How do you get on when you appeal against sentence?

Mr GROOM: When one appeals against sentence, one can deal only with the matters that were before the magistrate or justice who heard the case in the first place. One cannot introduce new evidence. The Justices Act contains a section dealing with new evidence, and there are stringent rules. For instance, it must be shown that the evidence was not capable of being called at the time of hearing, because the procedure is like an adjournment while one is waiting for that information. So there are problems.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time. It is a debate.

Mr GROOM: Once an appeal is provided, the means must be provided whereby the magistrate or justice gives reasons for his decision, because the Supreme Court judge will want to know on what basis the original decision was given. In respect of bail applications there are a whole series of discretionary criteria on which a justice or magistrate may exercise his or her discretion to grant bail. The Supreme Court judge will want to know what were the criteria on which the justice acted before granting bail. So, bail applications have been dealt with, historically, in an expeditious manner. However, magistrates are here being locked into having to give reasons on every bail application. I personally, as well as other members on this side, am sympathetic to the general thrust of the honourable member's aim. It is wise to provide the Crown with an appeal or review: that is, to provide the Crown with the right to have a reconsideration of bail granted by a justice where the Crown feels strongly that bail should not have been granted.

However, the answer may be in a review situation because, if it is a review, the Supreme Court judge would not be hampered by stringent legal rules in respect of appeals. In other words, on a review the Supreme Court judge could hear the entire matter again, taking other material into consideration, including that which was put before the justice. The honourable member has made himself aware of one of the difficulties of the Bill as introduced: the problem of what to do with the accused person once the Crown has appealed. That difficulty has occurred to the honourable member and he has sought to remedy it. However, in respect of appeal, as the honourable member has not moved his amendments he may wish to consider a provision that a Supreme Court judge shall review the matter once notice has been given, review it within 24 hours, and provide for a stay of the order.

Those are some of the matters to which I wished to draw the honourable member's attention. Those matters should come out of the review being conducted by the Attorney-General. In this regard, I hope that the honourable member can find his way clear to be part of that review and to put in some of the input that he has given here. Whether he wishes to wait that long is for him to determine, but members on this side believe that this Bill should not be passed until the Attorney-General's review has been completed.

Mr Mathwin: How long will that take?

Mr GROOM: I am not sure; perhaps the honourable member should take that up directly with the Attorney-General. I can assure the honourable member that members on this side are sympathetic to his intentions and to the general thrust of the Bill.

Mr BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

KINGSTON LIGNITE DEPOSIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

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.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 992.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): As I pointed out when I last spoke on this motion, I believe that the House needs to be aware that the present environmental impact statement provided by the proponents of the lignite mine at Kingston is inadequate and inaccurate and that, because of the implications that any such mine has for the community at Kingston, an indenture Bill needs to be passed by this House providing for adequate compensation for the Kingston community, for the District Council of Lacepede and for any private landholders who may be affected by such development.

Referring to the review made by the consultants to the District Council of Lacepede, I wish to give examples of areas in which I regard the environmental impact statement to be inadequate. Section 4 of the response to the proponent's e.i.s. by the consultants to the District Council clearly points

out that fresh water tables exist where they were ignored and that there is an inadequate description of the rainfall recharge rate of these basins and the way in which ground water is to be drawn down. I draw to the attention of members the many points in the submission by the watchdog committee. Accordingly, I conclude my remarks.

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

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this short Bill is to make important changes to the constitution of the South Australian Health Commission. Members will recall that in January of this year, as part of the general review of Government Management and Operations, Cabinet approved a review of Health Commission management arrangements and performance, focusing particularly on the central management and co-ordination functions of the Commission, including the sector offices. Members of the review team were Mr Don Alexander, Deputy Director-General of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr Don Faulkner, Director of the Management Systems and Review Division of the Public Service Board and Mr Mel Whinnen, Director of Administration and Finance in the Department of Mines and Energy.

On 12 May, the report of the review was tabled in Parliament. The report recognised that the Health Commission had undergone significant change in its organisation and role since its inception. It acknowledged that the Commission had been subjected to close scrutiny; areas of poor performance had been identified and improvements had been made progressively. The report surveyed the prevailing management climate in the Commission, its objectives, functions and organisation. It identified further areas for improvement in general management, resource allocation, financial management, computing, planning and policy development. The review was another important step in the process of critical evaluation aimed at constructive change. In the words of the review team:

> The report is considered to be a framework or guideline for the Minister, the new Chairman, the Commission and the senior officers of the Commission to further develop the organisation and management processes of the Commission . . .
>
> Broadly, the recommendations in this report are directed towards creating a climate of clarity of purpose and role of the agencies involved in delivering health services, tighter management processes in the Commission and a recognition of the importance of the health units managing their affairs to the maximum possible extent within the essential restraints of policy, finance and staffing plans formulated by the Commission in accordance with the Government's policy for health services.

An essential feature of the managerial thrust of the report is the restructuring of the Commission itself. Members will recall that the Commission originally consisted of three full-time members and five part-time members. So structured, the Commission relied heavily on collective decision making, a situation not conducive to the establishment of clear lines of authority and accountability. In 1980 the Commission was restructured to consist of one full-time member (the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer) and seven part-time members. The review team found that, under this structure, the Commission itself has had little opportunity to contribute to the ongoing management of the organisation. There has been confusion among part-time members as to whether their proper role was of a general advisory nature, policy development or day-to-day administration. The review team commented that the nature of Commission membership has not lent itself to addressing managerial issues.

