

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 February 1985

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

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
TAPED TELEPHONE CONVERSATION**

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The Premier has asked me to provide to this House a statement concerning the investigation of allegations as to the illegal taping of a telephone conversation. Those allegations were made in this House yesterday by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues concerning specifically the alleged illegal taping of a telephone conversation between a senior public servant and a member of this House. Departmental reports have been prepared concerning those allegations, and those reports have been referred to the Crown Solicitor's Office for advice.

The Crown Solicitor has been asked to advise, on the basis of the material contained in those reports, whether there is any evidence of a breach of the Listening Devices Act, 1972-1974, or of any other Act (State or Commonwealth) concerning the recording or taping of telephone calls. I will inform this House of the Crown Solicitor's advice as soon as that report is to hand, which is expected to be within a week.

The **Hon. Michael Wilson**: Were you aware—

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: At the same time I will provide any other relevant information.

QUESTION TIME

GRAND PRIX

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier explain why the cost the Government will have to meet to stage the Grand Prix has doubled and probably trebled in the past three months, and will he also say why there has been a delay in signing a contract for the race? The Premier told this House on 30 October, just after he returned from London, that the net cost to the State of staging the race would be between \$1.5 million and \$2 million. However, the Public Works Committee Report on the race just tabled in Parliament indicates that the Government will be involved in a construction, erection, and dismantling cost of more than \$4.6 million to stage the race in its first year. That is more than three times the lower estimate given by the Premier on 30 October. The report suggests that these costs will not be recouped, and indicates that only the other recurrent costs of up to \$3.8 million will be met from earnings.

The Committee's report, which was signed on Tuesday, also indicates that a final contract for the race has yet to be signed, whereas the Premier told us on 15 November that it was expected that the contract would be ready for signing within a fortnight. In raising these questions, I reiterate the support of the Opposition for this event, as I clearly indicated by facilitating a pair for the Premier's trip to London. However, these questions are legitimate questions that are in the public interest and based on earlier statements by the Premier.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support, his very strangely expressed support, for this event. Let me deal first with the statements made concerning the financial implications of the event. In

reply to the Leader, the capital costs of the track assembly have always been treated as a separate item, although amounts can be recouped from such expenditure. We are also hoping for assistance in relation to that matter, and other aspects of capital expenditure have been included in ongoing works programmes: in other words, road work changes that will be necessary at some stage or other can be offset as part of their being brought forward as part of the preparation of the Grand Prix course. I still stand by my estimate that the current costs to the State will be between \$1.5 million and \$2 million.

The capital costs themselves cannot be precisely identified at this stage because contracts are still to be let. One will only know, when those contracts are let, what will be the final cost. However, against that cost must be offset the estimated income from the various sponsorships and so on, a matter that is still being actively considered. However, on all the best financial advice that we have, from firms such as P.B.L. Marketing and others that are involved in making these assessments, that is the extent of the risk involved in the Grand Prix in terms of direct assistance by the State. Let me set that off against the expected income, which will come in part as revenue to the State because of the economic activity that is generated and which will certainly come as part of the increased expenditure that the race will generate. In indirect terms, and in terms of jobs created, that offset will far outweigh our outlay.

That point is worth making to those who say that money of this sort should be spent on other areas of State or Government expenditure. We are spending this money in an entrepreneurial fashion in order to make money for the State, and I believe that that is a perfectly legitimate function of Government. If it is done on a proper and adequate basis, it can yield tangible returns. I refer members to the report that I released concerning the economic benefits derived from the Adelaide Festival of Arts. The State provides considerable financial support not only to the Festival of Arts by way of direct grant (that totalled about \$1 million for the 1984 festival: that money was simply paid out as a grant and I do not complain about that because that is appropriate), but it also involved support of the Festival Centre and its ongoing operations and support of the various arts companies. One must then set that off against economic benefits that such expenditure brings to the State. The Grand Prix is in exactly the same position and, if we can get away with a net outlay of about \$2 million, we shall be doing very well indeed. The ledger will be extraordinarily positive. Members should consider that argument.

In relation to signing of the contract, the contract has been ready for some time and there has been discussion on some points in the contract as there must inevitably be between our lawyers and Mr Bernard Ecclestone's lawyers. Only last week Mr Ecclestone told me that he had signed the contract, and that one or two matters of detail that were outstanding could be solved by exchange of letters. That matter is being investigated at present and is in the hands of the Government's solicitors. It is all very well for the Opposition to say that it has a positive attitude to that, but it has a very odd way of displaying it. As an example I shall refer to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition about the date of the Grand Prix. The date has not been determined yet.

Mr Olsen: Not much!

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Leader of the Opposition is certain that it will be 3 November and is adamant that that will be the date. He goes on further to say that the Government should nominate the date and outline planning for the event. It may be that 3 November will be the date, but I point out that the loud mouthed clamouring of the Leader of the Opposition in fact ran the risk of severely

undermining a delicate negotiating point that we were making. I will explain why: this is the sort of blundering bull in the china shop stuff we would expect: it is the sort of super smart, 'I know, ha, ha, what is going on', without any respect for the consequences. As members will recall, the date originally allocated in the FISA calendar was 13 October. I point out to the House that it is not the Government that nominates the date but FISA, the international organisation. Our planning and preparations had been built around that date. Subsequently, FISA came back to us and said that an extra event had been inserted in the calendar and that they wanted us to shift. For various reasons we were not inclined to shift our date, the chief of which being that we had gone ahead with the planning on the basis of the 13 October date.

As part of the negotiations with FISA it was essential that we maintained a position that 13 October was the date for South Australia. In terms of our negotiations it is a joke to have the Leader of the Opposition saying, 'Don't worry, we have accepted the 3 November date; I have information on it, and I am adamant that that is so.' I come back to the point that it may well be that 3 November will be the date, but I am simply cautioning members opposite. If they are genuine in support of this event they must recognise that on occasions their very smart statements have adverse effects. What is the point of the Leader of the Opposition's making that statement except to prove what a clever fellow he is. Before doing that he should reflect on the consequences and on how that could affect negotiations.

Mr Lewis: What about people's plans and bookings.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I agree: as the member for Mallee says, it is vital that we have a firm date as soon as possible so that people can make bookings, and they are an essential part of it, as is the reservation of accommodation. For someone to say, 'I am smarter than you, I am going to tell—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, but not for the purposes of the press. So, let us have a constructive attitude to what will be a very important event for South Australia. I would like to see a more positive attitude instead of this carping nonsense and smart carrying on that is coming from the Opposition.

MORPHETT ROAD PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mrs APPLEBY: Regardless of the outcome of further Road Traffic Board surveys of numbers in regard to a pedestrian crossing on Morphett Road between Sturt and Seacombe Roads, is the Minister of Transport prepared to support the provision of a pedestrian actuated crossing at that location as a matter of some urgency? Last year I requested the Marion council, being the body responsible for road traffic management in this area, to have a pedestrian actuated crossing installed in the near vicinity of Folkestone Road, and adjacent to some shops. On 26 June 1984 a survey relating to the movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic was undertaken. The statistics obtained did not meet the criteria of the Road Traffic Board of South Australia for the installation of such a crossing, and as a result no further action was taken at that time. As many children and aged persons negotiate the road in this vicinity and, as we all know, young children have little road sense and their actions are not really predictable, I urge the Minister to give urgent consideration to this matter as a child has now died.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for her question. She has brought the problem of this crossing to my attention on several occasions. Yes, I can assure the honourable member that I will give my fullest support to

the installation of a crossing. I have made some inquiries this morning and I believe that the Marion council, which has responsibility for this road, is awaiting the results of a new count of traffic and pedestrian numbers at Folkestone Road. As children have now returned to school it is my belief that the numbers will prove sufficient to justify a pedestrian crossing. The surveys conducted in the past were very close to the criteria, so I think it is now warranted. In these circumstances, I believe that the crossing should be installed without delay. On that basis, I will be instructing the officers of the Highways Department to liaise with the Marion council and to provide whatever assistance may be needed to ensure that this crossing is installed in the near future.

The SPEAKER: I would like to remind honourable members that in their questioning, in particular the explanation of the question, it is against Standing Orders to put a personal plea or argument. It is quite in order to indicate, as I have said on previous occasions, what evidence is available or what pleas are being put to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NURRUNGAR BASE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think my explanation will be argumentative: I certainly hope not. It will be factual. It is just coincidental that it is before my question to the Premier. What response did he receive to his request to the Federal Government last year for information about the upgrading of the United States satellite ground station at Nurrungar, near Woomera, and is he pressuring the Federal Government to close down the base?