It recommended that the Commission be reduced in size, to comprise the Chairman and Deputy Chairman (both full-time) and three part-time members. The Commission's role should be revised so that it acted more like a board of management; it would advise the Minister and assist the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer in the management of the Commission's affairs. The Deputy Chief Executive Officer, who is presently not a member of the Commission, should become a member through the additional designation of the office as Deputy Chairman, thus overcoming problems of accountability during the Chairman's absence. The three part-time members of the Commission should be selected primarily for their potential contribution to management.

The Government endorses these recommendations of the review team. It considers that change in the constitution and role of the Commission is of fundamental importance to the upgrading of the Commission's management function. Indeed, as a preliminary step towards implementing the recommendations, the Government recently filled three vacancies in part-time membership by appointing persons with the background suggested by the review team, namely, a senior, or recently retired public sector manager (Commissioner Mary Beasley of the Public Service Board); a private sector appointee (Mr R.H. Allert—Chartered Accountant) and a respected health administrator (Dr B.J. Kearney—Director, Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and formerly Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission).

The provisions of this Bill restructure the Commission in line with the recommendations of the review team. The other important change proposed by this Bill is the abolition of the Health Services Advisory Committee. This committee is a 14-member body, made up of nominees of various organisations and having broad advisory powers in relation to the provision and delivery of health services. The review team found that the committee had not played a useful role in the Commission's affairs over the years. Some of the reasons for this were that it duplicated the role of the Commission to a certain extent; its membership was too large and comprised sectional interests; more effective and quicker advice could often be obtained through the directed efforts of Commission staff.

Members may recall that the committee was not a feature of the original Bill. It was inserted by way of amendment in the Legislative Council. With a considerable degree of foresight, the then Minister, in speaking against the committee (or council, as it was then to be called) said:

> If the council goes ahead I believe it would virtually take over the role of the Commission.

In the event, the amendment passed, and successive Ministers, Commissions and the committee itself have been unable to find an effective role or reason for the continued existence of the committee. The Bill therefore seeks to abolish the committee.

The review team also recommended the establishment of a Community Health Advisory Committee. That proposal is receiving detailed consideration by the Chairman of the Health Commission taking particular account of anticipated expansion of the Community Health Programme, with additional Federal funding as from 1 February 1984 as part of the Medicare package. In summary, the Government believes that the proposals embodied in this Bill are of fundamental importance to the upgrading of the South Australian Health Commission's management function. I commend the Bill

to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the appointment of two full-time members of the Commission, one being the Chairman and the other the Deputy Chairman. Provision is made for the appointment of three part-time members instead of the seven as at present, and all current offices must therefore be vacated upon the commencement of the amending Act to allow for fresh appointments to the reduced number of part-time positions. Sundry amendments are made that are consequential upon the fact that there will now be two full-time members instead of only one. Clause 4 re-casts the section providing for the appointment of deputies. The Deputy Chairman will act as the deputy of the Chairman. All other members of the Commission may have suitable persons appointed as their deputies.

Clauses 5 and 6 effect consequential amendments. Clause 7 provides that the Deputy Chairman will preside at Commission meetings in the absence of the Chairman. A quorum at any meeting will now be constituted by three out of the five members. Clause 8 repeals the section that provided specifically for the establishment of the Health Services Advisory Committee. The Minister of course still has a general power under section 18 of the Act to appoint such advisory committees as he thinks fit. Clause 9 provides that the Deputy Chairman will also hold office as Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Commission, just as the Chairman also holds office as the Chief Executive Officer of the Commission.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This small amending Bill remedies a minor anomaly that has affected the principal Act by virtue of the operation of the Planning Act, 1982. The principal Act presently defines the metropolitan area by reference to the metropolitan planning area under the Planning and Development Act, 1966, which included the City of Adelaide.

The Planning and Development Act has been repealed by the Planning Act and it is therefore necessary to review the definition of 'the metropolitan area' for the purposes of the principal Act. The Planning Act does not apply to the City of Adelaide and it is desirable to clearly identify that the City of Adelaide comes within the provisions of the principal Act. The municipality of Gawler is also specifically included, as it is in the present definition. The amendment will have retrospective operation from 30 June 1983, so that there will be no effect upon rates of land tax for the 1983-84 financial year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is deemed to have commenced on 30 June 1983. Clause 3 strikes out from section 4 the definition of 'the metropolitan area' and substitutes a new definition of the metropolitan area which means the part of the State comprised of metropolitan Adelaide as defined in Part VI of the Development Plan under the Planning Act, 1982, and the areas of the City of Adelaide and the Municipality of Gawler.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Section 10aa (2) of the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967, provided that the Authority may not hold any interest or shares in or debentures of, a body corporate unless the body corporate has an interest in the exploration for or exploitation of a petroleum resource situated within the prescribed area. The prescribed area is accurately defined in subsection (4), but speaking generally, it is the area within an imaginary line drawn as follows: along the Western Australian border, thence along a line 300 kilometres north of and parallel with the Northern Territory border, thence along a line 300 kilometres east of and parallel with the Queensland, New South Wales and Victorian borders, thence to a point approximately 1 000 kilometres off the South Australian coast.