The Premier tried to evade a question yesterday about the US naval visits to South Australian ports when he said that it was a Commonwealth matter. However, this was not the view he took last May, when he asked the Federal Government to give details about a \$126 million upgrading of the United States satellite ground station at Nurrungar, in South Australia. He said in a statement in the *Advertiser* on 26 May that it seemed only proper that the South Australian Government should be given information as to the function and role of a base located in this State, and the statement made front page news.

However, while we have heard nothing further from the Premier about any information he may have received, the State branch of the Labor Party at its annual convention in June last year decided to pressure the Federal Government to close down all military bases in Australia. The motion was moved by the Federal member for Hindmarsh (Mr Scott), who has been a leading figure in recent agitation against the ANZUS treaty and the US generally. In view of the action the Premier took last year to seek information about the Nurrungar base, I ask him to reveal what response he received from the Federal Government and whether he has pressured it to remove these bases in line with the policy established by the State branch of the ALP.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I received a response, from memory, from the then Minister of Defence (Mr Scholes) and the Prime Minister. Again, my memory of that response was basically that at that stage there were no details that could be released on the Nurrungar upgrading that had been reported, but it may be appropriate if in fact that became an issue or that upgrading went ahead—and again I crave the House's indulgence on my memory of a letter that was sent some months ago—that further communications would be made with me.

I have not heard anything subsequently about that supposed upgrading of Nurrungar. If this upgrading was going

to involve the use of any materials, labour or whatever, relating to the State, obviously it would have some significance for the State, although I understand that in most of these instances upgrading or construction of equipment, and so on, is done in the United States and flown in. That was the response I got and I was promised that there would be a further response when there was something to report.

In relation to the policy issue raised by the Deputy Leader, the Federal policy of the Party is in place and, as I said to the House yesterday, as far as those matters are concerned, they are under the responsibility of the Federal Government under the Constitution. I have not called for the removal of that base and, in so doing, I have remained consistent with the Federal policy of the Party. I thank the Deputy Leader for his interest in the matter.

SENIOR SERGEANT SYMONS

Mr TRAINER: Did the Deputy Premier and Minister of Emergency Services approve a request from the Leader of the Opposition for the secondment of Senior Sergeant Mick Symons to the Opposition staff in the position of press secretary? I ask this question because the Leader of the Opposition was quoted on Thursday night as saying that he had never had any intention of appointing Mr Symons to his staff as Press Secretary. That explanation was made after the appointment had prompted a strong reaction from the South Australian branch of the AJA. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was always his intention to appoint Senior Sergeant Symons to the position of Media Adviser and that he had for six weeks been intending to appoint someone else to the position of Press Secretary, a position which would be privately funded.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I was trying to take advice on several matters at the same time. That question is skating very close to the line.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have no control under the Standing Orders, which honourable members ask me to enforce, over answers given. I will ask the Deputy Premier to take note that I was in difficulties as the question was being asked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members should bear in mind that, had I heard the whole question as I think it was coming out, I may well have disallowed it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, Sir, do I understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Torrens to be seated. I cannot hear his point of order above the shouting.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Do I understand, Sir, that you said that if you had heard the question you may have ruled it out of order?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: If that is so, may I suggest that you, Sir, ask the honourable member to restate the question so that you can hear it, and then rule it out of order?

The SPEAKER: I will consider that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair will not take lightly these reflections on it and the holding up of the Chair to jollity in this way. The Standing Orders have been forced upon me by honourable members—I did not write them. I think the appropriate thing is that the honourable member restate his question first, before giving any explanation.

Mr TRAINER: With some pleasure. Did the Deputy Premier and Minister of Emergency Services approve a request from the Leader of the Opposition for the secondment of Senior Sergeant Mick Symons to the Opposition staff in a position of Press Secretary?

The SPEAKER: I rule that question out of order as not being the business of the House.

An honourable member: Very good.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not want to dispute your ruling, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Have you finished your frivolity?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I think that there is just something in my mind (and it might not be as clear today as it is on most occasions), but if one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: —is to interpret your ruling, Mr Speaker, that means that questions cannot be asked or answered in this House about any appointment that is in the execution of public funds. That is the consequence of your ruling as I see it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I propose to take into account everything that has been said and bring down a written ruling on Tuesday next. The honourable member for Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

APPRENTICE ENROLMENT FEE

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: We are being threatened by the Deputy Premier, Mr Speaker. He is waving his finger at us.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear any threats. I ask the honourable member for Torrens to ask his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I find the competition rather alarming. My question is on a serious matter. Will the Minister of Education modify his new instruction to TAFE College Principals that 'apprentices must pay the \$25 service fee on enrolment to enter a class' to allow more flexibility in the system? I and some of my colleagues have received complaints from employers of apprentices and parents that apprentices have been arbitrarily excluded from block training at some TAFE colleges because they were unable to pay the \$25 service fee on the first day of training.

I quote the following case as an example, and I am prepared and able to provide documentation to the Minister if he so wishes. An apprentice attended college on the first day of block training. He was asked for his \$25. He told the officer concerned that he would bring it with him the following day. The officer then explained that the apprentice would have his enrolment terminated. When the apprentice pressed the point he was asked to leave the premises.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There was an episode brought to my attention on the first day of enrolment of apprentices or just before the first day regarding the fact that there might be some students who may not have the \$25 with them and who, therefore, according to that ruling would be ruled out. As a result of discussions held between members of my office and the Department of Technical and Further Education it was agreed that students should be given the first month within which to pay the \$25 fee, because it is quite correct that students may not have that money on the

first day. With school fees we certainly allow flexibility when parents are paying book fees in primary and secondary schools. It is only right that the same flexibility should apply within the Department of TAFE.

CHILD/PARENT CENTRES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education clarify for the House the Government's position on child/parent centres? Over the years there have been constant rumours about Governments threatening to remove child/parent centres from their local schools. My constituents have sought clarification about the Government's position on this matter.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am pleased to give assurances on this matter and that the honourable member has asked me the question. There have been, as the member says, continuing concerns about child/parent centres for some considerable time going back to about 1982. The Government's policy has not changed: it is as it was spelt out before the last election, that is, that the Government supports child/parent centres and does not propose to remove them from the schools to which they are attached. It believes that child/parent centres form an integral part of the structure and organisation under their school council and under the junior primary or primary principal. It may happen, as a result of changes in enrolment patterns, that some individual child/parent centres may be created within a new pre-school or those whose numbers have fallen totally away may be closed down; that has always been the case.

As to the general principle of child/parent centres, it is Government policy that they continue to be part of the schools to which they are attached, and that means that they will continue to be under the junior primary or primary principal and the school council. I make that point most strongly because any suggestion to the contrary that there is any difference of opinion coming from the Education Department or the Government is without foundation. That point has been made by me on previous occasions; it has altered not one wit, and I have expressed that view only this week to the Junior Primary Parents Association in order to reassure them, because they were concerned to hear yet again the resurgence of these rumours. I hope that this restatement of the position, which has not changed, will convince those who are spreading rumours to the contrary that there is little merit in their continuing to do so and that they can only hope to achieve some sort of dishonourable mischief.

POLICE COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Public Works order an immediate resumption on the construction of the police communications tower at Mount Barker? The police have been attempting since last August to erect this tower because it is vital to the communication network in the Adelaide Hills. The seven month delay has caused great concern to Hills residents in many towns where ineffective communications are adversely affecting the police in the performance of their normal duties and can leave Hills residents vulnerable during major bush fires.

I understand that the need for this tower was highlighted yet again by the major fires that occurred in the Hills on 21 January, when police communications were chaotic until a mobile unit was sent up to the Mount Barker summit to relay transmissions. The Government announced last November that a compromise had been reached with Aboriginal land rights activists and union representatives to allow the work to proceed.

However, at a meeting yesterday that the Minister tried to cover up from the media, he ordered a suspension of work, even though I have been informed that the work done so far complies in every respect with the agreement reached last November for the project to proceed. As each new location for this tower effectively diminishes its range and benefits, I ask the Minister to demonstrate that the Government gives a higher priority to the safety of Hills residents than to dubious land rights claims by ordering an immediate resumption of the work.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Murray has once again demonstrated his irresponsible attitude to the situation. We all recall some of those inflammatory statements that the member for Murray made when there was a problem between the Aboriginal people and the Police Department as to whether this site should be in the original position or in the alternative one which was agreed between the Police Department, the Aboriginal people and those who represented them, and the Department of Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: How many Aborigines were actually involved?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The issue at the present moment is the exact siting. The Aboriginal people believe that they have an agreement with the police that the tower will be built at the centre of the car park. That is the only problem. A view is held by the Police Department that the tower should be built anywhere in the car park. However, agreement was reached that the tower should be built in the centre. The original agreement said that it could be built within the car park, and that is the only dispute at present. On hearing of the disagreement I as the builder (and let us get that perfectly clear), immediately got together all interested parties to decide exactly what everyone wanted.

It is a minor hiccup, and in no way will the siting be changed. The Government has committed itself to the building of the tower on that site and, as a result of the meeting that was held yesterday (and I think another meeting will be held tomorrow), those minor points will be cleared up. The Government is committed to having that tower built on that site. The only problem is whether the actual tower is built in the middle of the car park or on the outside. That is the only problem, and any inflammatory statements that the member for Murray wishes to make will only increase the problems.

The member for Murray made a point about the view put forward by officers of my Department that little should be said to the media. That was done merely to stop the kind of inflammatory statements that the member for Murray is always wont to make about the situation in Mount Barker. The member for Murray wants to create in the minds of the community the belief that, if the tower is not erected at Mount Barker (and I can assure him that it will be erected), there will be real problems. We say that the tower will be built and the only decision that has to be made is whether it will be built in the centre of the car park or on the outside. The member for Murray is once again putting red herrings right across the path. He knows nothing about the situation. My advice to the honourable member is that he should perhaps go to my officers and be given an up to date briefing of what will occur so that, when he stands up in this House in future, he will be able to talk a bit of sense.

INDIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr HAMILTON: As the Minister of Tourism presented a paper—a very good one—to the Indian Pacific Seminar in Perth on 22 January, will he tell the House the outcome of that important seminar and when we can hopefully expect

positive proposals or recommendations to secure the future of one of the greatest train trips in the world? My question is prompted by recent television advertisements and press coverage in the *News* on 12 February in which it was stated:

Australian National launched a major campaign this week to woo more South Australians to interstate train travel. The theme of the campaign is 'Getting there is half the fun.'

A television commercial filmed at the Adelaide rail passenger terminal at Keswick features a passenger train typical of Australian National's Ghan, Trans-Australian, Alice and Indian Pacific services. It depicts on-train facilities available to passengers and is designed to emphasise the glamor of train travel as part of a holiday.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I was privileged to be able to present a paper to the seminar on behalf of the Australian Tourism Ministers Council and, as such, on behalf of the tourism industry in Australia. I was delighted to see the member for Albert Park taking a great interest in that seminar—I understand that he travelled by train to and from Perth. It is a trip that I wish more members on both sides of the House could experience. I must point out, however, that the standard of the train today is not what it was 20 years ago, and that is why the seminar was held and the reason for its being so well attended by people within the tourism industry, the transport industry, trade unions, those associated with railways societies and both national and international personnel.

It was a well attended seminar, and I am delighted that the paper that I presented has formed the basis of a five point action plan to which I shall refer in a moment. One of the critical areas that was addressed by the seminar concerned the future of the train itself. Indeed, that was the very basis of the seminar. I pointed out that we in Australia must make up our minds what we want of the Indian Pacific: either a world-class holiday experience or simply a commuter service. I considered that, if we wanted a world-class train to be promoted to international visitors with a sense of pride and security that the service would run, significant changes would have to be made.

However, if the train was to provide only a commuter service and the standard gradually allowed to deteriorate, the service might just as well be let go altogether. However, my view, and that of many other people, is that the problem with the train is that it relates to the lack of capital expenditure on it in recent years. The staff on the train do an extremely good job in increasingly difficult circumstances. However, I believe that there has been an impact on the enthusiasm of the staff working the train as a result of the insecurity that they feel because there is no guarantee that the train will continue to run. There has also been a damping down of their enthusiasm because of the lack of capital expenditure on maintenance of the train in essential areas and a feeling among the staff that they are being blamed for what is happening to the Indian Pacific when, in fact, they, like the passengers (the consumers), are victims of the situation.

True, all the railway authorities at the seminar were enthusiastic in their desire to do something, but we have this problem of resources. In my paper I said that either Australian National should take a more up-front role and perform what I believe is its responsibility in running the train or consider having the responsibility for the train transferred to an independent joint venture authority that would include representatives of the Western Australian, New South Wales, South Australian and Federal Governments, with a board of control probably including representatives of those Governments and the unions involved.

Mr Roger Jowett (I think he is the Assistant Federal Secretary of the Australian Railways Union) gave what I believed to be an important paper, and union representatives

at the seminar, in supporting that paper, guaranteed that they would work with the authorities to exclude the Indian Pacific from normal industrial disputes that occur from time to time within the other authorities, so that the service could be promoted with certainty and reliability to our international visitors. That was a significant part of the seminar.

Certainly, I am delighted to see Australian National now in the area and promoting its passenger trains as a holiday experience. I am sure that such promotion will succeed and that more people will enjoy the service provided. As a person who spent 20 years in the railways, I have a parochial interest and, having worked in passenger trains, I have an even greater interest.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Did you travel by train to the seminar?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I could not travel there and back by train because the train was not running. That is a matter that we should address. I commend Mr Brill (Western Australian Transport Minister) for convening this seminar and also for summing up on the five point plan which he put to the seminar in a motion that was carried unanimously. I shall briefly point out what that five point plan hopes to do. It involves:

carrying out a study to define the market for the Indian Pacific rail service.

There is no real point in going out to market it if it is not known what it is designed to do in the market that it should be directed towards. It further involves:

carrying out a study into the appropriate management structure to operate the service;

commencing discussions with rail unions with a view to gaining some immunity for the Indian Pacific from industrial action;

seeking Commonwealth Bicentennial funds to refurbish the service's rolling stock; and

carrying out a study into the true financial position of the Indian Pacific.

Each of those points will have the necessary follow-up action. It is hoped that the full reports will be with the Australian Transport Advisory Council (ATAC), which is to meet in Perth in June this year. This is a very urgent matter which it is hoped can be addressed in June, when the appropriate recommendations can be made in the hope that the relevant authorities can accept them.

OVERSEAS BORROWINGS

Mr BECKER: Will the Treasurer provide the House with full details of the \$US95 million deep-discount zero-interest loan negotiated by the South Australian Government Finance Authority in November last year, including what steps have been taken to cushion the impact on State finances resulting from the continual decline of the Australian dollar against its United States counterpart?

In late November last year a tombstone advertisement appeared in the *Australian Financial Review* indicating that the South Australian Government Financing Authority had negotiated a \$US95 million loan at a zero rate of interest with an issue price of 32.5 per cent, maturing in 1994. From my calculations at loan drawdown the Government received \$US30.8 million and at its maturity in 1994 must repay the sum of \$US95 million.

This means that in 10 years time the loan repayment will comprise \$US30.8 million in principal and \$US64.2 million in interest (that is compounding at a rate of 12 per cent per annum, or 20.8 per cent flat). As at November, when the loan was negotiated, the \$US95 million would have cost \$A110.8 million. However, today, because of the fall in the Australian dollar, that \$US95 million will now cost approximately \$A130 million. This indicates a loss of about \$A19

million in the past few weeks because of the fall of the Australian dollar against the US dollar. However, I understand that it is dangerous to predict what the situation will be in 10 years time. This highlights the difficulty of the State's borrowing money overseas.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is well aware of those risks, as are any businesses and others which borrow from overseas. At the moment our holdings through SAFA, as referred to by the honourable member, are held entirely off shore, and our current US borrowings are entirely offset by investments made in United States dollars. In making those arrangements various steps are taken in order to minimise currency risks, and in fact advice is taken in the consortium that places these borrowings to ensure that there are various hedges and offsets so that we are not overexposed. In terms of the details in the honourable member's question, obviously I am not in a position—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Are you suggesting that you're doing some money speculation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, we are not speculating but we are borrowing off shore in order to make money for the State. It is cheaper to borrow off shore.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are doing that in order to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are getting distinct advantages and we are doing it under recent agreements reached with the Loan Council. As I say, it is being done in a way that is minimising exchange risks. In terms of the detail, I will be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member. Members will realise that this is a very complex area, but I assure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that members opposite are displaying a good deal of ignorance about the whole process and the way in which it is carried out. I will bring down a report, which I will send to the honourable member.

BREAD PRICES

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, explain the mechanism that controls or affects bread prices in South Australia? At a meeting in my electorate that I attended on Monday night, an increase of 2c in the price of bread manufactured by Tip Top and another big company was brought to my attention by a constituent who was very irate about this increase announcement, which had been headlined in the newspaper. I think that everyone is fully aware that there has not been an increase in wages since June last year when there was a 4.1 per cent increase, so this did not follow an increase in wages.