Therefore, the Authority is prevented from holding an interest in a company which is not engaged in exploration for or production of petroleum within that area, and if any company in which the Authority is permitted to hold an interest discontinues its activities in the prescribed area, the Authority must divest itself of its interest in that company. This situation is undesirable for two reasons: first, it unduly restricts the ability of the Authority to hold interests in bodies corporate which operate entirely outside the prescribed area; and, secondly, it indirectly restricts the freedom of the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation, or other companies in which the Authority may wish to hold an interest in the future, to discontinue their activities within the prescribed area, if they so wish. The amendment will allow the Authority, with the consent of the Minister, to hold an interest in a body corporate which has no involvement with activities situated within the prescribed area.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 10aa of the principal Act and substitutes a new section also designated 10aa. The new section provides in subsection (1) that the Authority may:

(a) hold and deal with a share or interest in a licence authorising the exploration for, or exploitation of, a petroleum resource;

(b) enter into agreements in relation to exploration for, or exploitation of, a petroleum resource; or

(c) acquire, hold and deal with shares, debentures or other interests in a body corporate that holds a share or other interest in a licence authorising the exploration for, or exploitation of, a petroleum resource.

Subsection (2) provides that the Authority may not exercise its powers under subsection (1) *(a)* or *(b)* in relation to a petroleum resource outside the prescribed area without the Minister's consent. The Authority may not exercise its powers under subsection (1) *(c)* in relation to a body corporate that holds no interest or share in a licence to explore a petroleum resource situated within the prescribed area without the Minister's consent.

Subsections (3) and (4) have the same effect as subsection (3) of the repealed section: any income derived by the Authority pursuant to activities allowed under subsection (1) which would be subject to Commonwealth income tax if the Authority were not an instrumentality of the Crown, shall nevertheless be taxed at the same rate as company income under Commonwealth laws. The Authority shall pay to the Treasurer, for the Consolidated Account, any amount certified by the Auditor-General to be so taxable.

Subsection (5) contains definitions for the purposes of the section:

'licence' means a licence permit or authority, granted under a law of this State, the Commonwealth, another State or Territory, authorising the exploration for or exploitation of a petroleum resource;

'petroleum resource' means a naturally occurring hydrocarbon or mixture of hydrocarbons whether gaseous, liquid or solid and whether or not occurring in combination with other substances;

'the prescribed area' is defined in exactly the same terms as in the repealed section.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1083.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): This Bill to amend the Licensing Act imposes a moratorium on the present system of granting late night permits, and I cannot help reflecting that the Government has a very flexible set of principles when it comes to accepting Bills to alter situations which are currently under review and opposing Bills to alter situations which are currently under review. This afternoon the member for Hartley opposed a private member's Bill to amend the Justices Act on the basis that the Act was currently under review. Here we have the Government introducing a Bill to amend an Act which is currently under review, namely, the Licensing Act, so one can bend one's administrative principles to suit the prevailing breeze, which appears to be the case in this situation.

The Opposition supports the Bill, but only on the basis that it will allay the fears of some residents who currently live near premises for which late night permits might have been contemplated. The review of the Licensing Act will study this issue of late night permits, and it seems to us that legislation such as this, if indeed it is recommended by the review, could well have waited until the review was completed and a repeal measure and new Licensing Act were introduced in Parliament. As things stand at the moment, I would have thought that the Licensing Court had the power to deal with situations that are causing difficulty in respect of late night permits. This situation was well described in a letter from the South Australian Association of Restaurateurs, which was read into the record during the debate in another place, but it is worth quoting one or two comments from that letter. The President of the Association, Mr Les Williams, states:

> Our Association is constantly striving to achieve and to maintain high standards in the areas of hygiene, cuisine, service and premises, and, as such, is completely against the unscrupulous operators who seek to apply their interpretation of these permits to enable themselves to operate, often in premises with inadequate facilities, 'entertainment' venues which do nothing but damage South Australia's image in the eyes of both visitors and discerning local residents.

Later on in the letter the restaurateurs express their concern, which is also shared by the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee, about the lack of requisite knowledge of people entering the industry and obtaining liquor licences. There is no real screening or selection of those people in terms of their previous background and experience in the industry, and this has led to problems. The letter states:

> The Government must take immediate action to ensure that holders of existing permits trade within the law, and ensure that all criteria must be met prior to any licence or permit being granted in the future.

As I understand that statement, and as I think any reasonable person would understand it, the power already exists in the law and is vested in the Licensing Court to deal with the situation that the Government is attempting to deal with by this Bill in respect of placing a moratorium on the issue of permits. I would have said that the Government is failing to ensure that the existing law is properly upheld but, having said that, and knowing of the deep concern in some local areas about the way these permits are operating, the Opposition, with some reluctance, supports the Bill.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1084.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This is an extremely interesting piece of legislation and revolves around the 68th Report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia relating to the Inherited Imperial Law on Gaming and Wagering. The committee canvassed a series of Imperial enactments ranging from the years 1541 to 1836, that is, some 442 years ago. One tends to wonder what must have gone through the minds of the legislators and His Excellency at the time some of this legislation was introduced into our system. Here we are now in South Australia having to go through the formality of repealing certain Acts. The Law Reform Committee of South Australia was established by proclamation, which appeared in the South Australian *Government Gazette* on 19 September 1968. The present members and the members who were responsible for the 68th report were the Hon. Mr Justice Zelling, the Hon. Mr Justice White, the Hon. Mr Justice Legoe, D. W. Bollen, Q.C. (as he then was); and Messrs M.F. Gray, Solicitor-General; D.F. Wicks; A.L.C. Ligertwood, and G.F. Hiskey. In the report to the then South Australian Attorney-General, the Hon. K.T. Griffin (in 1982), they drew the Attorney-General's attention to many of the old Statutes. As to one of those Statutes (The Statute 33 Henry VIII c.9 (1541)), the committee stated:

> This Act as its long title shows: The Bill for the maintaining of Artillery, and the Debarring of Unlawful Games' is an Act to prevent people from spending their time in sport when they should be at the butts improving their archery.