When I did a little research to assist me in formulating my question, I was amazed to find that in 1983 it was stated by people from the Millers Association and also United Farmers that the reason they increased bread prices by 2c at that time was mainly as a result of wage payments, but they also explained that the increase would apply from the following Monday. Most people will probably remember the announcement by the Federal Minister for Agriculture in September last year when he said that, because of the grain quantities, wheat would be released and there would probably be a decrease of 2c per loaf of bread.

However, in an interview involving the same people from United Farmers and the Millers Association it was stated that unfortunately that would not happen immediately,

because the millers had to purchase their supplies to last them 12 months. When the increase occurred, they did not have to worry about the stock they held and imported it at a cheaper price.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commencing to debate the issue.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Everyone here would agree with my point that there is no control on bread and that Tip Top and other bread manufacturers can increase the price at their own will. I am worried greatly when I read that \$1 million worth of bread is dumped every year in South Australia.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: We're commenting again!

Mr PLUNKETT: I apologise if I was commenting. I ask the Minister of Community Welfare to seek from his colleague an answer for my constituents, who are all bread-and-butter people and are not living high.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, he raises a matter of considerable importance in the community. I will be pleased to refer it to my colleague in another place for the appropriate reply and for any information on the action that that Minister is already taking on this issue.

TAPED TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning make available today to the member for Eyre, and if possible table in the House, the departmental reports sent to the Crown Solicitor's Office for advice in relation to the alleged offence of illegal phone taping by a senior public servant and the transmission of the contents of the taped conversation by two others?

In a Ministerial statement today the Minister told the House that departmental reports have been forwarded to the Crown Solicitor in order for a judgment to be made as to whether any offence has been committed under the Listening Devices Act. It seems a very one-sided affair where it is quite clear that the departmental officers concerned will be putting their side of the story as they recall it. The Minister looks puzzled. They are departmental reports.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not suggesting that. In fairness to the member for Eyre, he should see the contents of those departmental reports: there may be some errors in them, and the interests of the honourable member may not be protected. There was one error in the document which was sent to the Minister by one of his officers and which included a transcript of the conversation: it stated that Mr Gunn had phoned the person concerned, whereas in fact that person had phoned Mr Gunn. It is quite clear that a departmental report will give one side of the story as it is prepared by the Department. It is essential, in our view, that those reports be made available immediately to the member for Eyre to enable him to check their factual content and confirm his knowledge of the events and, if possible, that they be tabled in the House today.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In light of the statement I made it would be undesirable that anything be tabled in the House today. However, I am happy to talk to the member for Eyre on any of the matters involved. I can only assume that he already has the report, and I will be happy to confirm with him what reports are available. I would certainly facilitate, if it would seem appropriate or necessary for the task given to the Crown Solicitor, the opportunity for the honourable member to put a point of view. However, I am not prepared at this stage to table that information in advance of advice from the Crown Solicitor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction give further details of the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement signed last week in Adelaide?

Mr Ashenden: Read it straight out of the paper—it was written up a few days ago.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I will ignore that interjection. Last week the Premier said that the flow-on to this State in the first three years of the agreement would be 9 000 Housing Trust homes and 9 000 low interest loans. As this is a tremendous boost in housing assistance to lower income households, and affects many of my constituents and thousands of South Australian households generally, the Minister's elaboration on these figures would be appreciated.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Those who were present at the historic signing of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement would have heard the Federal Minister for Housing say that, on a per capita basis, South Australia led the field in housing throughout Australia, not only in terms of building homes but also in providing housing related services. On the three year funding basis, as the member for Price mentioned, even on the base level funding of \$510 million, it would affect 9 000 Trust homes, 9 000 low interest loans and 40 000 people who received assistance either in rent relief or in emergency housing operations during that period.

As a result of that agreement, for the first time we sought from the Federal Government an introduction of base level funding by this Government to provide certainty of planning in the housing sector. We did this because base funding also provides stability for the home building industry, and this had been recognised by the private sector.

This was the main plank of our economic recovery in the building sector. It was picked up by the Federal Government at the insistence of this State and now it is uniform throughout the Commonwealth. As a result of that, in the first year alone the Trust should add about 3 300 homes to its stock, and South Australia will be the only State in the Commonwealth that can almost achieve Federal Government Party policy of doubling the public housing stock over the next decade. The Bannon Government also consistently aimed for a healthy and smooth running housing industry not only to meet community needs but to provide jobs, and we have got it now in this State because of this far reaching agreement.

We attacked housing related poverty, as we said we would, and the Government worked hard to ensure that the agreement would provide a significant increase in low rental public housing and low interest finance through the State Bank for those low income households who want to buy. One of the significant things coming out of the agreement is that the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme (rental purchase scheme) which is provided and which was pioneered by this Government for the benefit of the people of this State is now uniform throughout the nation of Australia. What people can achieve in Prospect at this time they can also achieve in Wagga, and that is a significant thing for this State.

One of the other things is that we made a unique funding commitment to meet the agreement's objectives and we have allocated the entire Loan Council borrowings, totalling more than \$260 million over the past two years, to housing—a thing that has never been done before and a thing that is now being picked up by Western Australia and Victoria as a means of increasing employment in those States in an

attempt to overcome the excessive waiting lists that are prevalent throughout Australia.

One of the main things that we have pushed (and pushed all along) is that the beneficiaries of this agreement are the low income householders throughout the State who cannot afford private rental, who cannot afford to buy their own home and who are quite simply homeless. This new agreement is an excellent start, but still a lot more needs to be done because of the size, as I have said previously, of the housing problem across Australia. When I became Minister of Housing and Construction in this Government I said that we would declare war against homelessness. We are continuing that war, but we have also made another statement: those people on low incomes are the new dispossessed in our society and, consequently, in this coming year and in future years we will place more emphasis on those people in the private rental market who cannot afford to pay the high rents.

In that way we will increase our already high commitment to rent relief and emergency housing operations. We will make attempts to spread those services (and I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier will be very pleased about this) throughout the country towns, and I hope that very shortly there will be an announcement which will be able to meet the needs of those people in country towns who will be able to enjoy the benefits that are presently available to people in the city areas; so, there is more to be done. We need to convince the Government that the three year funding programme should be extended to a three year rolling programme. We need to convince the Federal Government that not only do we expect a base level funding but a funding level each year which not only exceeds inflation and provides an even greater amount to meet the ever increasing need for housing in the community. They are the major points that came out of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. We are in the forefront and will continue to be so and, as I said earlier, many other States are following South Australia's lead in this area.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY REPORT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That this House take note of the National Conservation Strategy Report tabled in this House on Tuesday 12 February.

It gives me considerable pleasure to table the National Conservation Strategy for Australia in Parliament and, in so doing, urge honourable members to support its thrust and provisions. Many honourable members will already be familiar with the document and the process which led to its finalisation. In 1980, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, in conjunction with the World Wildlife Fund and the United Nations Environment Programme released the World Conservation Strategy. This was a landmark document which not only drew attention to the way by which human activities are degrading the earth's capacity to support life, but also suggested ways and means of overcoming these problems. Its fundamental thesis, somewhat revolutionary for some at the time, was its assertion that, in the long run, sustainable development is dependent on conservation of the earth's living resources. While many of us grew up at a time when 'the environment' was regarded simply as a 'nice thing' to have and to enjoy—the furry animals and tall, green trees idea of the environment—the World Conservation Strategy was saying that the

environment is important not only for its own sake, but for ours as well.

A moment's reflection will show that this is indeed true: the livelihood of a fisherman in the long run depends on the protection of the mangrove areas which serve as hatcheries and nurseries for young fish. Similarly, a farmer must conserve his soil as this is the natural capital on which the viability of his farm ultimately depends. At a larger level, our use and abuse of the Murray River environment illustrates the point that the capacity of natural resources to sustain human use and development can be reduced grossly by our actions.

The World Conservation Strategy proposes three objectives as being crucial to sustaining the environment's ability to sustain human use. These were: first, to maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems such as soil regeneration and protection, the recycling of nutrients and the cleansing of waters; secondly, to preserve genetic diversity—the range of genetic material found in the world's organisms—on which depend the breeding programmes necessary for the protection and improvement of cultivated plants and domesticated animals, as well as much scientific advance, technical innovation, and the security of the many industries that use living resources; and, thirdly, to ensure the sustainable utilisation of species and ecosystems, notably fish and other wildlife, forests and grazing lands which support rural communities and major industries. To these, the National Conservation Strategy for Australia added a fourth: to maintain and enhance environmental qualities which make the earth a pleasant place to live and which meets aesthetic and recreational needs.