I remember being at the butts in National Service and not hitting the target at all with a .303. The report continues:

> There is also a more general reason assigned in section II of the Act namely impoverishment which ensues from the playing of unlawful games and the murders, robberies and felonies committed or done as a result of gaming and wagering.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Alexandra is making snide remarks again.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will continue to keep his remarks relevant to the Bill.

Mr BECKER: The report continues:

> The games prohibited by this Statute in relation to the use of a house kept for unlawful games are 'bowling, coyting, cloysh-

cayls, half-bowl, tennis, dicing table or carding, or any other manner of game prohibited by any Statute heretofore made, or any unlawful game now invented or made, or any other new unlawful game hereafter to be invented, found, had or made, . . . The Act goes on to provide by section XVI that at all times except at Christmas and even at Christmas only under the supervision of masters or in the houses of their masters, servants shall not play 'at the tables, tennis, dice, cards, bowls, clash, coyting, loggating or any other unlawful game.'

So, I thought I would go down to the Parliamentary Library and find out what cloysh-cayls was because I had never heard of that before. I had extreme difficulty in finding out. We got down to 'cloysh':

An obsolete game with a ball or bowl prohibited in many successful Statutes of the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

The definition of 'cayls' (1554-1611) was:

Equivalent to nine-pins or skittles.

But, there seemed to be a scholarly argument. According to a Dutch lexicographer (who compiles dictionaries and Dutch descriptions), it appears that the bowl used in the game had to be driven by a spade or chisel-shaped implement, the klos-beytel, through a hoop or ring as in croquet.

Then we got down to loggating, which was some derivative of a log. It is an old game in current use in 1773. It is also the missile used in the game. In 1541 it was first known, and I have no doubt that was where the original interpretation came in. It is a seventeenth century game played in several parts of England. A stake is fixed in the ground. Those who play throw loggats at it. He who is nearest the stake wins. It was dying out in the eighteenth century.

I know a derivative of that game today; that is, of course, throwing a coin at a wall. That operates in many parts of the western suburbs. Whoever is the winner is closest to the wall and scoops up all the coins. The committee did an excellent job. Obviously it has taken all the fun out of anything and everything that has gone on within this State ever since the foundation of the colony, and of course something that has been around for 442 years. During my research I was interested to note that the Law Reform Committee in one of its sections referred to deals with advertising foreign and illegal lotteries:

The subject matter of this Act of William the Fourth is dealt with in sections 8 and 10 of our present Act. We think it should be declared that that Act is no longer to have effect as part of the law of South Australia. It was repealed in England in 1934.

There is much contention today in relation to advertising foreign and illegal lotteries and advertising lotteries in general.

A very interesting report was brought down by the Law Reform Committee, no doubt involving a considerable amount of research. I noticed in the Parliamentary Library that in New South Wales they have an Imperial Acts application. In 1969 it virtually repealed what we are doing tonight through that Act and a limitation Act. The limitation Act as I saw it was complementary to the Imperial Acts application. That Act simplified it. There was no need to bring in piecemeal legislation to repeal all these old Acts. The Limitation Act, 1969, of New South Wales, was an Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to the limitation of actions, to repeal section 5 of the Imperial Act, known as the Common Informers Act, 1588, and certain other Imperial enactments and to repeal the unrepealed portion of any Act passed in the fourth year of the reign of William IV, etc.

It appears that it went then on to repeal, as one of the parts, the Imperial Act No. 7, George II, chapter 8, which is known as the St John Barnards Act. That was referred to in the Minister's speech. The St John Barnards Act was dealing with the illegal practice of stock jobbing; that is, the unscrupulous speculation in shares and securities. Of course, as anyone would know, probably the most open and wholesome form of gambling for many years has been on the stock market. Thank goodness most of the practices of past decades have now been wiped out. But of course it was a common practice to sell shares that you did not have and buy shares before you paid for them, sell them, and take the profit. That is all very well, but of course many people got caught. I do not believe it was ever the intention or purpose of the Stock Exchange anyway.

As I said, it is a very interesting piece of legislation from a research point of view and makes interesting reading. It would be great if we could simplify this whole procedure. As I said when I began my speech, fancy having the opportunity of dealing with something that happened 442 years ago. I pray to the good Lord that I will not be around in 442 years from now. I feel sorry for somebody who would have to research the speech. The Opposition has pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill, which simply repeals the obsolete legislation on the results of the report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia relating to gaming and wagering. I congratulate the committee. Indeed, I congratulate the member for Hanson for the research he did in this matter. Although the Law Reform Committee people I would venture to say would not have a gambler amongst them, certainly they think it is necessary to enact this legislation so that we deal in modern situations relating to the Lottery and Gaming Act. While the Law Reform Committee identified that enactments still have some residual role to play, as a consequence this Bill provides for the continuation of those matters in the current Lottery and Gaming Act. The law to repeal some of those Acts comes from periods of history with differing social views on gaming and wagering and as a result reflect the philosophy of various times. I thank the honourable member for Hanson. I missed the first part of his address, which mentioned Statute 33 of Henry VIII.