The principles of the World Conservation Strategy were accepted by the Australian Government in 1980 and a process was begun leading to the formulation of a national conservation strategy for Australia. The process, which extended over 2½ years, involved: preparation of specially commissioned papers on aspects of living resource conservation; discussion of the papers at a national seminar in December 1981; preparation of a discussion paper released in May 1982 for public comment (a very useful three-day conference was held in South Australia to review the paper and contribute to the strategy); consideration of over 550 written submissions on the discussion paper; preparation of a conference draft strategy and associated background papers; and convening of a national conference in June 1983 at which a consensus was reached on the National Conservation Strategy for Australia.

The entire process has involved persons from many walks of life in the community—business and commercial interests, community groups, Government officers, developers, conservationists and academics. A broadly based consultative group assisted a governmental steering committee in overseeing the process leading to the NCSA and the two groups combined in the national conference to form a Conference Bureau, headed by its Chairman, Sir Rupert Myers. A nearly identical group now comprises the Interim Consultative Committee which advises the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment on measures to promote and implement the strategy.

In April 1984, the South Australian Government became the first Government in Australia to announce its endorsement of the strategy and since then it has been followed by the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victorian, Western Australian and Northern Territory Governments. The strategy has also been tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament by the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment. In endorsing the strategy, the South Australian Government agreed to a series of measures to implement its thrust and provisions. These are: first, to require Cabinet submissions which have implications for the management of natural

resources to include a statement indicating their compatibility with the strategy; secondly, to require departments and authorities to reflect, to the maximum practical extent, the strategy in their corporate planning, policies and programmes; thirdly, to establish an NCSA steering committee to promote the strategy, advise and monitor its implementation, and identify areas which require increased priority to achieve the strategy's objectives; and, finally, to undertake a publicity programme in conjunction with national action and within existing resources to explain and promote the strategy.

I refer to the process leading to the NCSA and the two groups combined in the national conference to form a Conference Bureau, headed by its Chairman, Sir Rupert Myers. A nearly identical group now comprises the Interim Consultative Committee which advises the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment on measures to promote and implement the strategy. In April 1984, the South Australian Government became the first Government to announce its endorsement of the strategy, as I have earlier indicated, and so things have proceeded.

The other point that I should have made under this general heading was the resolution of the South Australian Cabinet that we should table the strategy in Parliament with a resolution of support of both Houses of Parliament. In commending the strategy to the House for its support I wish to affirm its importance as a basis for policies and programmes concerning the development and use of our living resources. The strategy marks a transition in our relationship with the environment, a maturing in the realisation that we need to work with nature, not against it, for our own good, as well as for that of the environment.

In further commending the strategy to honourable members I would simply make the point that the matter we are considering here and on which we will eventually vote runs very much wider than the specific confines of my portfolio. Most of the Ministerial portfolios in this State and, indeed, in any Administration have significant environmental components associated with them. Obviously, the Mines and Energy portfolio has a significant environmental component: quarry rehabilitation, for example, has been a feature of a portion of the legislation which for many years has been under the care and control of that Minister.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: The poor old Minister doesn't get a look in when you are around.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I, of course, have a very constructive and positive working relationship with the Minister of Mines and Energy, and indeed anything even close to what the honourable member is suggesting by way of interjection would be, as all those who know the Minister are aware, absolute nonsense. There is a positive working relationship between the two Ministers in this field, as indeed there must be if a Government is to have a programme of balance which takes into account on the one hand the necessity to endorse all these matters which are in the conservation strategy to which we are directing our attention and at the same time admit of the necessity to continue to win resources from the bowels of the earth. If the honourable member thinks there is something strange in that, perhaps he can explain himself and vote against this motion.

To continue with a few other examples: obviously the Minister of Transport is involved in an area which has considerable conservation and environmental implications. The move towards the use of lead-free petrol, which is increasingly being embraced by all Governments around Australia, has obvious environmental implications. The Minister of Local Government has waste management under his control, and there is a move towards total collection of domestic refuse, waste transfer stations; the rationalisation of tipping facilities in the metropolitan area and the regional

areas is a very important matter in our total environmental management field.

My other portfolio, Ministry of Lands, particularly in its application to the pastoral lands in the north of the State but indeed also the agricultural areas, has a very strong environmental thrust, one which I have certainly encouraged to grow but one which was certainly there before I took over the portfolio in the convictions of the people in the Department who are concerned for land management in all of those areas. The Minister of Fisheries is responsible for marine reserves. He is concerned for the fish stocks. I can recall one former Director of Fisheries saying that someone asked him whose side he was on as between the amateur fishermen and the professional fishermen, and he said he was on the side of the fish. I guess indeed all fishermen who like to think properly on this subject would want to agree with him. Indeed, the conservation of that resource is absolutely necessary if the resource is to be exploited in future years.

The Minister of Agriculture is responsible in all sorts of ways for a considerable environmental regime. The control of pesticides, herbicides and fungicides used by primary producers, the way in which the land in fact is managed for agricultural and the more intensive grazing purposes which apply to the heavier rainfall areas of the State, improved pastures, all have considerable environmental implications. I wanted to make the point that the whole of Government these days is very much involved in an environmental thrust because it is necessary for the continuing health of the biosphere and because it is expected of us by the people who have put us here. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I am delighted that the Minister has agreed to debate this National Conservation Strategy, which I believe is one of the most important strategies that this country has ever seen. My personal involvement in regard to the world strategy and the National Conservation Strategy, or the strategy for Australia, goes back some time to when I first came into this House. I then became very much aware of the World Conservation Strategy and of course, when coming into Government I had the opportunity as Minister for Environment and Planning to become involved. I well remember soon after coming into Government organising and chairing a very worthwhile seminar that brought together people from all walks of life. I understand that that was, if not the first one of the first seminars to be held in an Australian State to look at the preparation of a national conservation strategy for Australia.

Since that time it has been supported by Governments of all persuasions and I am pleased indeed that we are taking this opportunity today to debate this strategy. Twelve months ago I first approached the current Minister for Environment and Planning and requested that the opportunity be provided to debate this strategy and to have it tabled in this Parliament. Towards the end of last year I reiterated my support for the debate in this place and in another place, and urged that the opportunity be provided for the South Australian Parliament to endorse the strategy. I do not want in any way to be political in my speech in regard to this strategy but I am disappointed that the notice of motion states that the House take notice of the National Conservation Strategy. I intend to move an amendment so that the opportunity is provided for this House to endorse the National Conservation Strategy. I hope that it is also possible for debate and for endorsement to take place in both Houses of Parliament. I am not aware whether arrangements have been made to have a debate take place in the Upper House.

The Hon D.J. Hopgood: They have some other work to do up there.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I hope that that will continue. The Minister referred to some of the background relating to the preparation of the strategy that originated with the publication in 1980 of the World Conservation Strategy, the principles of which were accepted in more than 30 countries around the world, including Australia. That document describes the problems facing many parts of the world as a result of the continued use of living resources with little regard to the provision for future needs, to which problems all nations, including Australia, have contributed.

At this point I shall quote from a magnificent document, entitled *An Introduction to the World Conservation Strategy*, and specifically from the foreword that was prepared by the late Indira Gandhi. This statement is well worth being read into *Hansard* and I support these words from the pen of that well respected world identity:

I do not cease to marvel at the multi-faceted beauty of the earth and the remarkable achievements of human endeavour. But I am astounded that human beings should allow their vision to be so clouded by greed for profit or other selfish motives or even by false notions of national pride as to be imprisoned by the immediate here and now. What would our earth be like without the forests left uncut and the trees planted by those who went before us?

Today, three-fourths of the world is poor. Poverty is degrading and ridden with dirt and disease. It must be fought and eradicated. Sustainable development is a necessity. But what of short-sighted developments, those steps to 'progress' which denude forests and pollute the air, water and earth? What of mental attitudes which justify wasteful and harmful exploitations of nature and discrimination against different religions, races and women? Such attitudes even lead to justifications for nuclear war.

Fortunately, there is no real conflict between development and conservation. Enduring development requires a more thoughtful and thrifty use of resources, greater care in the planning and siting of industrial and other projects, measures for stopping pollution, and the bettering, rather than replacing, of existing life styles and traditional working methods.

Recent years have seen an increasing awareness of these issues. The various movements for the conservation of nature and the redressing of the balance of nature which has been grievously upset are not impractically idealistic. These movements plead for saner, more practical measures to translate oft-repeated statements of goodwill into actions in time to save the earth and our species—the affluent members no less than the poor.

The worldwide movement for conservation is working against great odds, facing criticism and sometimes ridicule. Its influence grows, but not sufficiently. This is what makes the World Conservation Strategy important, and its message so urgent. Remedies for the world's environmental problems are known, but there is an immediate need, as the strategy suggests, for international co-operation, for a 'joint effort by many minds and organisations throughout the world', to put the remedies to work.

We must enable the earth to renew itself. We must aim to improve the material, intellectual and spiritual circumstances of peoples. And we must nurture the values which enhance human possibilities. Our ancients believed in the unity of all living things, and even of life and non-life. We must rediscover this sense of identity with and responsibility for fellow humans, other species and future generations.

It would be well for many people to learn and to live out the sentiments expressed in that foreword. The World Conservation Strategy outlines solutions to the perceived problems. One of its main recommendations concerns the preparation of national strategies. The purpose of the National Conservation Strategy for Australia (I shall refer to this as the 'NCSA') is to provide nationally agreed guidelines for the use of living resources by people living in Australia so that the reasonable needs and the aspirations of people can be sustained in perpetuity.

The NCSA, like the World Conservation Strategy, seeks to ensure an important balance between development and conservation and follows the World Conservation Strategy as it concentrates on living resources. As such, it can be seen as the first step in developing a framework for conservation in this country. If it is to be fully effective and really

work for conservation, NCSA will need to be complemented by other strategies on such subjects as energy, population and national development, and by strategies at State and regional levels. The preparation of the NCSA was initiated by the Federal Government in 1980 and strongly supported by the then Prime Minister (Malcolm Fraser), as it is by the current Prime Minister. It has been undertaken jointly by Governments, industry, and conservation and other groups following widespread consultation.

I believe that the consultation process followed is an example that Governments generally could follow, because there has been a wide opportunity for people to contribute to the preparation of this work. After the launching of the World Conservation Strategy, the Commonwealth, all States and the Northern Territory agreed to co-operate in developing a national conservation strategy. At that time four groups were established: first, the National Steering Committee comprising representatives from the Commonwealth, States and the Northern Territory; secondly, a consultative group of eight members equally representing industry and conservation interests to advise the National Steering Committee; thirdly, a Commonwealth Co-ordination Committee with representatives from the relevant Commonwealth departments and agencies; and, fourthly, the National Conservation Strategy Task Force within the Commonwealth Department of Home Affairs and Environment to help develop the strategy within the guidelines set down by the National Steering Committee.

An NCSA seminar held in December 1981 was attended by about 200 people, representing a broad cross-section of the Australian community. They debated and discussed in workshops and in plenary sessions a series of specially prepared papers relating to this country's living resources and how those resources are affected by various activities and policies. As a result of that seminar, a discussion paper, entitled *Towards the National Conservation Strategy*, was released in May 1982 for public comment. Well over 500 public submissions were received from organisations, both public and private groups and individuals, and in the light of those comments a conference draft on the strategy was prepared and made available publicly towards the end of 1982.

In June 1983, the national conference, comprising over 150 delegates, met again, and it is worth realising that a large group of people came together on each occasion to discuss and debate matters so vital to the preparation of the document. At that conference, which again represented Governments, industry, conservation and other community interests, it is pleasing to note that 50 observers also attended. They all considered and amended the draft strategy. Under the guidance of the conference Chairman, Sir Rupert Myers, consensus was achieved on all but a few items. I understand that on some occasions debate became quite heated because there were various interest groups that wanted to push their point of view. But major progress was made in reconciling conservation and development views.

A number of reasons were advanced in favour of the implementation of a national conservation strategy. I would like to refer to some of those in detail but time does not permit me to do so. Very broadly, these reasons go a long way in pointing out the deterioration of soil and water quality and the endangering or increasing scarcity of native species of plants and animals through inappropriate land use or management practices. However, consensus was reached on the essential elements of an NCSA. These are:

- (a) two definitions: of development and living resource conservation;
- (b) four objectives of living resource conservation;
- (c) five principles: integrating conservation and development, retaining options for future use, focusing on

causes as well as symptoms, accumulating knowledge for future application, and educating the community;

- (d) 12 priority national requirements; and
- (e) 60 priority national actions which expand on the above principles and requirements and identify more specific measures for achieving NCSA objectives.

Echoing the recognition of the World Conservation Strategy that living resource conservation and sustainable development are interdependent, the World Conservation Strategy definitions of conservation and development were adopted for the NCSA. I believe they are sufficiently important to warrant outlining them in full, as follows:

Conservation is the management of human use of the biosphere so that it may yield the greatest sustainable benefit to present generations while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations. Thus conservation is positive, embracing preservation, maintenance, sustainable utilisation, restoration, and enhancement of the natural environment. Living resource conservation is specifically concerned with plants, animals and micro-organisms, and with those non-living elements of the environment on which they depend. Living resources have two important properties the combination of which distinguishes them from non-living resources: they are renewable if conserved and they are destructible if not.

Development is the modification of the biosphere and the application of human, financial, living and non-living resources to satisfy human needs and improve the quality of human life. For development to be sustainable it must take account of social and ecological factors, as well as economic ones; of the living and non-living resource base; and of the long term as well as the short term advantages and disadvantages of alternative actions.

The National Conservation Strategy of Australia sets out four main objectives of living resource conservation in Australia, the first three of which were adopted from the World Conservation Strategy. They are:

- (a) to maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems (such as soil regeneration and protection, the recycling of nutrients, and the cleansing of waters), on which human survival and development depend;
 - (b) to preserve genetic diversity (the range of genetic material found in the world's organisms), on which depend the breeding programmes necessary for the protection and improvement of cultivated plants and domesticated animals, as well as much scientific advance, technical innovation, and the security of the many industries that use living resources;
 - (c) to ensure the sustainable utilisation of species and ecosystems (notably fish and other wildlife, forests and grazing land), which support millions of rural communities as well as major industries;
- and
- (d) to maintain and enhance environmental qualities which make the earth a pleasant place to live in and which meet aesthetic and recreational needs.

The National Conservation Strategy of Australia acknowledges the role of development which I believe is and which is seen to be very important in achieving these objectives, and it emphasises that:

Conservation and development are fundamentally linked by their dependence on living resources. Both conservation and sustainable development require an attitude of stewardship, especially towards those plants, animals and micro-organisms and the non-living resources on which they depend that could be destroyed if only short term human interests are pursued. To provide for today's needs as well as to conserve the stock of living resources for tomorrow, both conservation and development are necessary.

Each one of those is so very significant, and in themselves such important statements. In considering the resource use role of development, the NCSA document emphasises that it is important for the implementation of the strategy for there to be regard for the general economic climate as well as for social, cultural and other relevant goals, and a proper accounting of the costs and benefits to society—again so very important.

As the Minister indicated earlier, an interim consultative committee (the formation of which was recommended by the June 1983 conference) was established last year with the concurrence of the present Prime Minister, the State Premiers and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory.

The committee has a total membership of 22 and has representatives of all State Governments and the Northern Territory Government as well as representatives of business, industry, research, education, conservation and other community groups. It is worth noting the names of those representatives on the interim consultative committee and their occupations. In alphabetical order they are as follows:

Ms Elizabeth Bourne, Queensland Conservation Council.

Mr Murray Elliott, Conservation Commission of the Northern Territory.

Mr Peter Faircloth, Department of Industrial Development, Tasmania.

Ms Ann Forward, ACTU.

Mr Doug Hill, Australian Conservation Foundation.

Mr Keith Jennings, Institute of Foresters of Australia.

Mr Don Johnstone, National Parks and Wildlife Service of N.S.W.

Dr Russell Linke, Australian Association for Environmental Education.

Mr George Littlewood, Business Council of Australia/Australian Mining Industry Council.

Mr Patrick Malone, National Aboriginal Conference.

Cr Jim Mooney, Australian Council of Local Government Associations.

Dr Maurice Mulcahy, Department of Conservation and Environment, Western Australia.

Mr Malcolm Overland, Confederation of Australian Industry.

Mr Vic Parkinson, Australian Council of National Trusts.

Mr Ted Phipps, Department of the Environment and Planning, South Australia.

Mr Syd Schubert, Premier's Department, Queensland.

Professor Peter Scott, CSIRO Advisory Council.

Mr Vincent Serventy, World Wildlife Fund Australia.

Mr Ken Thompson, Commonwealth Department of Home Affairs and Environment.

Mr John Whitelaw, National Farmers Federation.

Mr David Yencken, Ministry for Planning and Environment, Victoria.