The long title of the Act was 'The Bill for the Maintaining of Artillery and the Debarring of Unlawful Games'. It was an Act to prevent people spending their time in sport when they should have been at the butts (as they called it), improving their archery. It has already been commented on by the member for Hanson, and it seems rather peculiar in modern times that games such as bowling, tennis and other games were unlawful. This included quoiting, with which I am not familiar—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Quoits.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Quoits, is it? There was also closh-cayls, whatever that might be in modern times. I do not wish to delay the passage of the legislation, and I thank the Opposition for their support and hope that the Bill has a speedy passage through this House.

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

STATUTES REPEAL (HEALTH) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1194.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill which simply repeals redundant Acts. The research necessary for the repealing of these Acts, as I recall, was instituted under the previous Government at the direction of the then Premier, David Tonkin, who asked each of his Ministers to ensure that all outmoded and outdated legislation was removed from the Statute Book. It is interesting to look at the second reading explanation which outlines the background of the various Acts—five of

them in all—and to note that some of them, for example, the Mental Institution Benefits Act could have been repealed 15 years ago.

The Vaccination Act, although no specific date is given, could probably have been repealed three decades ago. The second reading explanation highlights the amount of redundant and outmoded legislation—health legislation—on the Statute Book and undoubtedly legislation in other areas which should, as a matter of public policy, be removed, because, when the Statute Book becomes clogged with legislation that no longer serves a useful purpose, that is a sign of very poor management on behalf of Governments and Parliament.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I assure the member for Coles that we are quite happy to share the credit with her Government for this effort in deregulation, and I thank the Opposition for its support of the measure.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This grievance debate allows me the opportunity to raise in this House a matter of grave concern to a large number of my constituents from Coober Pedy. I have just received a telegram addressed to Mr G. Gunn from the Coober Pedy School which states:

> Motion passed today at general meeting Coober Pedy School. All parents as a protest against present toilet situation keep their children away from school from Monday 31 October until Wednesday 2 November. Review situation at general meeting on that day 2 November. Signed Coober Pedy Community School Council.

This matter has not just arisen. Yesterday I received a telegram which stated:

> Following message sent to Minister Director-General Regional Director. Your reply unsatisfactory require replacement repeat replacement nothing less is acceptable.
> Vanajek Coober Pedy School Council.

Another telegram was sent to me last week which states:

> The following motion was carried at school council meeting: if a satisfactory answer is not given to toilet replacement at Coober Pedy Community School by Friday 21 October parents will be advised by council to withhold their children from school as of Monday 31 October until such time as we are assured that toilet replacement will be commenced before end of current school year.
> Vanajek Chairperson Coober Pedy School Council.

I replied to their telegram and I delivered a copy of the telegram to the Minister and the Premier. During the time that the Premier was in Coober Pedy I managed to convince him that he ought to visit the school which he did. He met members of the staff and school council and discussed the problem with them. The history of the matter, as I recall and understand it to be, is that for a considerable time the parents of the children at the school have been most dissatisfied with one of the ablution blocks. There are over 400 students attending the school, and they have to endure, particularly at this time of the year, very hot conditions. When inspecting the building with the Premier it was obvious that it needed a lot of work done on it to bring it to a reasonable standard. If that work is to be carried out there is an urgent need for a temporary toilet while that unit is upgraded. What the parents desire, and believe to be the only satisfactory solution in the long term, is for a new ablution block to be erected at Coober Pedy. I suggest to the Minister immediately that he has a temporary toilet placed at Coober Pedy so as to relieve the pressure, and hopefully it will be one of a higher standard than is currently there. He should also make arrangements to have a solid construction ablution block built at the school. I know that the Regional Director has had problems making his money go around; however, this is a difficult part of the State which has peculiar problems. I refer to a letter which I received, and which I believe has been sent to other people, from the school council. It states:

> We believe that urgent action must be taken as follows: a complete upgrading plan of the school be drawn up, and as part of it the toilets be replaced; unsatisfactory wooden buildings be replaced; and reasonable recreational facilities be provided.

They are talking about the oval. Then they sent a letter to the Regional Director, which states:

> We have received Public Buildings Department plans for proposed modifications to our toilet block (letter dated 7 September 1983, and Plan No. 1543WB83) sent to our Principal Mr Mike Day. At a council meeting held 20 September, the following motion received a unanimous vote: That Council advises the Department that it rejects as most unsatisfactory, the proposed upgrading of the toilets as presented in Plan No. 1543WB83.
>
> Council finds these proposals unacceptable because:
>
> 1. The opening-type grilles to allow hosing out of floor effluent (not always liquid) are situated in a position which allows open run off over some thirty feet of cracked concrete in playground to a drainage trap beside the swimming pool entrance. Hygiene is non-existent and the introduced stench and fluid in playground will be an attraction to blowflies.
> 2. The floor structure is still an issue.
>
> *(a)* the chipboard remains impregnated with urine. The tiles which were replaced between the urinals in May 1983—(without prior notification to either Principal or Council) have done nothing to alleviate this problem and it is unlikely the new plan for retiling will either.
>
> *(b)* Because the floor is flat and will not be structurally altered to allow a drainage slope, mopping after hosing until floors are safely dry (slippery when wet) will be time consuming and laborious. Council may accept this situation as an interim measure but it is unrealistic for such a situation to remain permanent.
>
> It has been stated in earlier correspondence that we know, given the advantage of local knowledge and experience, the only permanent solution is for concrete floor and walls with drainage slope feeding into traps in floor. These traps should feed into 'S' bends and then into main sewerage system. We await a copy of the architects' report from their May visit and would like to see the detailed costing of a replacement brick building, as promised in March. In addition to the toilet issue the visiting architects looked at the state of decay of our wooden classrooms. Their attitude was one of hopelessness, the buildings being too far gone to dust proof. We would like to see their report as we believe that it will only support our opinion that these classrooms are just not capable of coping with this environment and are a severe handicap to our children's progress.

I have other correspondence in relation to this unfortunate and unsatisfactory matter. I realise that it is difficult to take action immediately in a place like Coober Pedy. However, this problem has been drawn to the attention of the relevant State Government departments, the Minister and the Premier over a long time. The people have been most patient. I have endeavoured to be patient about the matter but I now believe that I have no alternative but to raise this matter in the Parliament. First, I ask the Minister to send immediately to Coober Pedy another transportable ablution block and, secondly, to have plans drawn up and action taken to construct immediately a permanent block of solid construction. I know that it may cost some $200 000. However, to spend $70 000 or $80 000 to upgrade the existing facility in my opinion is just spending good money when there will be little or no permanent result of any advantage to anyone. The action that the school council has taken is most serious and I do not believe that it would have taken it unless it believed that it had no alternative but to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister and his officers.

I spoke to them today and they are extremely concerned, because I understand that they started to take action in relation to this matter in 1977. That is a considerable time ago and it probably goes back to when the Minister for Environment and Planning was Minister of Education, and there have been a couple of other Ministers since then. However, I would suggest to the current Minister that the people and the children at Coober Pedy will continue to take strong action if they do not receive some firm assurances and clear undertakings about the action that the Government proposes in relation to this matter.

We got the Premier to have a look at it. Various correspondence was supplied to him and his officers following that visit, and I appreciate his taking the trouble to go and have a look. Other officers from the Education Department have been there. The Minister has considerable correspondence from the school council and me on this matter. I believe that, if anyone looked at the school, the ablution blocks and the old wooden classrooms, one would see the problems which the staff and students have every time there is a dust storm. There are over 400 students attending the school: it is a large area school in some of the harshest environment in South Australia. Anyone who has been there when there is a dust storm would know what I am talking about. I recall early in my time as a member of Parliament, when those Samcon buildings had evaporative-style cooling, how unsatisfactory they were and what a costly exercise it was to alter the system there and in various other parts of the State.

That problem has been rectified, so I call upon the Minister to rectify the ablution block problem and to have his officers remove and replace those temporary classrooms with buildings which can be adequately cooled and sealed to keep out the dust. Some of the classrooms would be the original buildings put in Coober Pedy and they probably have a long history. Obviously, they would have been carted from other parts of the State.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Tonight I want to record a word of caution to honourable members opposite. I believe that the National Party is on the move in South Australia and that members opposite are seriously in danger.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: It will not be long before the member for Flinders swallows up members opposite, and there is a ready-made precedent for that occurring. I read in the *News* or *Advertiser* of 10 October 1983 an article headed 'Astounding swing to National Party', which states:

> Recent surveys of South Australian voting intentions show an astounding swing to the National Party, according to its leader, Mr Blacker. The latest figures suggested a 2½ per cent improvement in public support during the past six months, he said.

The member for Flinders went on to say that there had been a doubling of National Party support since the November election from roughly 1.6 per cent to approximately 4 per cent. The significance of that should not be lost because in relation to the recent Queensland election one only has to remember that some nine years ago the Country Party in Queensland deliberately changed its name to the National Party. Within nine short years the National Party has now decimated the Liberal Party in that State. One only has to look at the figures in Queensland.

During the recent election, the Liberal Party lost some 12.3 per cent. The Nationals were up some 11 per cent, and this was in only nine short years. What is happening in South Australia is that, at the time of the last State election, the National Party nominated candidates in metropolitan seats, much to the dismay of members opposite. It is certainly true that its vote, according to the latest *Bulletin* poll, is showing some doubling of its support from 2 per cent to 4 per cent. Nevertheless, Bjelke-Petersen started in much the same fashion in Queensland. He started off as Premier with something like 19 per cent of the vote. Today he has 38.9 per cent of the vote and has 40 seats plus several defectors from the Liberal Party, notwithstanding the fact that members of the Liberal Party—Mr Austin, and I have forgotten the other gentleman's name—

Mr Plunkett: Don Lane.

Mr GROOM: Not from the Don Lane show, but probably he is about to take up from where that honourable member left off. However, despite the fact that they were elected as Liberal members, they swapped spots and are now National Party members. I ask this question: what will the members for Fisher and Glenelg do? Where will they go? Will they follow the pattern that has been set in Queensland? What will they do at the next State election?

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Members opposite should watch out because this is the first time that the National Party has made a move into metropolitan seats. It gained something like an 11 per cent swing. The member for Morphett should not laugh because there is no question that the National Party has emerged from the wilderness. The situation in Queensland displays that. I ask the member for Morphett to say what is the significance of the change of name from National Country Party to National Party. The name was changed precisely to get a wide spectrum of votes and to move into the metropolitan area. According to a report in the *News* of 10 May 1983, the National Party said that it wanted to rid itself of its conservative image. The report continues:

> It will try to persuade a wider range of people to seek National Party preselection for the next State poll.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Members opposite should not laugh, because the precedent has been set. Today's *News* reports that it may not be the member for Flinders who leads the resurrection: it may be Malcolm Fraser.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hartley is entitled to have his grievance.

Mr BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood that this was a grievance debate.

The SPEAKER: It is, and there is no point of order. The honourable member for Hartley.

Mr GROOM: The member for Mitcham is concerned because a National Party candidate stood for his seat in the 1982 by-election, and he did reasonably well for his first time up. This is a sore point with the member for Mitcham. What was said after that by-election? Under the heading 'Angry Liberals slam the Country Party' the *News* contained the following report:

> Reeling from a shock defeat in the Mitcham by-election, Liberal Party leaders today lashed out at the National Country Party. Their message to their traditional allies was 'Get out of the city!'

Mr Cameron (Liberal Leader in the Legislative Council) was reported as saying that the National Country Party had lost the election for the Liberals because of the leakage of preferences. The then Premier (Mr Tonkin) said that there was no justification for the National Country Party's being in the metropolitan area. However, that Party has a perfect right to be in metropolitan Adelaide and it is absurd for members opposite to say that the National Party has not that right. That Party can stand candidates anywhere it likes: that is its democratic right.

The warning to Liberal members is there. In Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen decimated the Liberal Party as a result of its weakness, spinelessness and divisiveness. The Liberal Party was split down the middle as it is split down the

middle in this State. The member for Davenport has leadership ambitions that he has not given up. Indeed, I have heard him say in this Chamber that his full potential has not been realised. Members opposite are divided and inept, and there is an opening for the National Party in this State. Bjelke-Petersen has shown the way.

Calls have been made for a resurgence of a conservative Party throughout Australia. Today's *News* reports that Mr Fraser is to lead the new Party. That report comes out of Canberra, from one of Mr Fraser's former Cabinet colleagues (Mr Chipp). It is reported that Mr Fraser is to return to politics at the head of a new conservative Party. The report also states that all those heavy-weight Liberals just did not go into Queensland by accident.

At the last South Australian election, the National Country Party stood candidates in Todd, Newland, Unley and Goyder. The member for Goyder should not laugh, because before long his seat will be taken by a National Party member. In 1972, it was said that the member for Flinders would not succeed, but he pulled it off in Flinders. If one considers the time frame of nine years in Queensland in respect of Bjelke-Petersen's effort, one must realise that it will not be long before the member for Flinders has company in this place. Members may laugh, but the National Party is on the move in Australia. There is no question about it: the National Party is calling for a second coming, for a resurrection. For 50 years the National Country Party has been swallowed up in the Liberal Party, but now it is emerging throughout Australia and will decimate Liberal Party strength in South Australia.

I ask the members for Fisher and Glenelg to tell the House whether they will follow the precedent set by Messrs Austin and Lane in Queensland. For their own survival those members may consider that option. The member for Morphett must be careful because he may find that he has a National Party candidate opposing him. He should not laugh. The National Party has taken six Brisbane metropolitan seats from the Liberal Party, so it cannot be said that it could not do the same thing here.

Mr Meier: They won't do it.

Mr GROOM: The honourable member should be careful in what he says because he is vulnerable in his seat. The member for Mallee today referred to them as national socialists.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): That is probably one of the worst performances we have witnessed from the member for Hartley. Indeed, I feel sorry for him because he may have blotted his chances for the front bench. His performance was like that of a frustrated chook looking for a perch on the front bench. However, the Deputy Premier must now know that he has nothing to worry about and is safe for life.

I refer to a matter that has concerned me for some weeks. I am disappointed (in fact, I am ashamed) that members of Parliament cannot introduce legislation and then interpret it. I refer to the legislation concerning the pecuniary interests of members of Parliament. I should have thought that members could bring legislation to this House and later would not need to run to outside agencies to find out how to fill in their forms regarding their pecuniary interests. It is the right of the individual member to know what he has by way of pecuniary interests and, if other members wish to look at the details of another member's pecuniary interests, they should respect privacy. I refer to a report in this morning's *Advertiser*, which states:

> An unsuccessful move by Mr Duncan had two senior Liberals (education spokesman Mr Wilson and Mr Becker, M.P. for Hanson) barred from voting on the issue (the motion on the development of the Roxby Downs uranium mine) because both had disclosed that they had Western Mining Corporation shares in their submission to the pecuniary interests register.

That report is incorrect. I also refer to the point referred to during that debate by the member for Elizabeth, who said:

> On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is this the appropriate time to take the point about the two members who hold shares in Western Mining Corporation? If the amendment is agreed to, the prices of W.M.C. shares may be affected. Therefore, the members to whom I have referred have a direct pecuniary interest.