I have referred to those people and to the organisations that they represent because I want to make quite clear to the House that wide representation was sought on the interim consultative committee. A great deal of expertise was forthcoming as a result of the formation of that committee. The committee's function, of course, is to advise the Federal Minister on measures that can be taken to promote, endorse and monitor the NCSA as proposed by the national conference held in June 1983.

I refer to some of the comments that have been made by people in high places who had different responsibilities in the preparation of the NCSA. Sir Rupert Myers, as I mentioned earlier, was the conference Chairman (I should have said, when referring to those names, that he was the Chairman). Statements by him are referred to, as follows, in a description of the strategies produced by the conference in June:

... 'momentous, memorable and unique in the history of this country'. Sir Rupert said that throughout the conference he had been highly encouraged by the feeling of a groundswell of co-operation among the delegates from four areas involved—governments, industry, conservationists and other interested groups from all States and Territories. 'The document is one of great significance,' he said. 'Australia can be proud of it.' There were, of course, a few items considered to be important by one or other of the groups, that could not be included because consensus was not reached on them but, notwithstanding this, major progress has been made in reconciling conservation and development views.

I also refer to comments made by the Governor-General of Australia, His Excellency Right Honourable Sir Ninian Stephen, in an official address he gave, saying that he—

... saw the emergence of a consensus on the strategy as lending momentum and direction to the consultative process, at the same time heightening public awareness of the responsibility we all share for preserving the Australian environment for future generations, not just of people but of all fauna and flora.

The report to which I refer continues:

His Excellency spoke also of changing views in the community, which was in the course of modifying age-old habits. 'We begin for the first time to look upon flora and fauna about us as not just objects to be used to satisfy man's needs but as elements of life on earth, whose survival is essential to our survival and whose well-being and preservation is vital to our own,' he said.

Many others have made outstanding statements in regard to this strategy, but I have not time to refer to those this afternoon. We would all appreciate in this House that many of the day to day responsibilities for environmental matters rest with State Parliaments and State and Territory Governments. All States and the Northern Territory have now indicated recognition of the usefulness of the principle and strategic objectives of the NCSA, as the Minister said earlier.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think Queensland is against it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am informed that it is all States, but I am not quite sure.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I hope you're right.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I hope I am right, too. I am led to believe that all States have recognised it. Of course, it goes further than State and Federal Governments. The Australian Council of Local Government Associations, I understand, has discussed the endorsement of the NCSA at its national conference. The National Farmers Federation has indicated a general acceptance of the strategy's major points by its member organisations. The Australian Mining Industry Council, the Business Council of Australia and the Confederation of Australian Industry have shown support for the NCSA's emphasis on the interdependence of conservation and development and generally favour the promotion of the strategy's underlying concepts. The Institute of Foresters of Australia intends considering the strategy (I think it has now probably considered it at its meeting in December last year). The Australian Council of National Trusts has also looked at the principles and intends to incorporate those principles in its policies and programmes. Of course, we can go on. Various conservation organisations and many other organisations have endorsed the NCSA or are actively promoting its objectives.

With so many of the different interest groups having been brought together successfully it is very important that the impetus be maintained, that the community be informed and involved and that governments be advised and encouraged to act positively, and I am sure that that is happening. I was delighted only this morning to receive a promotional document prepared by the National Parks Foundation of South Australia Incorporated—a magnificent document, admittedly seeking funds and assistance from the people of South Australia to facilitate in so many ways the management and promotion of the national parks that have so much potential in South Australia. The document is very well prepared and indicates very clearly just how much we have to offer in South Australia in regard to national parks, which are of course only a part of the overall conservation of this State and this country.

Having said all that, I ask where we go from here and what role individuals can play, because we realise that action by governments and other organisations is only part of the story: the people themselves must also have an active role. We can all help by reading the strategy, by discussing it with other people, explaining the importance of development in line with sound conservation principles, and by taking responsibility for our actions and recognising how they affect the environment. It is not just good enough for us to

consider the environment only on World Environment Day or on any other particular occasion. The conservation ethic is and should be an integral part of our thinking, planning and doing. I certainly support the opportunity that has been provided in debating this strategy, and I formally move that the motion be amended as follows:

Leave out 'take note of' and insert 'endorse'.

I do not think it is important for me to explain the reasons why I want to see those words changed. At its very first meeting the Interim Consultative Committee decided that there was an urgent need to obtain the endorsement (not just a matter of noting it) of the NCSA at the Premier's Conference held last year. Members felt that, for major progress to be made both in achieving widespread community acceptance of the NCSA and in the successful implementation of the 60 priority national actions identified in the strategy, a highly visible lead must be given by governments.

In other words, governments and Parliaments must be prepared to endorse it as an embracing agreement with the objective and strategic principles of the conference document and a commitment to implement the priority national actions in co-operation with development and conservation interests, taking account of Australia's Federal, constitutional, legislative and administrative framework and the general economic climate. Now that we have the conservation strategy completed and tabled before this House today it is vitally important that the Parliament not only note it but strongly endorse this document.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I support the concept of a conservation strategy, which is important to a country as vast as Australia. It is especially important for Australia, reputed to be the driest continent in the world, in the sense that anything done to the country can have long and lasting effects. I wish to talk about some of the problems we have in our community which can be dealt with by a conservation strategy, and this involves all the people in the community. We are all very familiar with the sand drift on our metropolitan beaches for which many people have proposed remedies. In the past, the sand dunes that have been built up over a long period have unwisely been removed. Houses and business premises have been built up to the waterline, and consequently whenever there is a storm buildings are threatened. The State is then required to spend large sums of money reinstating those buildings and public structures.

We currently have a programme of removing sand from the North Haven, Largs Bay and Semaphore areas and transporting it to the Marino, Seacliff and Brighton areas to replenish the beaches there where erosion has removed sand, which has shifted to the more northern part of the gulf. It is a costly process and, if early in our settlement the people who had been responsible for planning had ensured that residences and businesses had been kept some distance from the beach, the sand dunes would have remained. That is not an isolated example. We are fortunate in South Australia. We have yet to incur the terrible cost that has been experienced on the Gold Coast where development has taken place and millions of dollars worth of buildings have been erected right on the waterfront and where, every time there is a storm, many structures come close to tumbling into the sea—and in time probably will do so.

The problem is not isolated in Australia. I have read a report on studies throughout the world which showed 24 areas where this sand reduction is taking place, sand addition occurring only in one place. It seems that the scientists and geologists are not clear as to why this is happening.

If in future developments we were to ensure that the structures to be built are located back from the sand dunes,

we would not be bothered with the expense of carting sand and reinstating buildings as a result of storm damage. At the same time, it may create problems for people who want to build right on the waterfront, but we need to balance the needs of some people—a very limited few—against the needs of the whole community. Since white man arrived in South Australia almost 150 years ago, there has been much development (or what we choose to call development) in our State which has meant that land has been cleared, buildings have been erected and farms and mines established, as well as a whole number of other developments, to build up the community infrastructure. In many cases care has not been taken with such activities, and I wish to refer to some of them.

I have already talked about our metropolitan beaches, and we have seen what has happened there. One of the most valuable assets we have in South Australia is our land. Members opposite keep telling us how that land produces most of our exports, whether it be livestock, primary production in the form of meat, wool or wheat, or whether it be minerals. In fact, land does not simply belong to one or two people or a select few, but rather to the whole of Australia. It is how we use or abuse that land that will determine what sort of country we leave behind us. We have a responsibility as citizens of this State—whether as members of this House, people in business, farmers or simply residents—to ensure that our activities do not degrade that land.

There have been some unfortunate incidents in the past where people have not taken much notice of some of our earlier pioneers. The best example of that is Goyder, when he set out his line and suggested to people who attempted to farm beyond that line that they would not be able to do so. At the time he made those suggestions the areas of land immediately adjacent to that line and north of it were experiencing good rainfall and producing quite good crops.

I have seen claypans in our north that at one time were fertile wheat producing paddocks. It was not until the dry weather arrived, or the rain did not come, that the wind storms that followed blew away all the top soil that had been created by clearing the land for growing wheat. My understanding is that Goyder developed the theory of his line on the basis of comparing plant life. The natural plants change dramatically at around the line he drew. It was by making that observation that he was able to decide that line. Today he is looked upon as a pioneer, but unfortunately years ago a number of people did not bother to take any notice of him.