I recall occasions on which you, Mr Speaker, have advised members to be careful. The statement of the member for Elizabeth is incorrect and he knows that it is incorrect. If he does not know that, he should have done his homework. On 7 August 1980 while making a speech to the House I made the following remarks (page 170 of *Hansard*):

> Regarding the future of Roxby Downs, I have not promoted uranium development strongly, because I am yet to be convinced about its safety, although from my recent reading I believe that it is becoming much safer to handle uranium and its enrichment. I also declare that my wife has about 110 shares in Western Mining Corporation which were bought many years ago and which have nothing to do with the future potential of Roxby Downs, which I believe is at least six years in the future, if it comes about.

The present Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne) then interjected, as follows:

> You are stating it publicly, which is more than another person did in regard to another matter.

I then stated:

> The shares were purchased some time ago. Of course, we did not know at that time about the potential of Roxby Downs.

The shares were purchased in 1973, and in fact my wife has 115 shares. Of course, she thinks that the matters currently being referred to are absolutely childish and she is annoyed about the whole thing. I do not see why her interests should be bandied around this House. As far as I am concerned, members' pecuniary interests should be treated as confidential. If honourable members are going to bandy details around in this House we know what will happen. It will be like a tennis match, going backwards and forwards.

Mr Trainer: Who threw the first ball up?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: I would not want to have anything to do with the disclosure of any interests of members of this House. I have made quite clear that the appropriate place for that information is with the appropriate people.

The SPEAKER: Order! Now that he has dealt with that interjection, I ask the honourable member to ignore any further interjections and to continue with his speech.

Mr BECKER: I hope that honourable members will treat the pecuniary interests of their colleagues with the respect that should be given. As far as I am concerned, I could not care less. In regard to the reference to the Western Mining shares, that was a classic example of two errors having been made, one of which was printed in the press. Of course, I would appreciate it if the *Advertiser* could correct that situation. I am not a shareholder in Western Mining Corporation. I do not mind if it cares to add that I am not a hard-liner on uranium and that I never have been. When the previous Government was in office I made a similar comment during a debate on the Roxby Downs indenture legislation, namely, that it would take a long time to convince me about the safety aspects of the mining and enrichment of uranium.

I said at that time that I was a little bit cynical about the whole procedure. I might as well go further on public record and say now, as I have already said to a prominent person with the Western Mining Corporation at a function, that if Western Mining Corporation was a statutory authority and I was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I would

closely examine the investments of Western Mining Corporation and the action of the Directors in spending the money that they have spent to this stage on something for which there were no guarantees for return on that investment.

Personally, I have always believed that the shareholders of Western Mining Corporation should be questioning very seriously the whole aspect of the spending of shareholders' money and the raising of shareholders' money for the Roxby Downs project. If it can be brought into operation, it will be a tremendous project for South Australia, provided that it can be done safely. It would provide benefits for those who will work there and live in the area and it would generate development and royalties for South Australia. However, I could not justify spending money in a wild-cat fashion as is the case at present. It really is a wild-cat prospect, because even the viability of the project at this stage does provide some reason for concern.

I would like to take the opportunity to point out some of the major shareholders of Western Mining Corporation and, again, this relates to the situation concerning pecuniary interests of members, having regard to the very large companies and organisations who are major shareholders. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a list of the 20 major shareholders in Western Mining Corporation which hold 140 663 437 shares, equal to 51.1 per cent of the total issued capital. It is purely statistical information.

The SPEAKER: With the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical, is leave granted?

Leave granted.

WESTERN MINING CORPORATION MAJOR SHAREHOLDERS

	Shares Held
ANZ Nominees Limited	50 501 032
National Nominees Limited	27 857 297
Australian Mutual Provident Society	13 944 680
Bank of New South Wales Nominees Pty Ltd	9 290 180
Lloyds Bank (Branches) Nominees Limited	7 870 822
The National Mutual Life Association of Australasia Limited	6 537 730
State Superannuation Board, Sydney	3 033 300
Enemelay Investments Pty Ltd	2 916 000
The Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited	2 622 840
Pendal Nominees Pty Limited	2 364 536
Washington H. Soul Pattinson & Company Limited	2 249 550
Government Insurance Office of New South Wales	2 196 300
The Prudential Assurance Company Limited	2 010 735
Darling Nominees Pty Limited	1 562 974
AUC Nominees Pty Limited	1 265 651
BNP Nominees (Aust.) Pty Limited	1 071 512
Westpac Custodian Nominees (Vic.) Limited	1 039 291
State Electricity Commission of Victoria	1 004 399
State Government Insurance Office (Queensland)	665 160
Burns Philp Trustee Company Ltd	659 448
Total	140 663 437

Mr BECKER: It is interesting to note in the annual report of Western Mining Corporation for the year ended June 1983 that the profit dropped from $6.9 million to $4 million. The company is experiencing difficulty: its assets dropped from $1106.7 million to $1 074 million, and its borrowings increased from $206.7 million to $242.6 million. That gives honourable members a quick idea of how the company is proceeding in a very difficult economic climate. It is also interesting to note that as at June 1983 the company employed 5 890 people. Whereas, at June 1982 it employed 4 790 people. So, it is a large company providing valuable jobs. Of course, I would like to see the company continue to expand, and it has many prospects in coal and gold, etc.

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

Motion carried.

At 8.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 27 October at 2 p.m.