It is hoped that a conservation strategy like the one referred to today will ensure that the mistakes made will not be repeated. We have a problem with irrigation, which is looked upon as abusing water to produce food but something that we need to do. In advocating and providing irrigation, we have to be very careful that we do not further degrade that land. We have seen problems arise since we have had irrigation in the Riverland. The leaching of sodium chloride out of the soil through irrigation and the removal of water has seen salinity rise in bore holes, and has meant in some areas that the land has become unproductive and has, in fact, been poisoned. We should take such action as to ensure that those things do not occur. As a Government and people in business, we should be very firm that proposals affecting a certain area do not proceed until such time as it can be shown beyond doubt that they will not cause further damage to the environment. We are yet to get an agreement on the Murray River salinity problem. In South Australia it is important to us, as salinity can affect our lifestyle.

We have also seen along the Murray River the destruction of our wet lands and the river gums that grow along the banks because of the construction of the locks. They had

to be built so that water could be retained in the river and so that vessels can move up and down the Murray in the dry season. They also facilitate the activities of people in the irrigation business. One needs to weigh up, on the one hand, the damage caused by the building of those locks and the need to supply water with, on the other hand, the benefits that come from the irrigated crops.

I think that we need to err sometimes on the side of caution because, if we are not careful, we can remove all the natural habitat in certain areas and completely destroy it. If we are not careful in how we use the land we will experience excessive soil erosion. That can be created by over-cropping, over-stocking or unsuitable land being used for purposes which are not really economic and which are not useful for excessive clearing. I suppose that the final approach to this is proper farming practice. One needs only one decent blow, if the farming practice is not proper, for the fertile topsoil to disappear in the wind and it could take three, four or five years of good farm work, of humus being built up in that soil, before it can get back to the original state.

It illustrates that, if one is not careful, one can destroy the whole viability of certain farming areas and it needs to be remembered that that will not always be there. I am of the view that perhaps there should be some stricter controls on this. I know from personal experience of some remarkable sand drifts that were stabilised by one farmer by planting the recommended seed in the sand drift that needed to be stabilised for three or four years before he put stock on it, and he could have gone back to restocking that paddock, but he could not wait. The grass got up to about 18 inches, he could not wait, he put the cattle in and in no time at all the sand drift was away again. I am of the view that the State should be a little tougher on some of those people because our country depends on the viability of the land, and it cannot be viable if the wind is blowing it about. A strategy such as the one proposed here, properly implemented, would ensure that those things would not happen.

We have another problem with bore water. One of the common things with bore water is that people on the land seem to think that they have the right to put holes in the ground and extract any amount of water. If we are to do that we need to ensure that the water we take out of the ground is replaced by the water that gets in there naturally, and if we are going to take more water out we need to be aware of the consequences. One is that it costs more energy to get the water out: therefore, it costs more. There is the prospect of saline water intruding into the water aquifers being used and we could finish up with the problems that occurred in America, where they had land subsidence of up to nine inches because of over-extraction of water.

That is a resource which can be removed and which is no longer there and useful, and that is why there needs to be proper conservation of our ground water supply. Another problem which we experience in our country and which is addressed in this policy is introduced fauna and flora. One needs to think only of rabbits, sparrows, starlings, foxes, cats and the damage that they have done.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: I have never thought that the cousins who have come from England have caused too much damage here at all, but the honourable member may think they have. These feral animals have had a colossal effect on the native habitats of our country. The cats and the foxes have removed and competed with their Australian counterparts. The rabbit has competed with the grass-eating animals and caused colossal damage.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Do you think that they have done more damage than the wallabies and kangaroos?

Mr GREGORY: I think that that would be quite true. A problem that we have also got with feral animals is that in a number of areas, but two in particular, they can have profound effects on the farming community. I refer to the buffaloes in the Northern Territory and the feral pigs that seem to cause a problem in New South Wales. I understand that there is a programme to fence the Northern Territory to eradicate the buffaloes, and it is being done for a number of reasons. One is that if by accident foot and mouth disease happened to get into the Northern Territory our agricultural industry would be in for one hell of a shock because it will mean that a lot of our livestock products will not be able to be sold on the world market. There will have to be wholesale destruction to eradicate the disease.

The other problem with the water buffalo is that they have been destroying the natural habitat of the Northern Territory, particularly the wet areas, and I am quite sure that this programme, properly implemented, will eradicate the buffalo except in the areas where they would be actually grazed and farmed, just as one does with cattle. It has been said by some people that to do that is impossible. I do not believe that it is. I believe that our primary industry is a very valuable industry and its export is also very valuable, and one needs to protect that just as we are protecting it by eradicating brucellosis and TB from the cattle herds. It has been said that it cannot be done, but it is gradually being done and it is being done in South Australia.

However, we also have a problem that comes with introduced flora, and some of us will recall reading about the introduction of blackberry smut in Victoria. It is obvious that someone has sent from Europe or had sent to them some blackberry smut infected leaves and have in Victoria deliberately gone along and put the spores of the smut on the blackberries. I suppose that that action was born out of the frustration of people who are cursed by blackberries and the slow work of the CSRIO in introducing a biological control for blackberries. One of the problems is that there are over 50 varieties of cane berry fruits which are useful and which are grown for use in Australia, and the CSIRO was using its research to ensure that any biological control that was introduced would not also harm those 50 varieties of cane fruits. To date there seems to be no damage to those other cane fruits.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: So you support the principle of biological control?

Mr GREGORY: Yes.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What about salvation jane, which is also a pest?

Mr GREGORY: I will get around to that. I think that when we talk about flora which has been introduced and which creates obvious problems one only has to look at the biological control of prickly pear. I see these plants growing in South Australia at varying places. I occasionally see their fruit for sale in the market at reasonable prices. I have yet to eat one, but I have been told that when they are ripe they are quite enjoyable. However, one of the things I find very hard to believe is that the plant covered vast areas of Queensland and the farming community, by natural means of chopping or removing, could not remove these things. Biological control removed the prickly pear from Queensland and I am a great believer that if we introduce flora into our country we should eradicate it.

The member for Alexandra was asking me about the biological control of salvation jane. Personally, I would like to see salvation jane biologically controlled. I know that the apiarists would not be too keen on it, because it produces a very white, clear, sweet-tasting honey; better than some other honey that I have had from the Murray Mallee which is not as good as that. What is the effect of it? It may save somebody's sheep from time to time but it also causes prob-

lems in animals and stops other grasses from growing. It is an introduced species that should be biologically controlled. This would allow more animals to be grazed and horses would not have to be destroyed because of the problems associated with it.

When we talk about the conservation strategy we need to look at other aspects. One of the problems in our secondary industry is that it produces by-products which can be poisonous to the community. People have dumped toxic wastes indiscriminately, without proper control, into the Love Canal in New York and those toxic wastes have leached through the soil into the canal until there is a poisonous cocktail, as one research worker said. Nothing grows in that canal and there have been reports on rivers and canals where at one time there were fish and aquatic plant life and now there is nothing; there is only a clear or coloured waterway because of the impurities and toxic wastes.

Closer to home, we have the Wingfield dump, which I joke about as being called Mount Wingfield because of the elevation of the area. The weight of waste products built up over a period of time places pressure on the soil and the leaching from the waste can reach the aquifers and finish up in the Angas Inlet. It is possible that that could happen and, indeed, work has been done to show that it is happening. Conservation is not only about not knocking down trees or old buildings; conservation is also about ensuring that we do not place in the ground things that can become poisonous and difficult to eradicate.

It is very important to ensure that we have vegetation retention. It is all right to talk about ensuring that species of birds and small mammals are able to survive, but they cannot do so unless their natural habitat is preserved, and that is called vegetation retention. When we look at the farming community, particularly our more closely settled areas, we see that there has been very little vegetation retention and the only natural trees are those few remaining on the roadsides and occasionally in the paddocks in the farming community in the Mid North and on Yorke Peninsula. We are also seeing in other parts of our State the death of trees because they are singular in their own paddocks and natural pests and enemies (insects and diseases) are destroying them. The defence of our natural flora is in being together because, when they are close, the pests that live on them and eat them are also destroyed and controlled by pests which in turn eat them. If we build up a native garden we can find after a while that certain insects no longer appear, even if we have plants which they naturally attack, because with those plants come birds and insects that will live on the pests.

I have seen this demonstrated by Vern McLaren at Kingston. He has a fairly firm commitment to conservation in our country. I notice with some pleasure that he was one of the participants in this conference and, frankly, a conference such as this in Australia could not leave him out. He made a very conscious decision when he was clearing land at Kingston to retain a sizable portion of it. It was about 900 acres and he has fenced it off and is proud of it. I have been there with him on a number of occasions and one of the most pleasurable experiences I have ever had was sitting down with him watching a Mallee fowl working a mound. The only time I have seen him angry was when he was talking about some people who had four wheel drive vehicles who wanted to know they could drive their vehicles through his scrub because they had heard about it and wanted to bash it down for him. I think this was the only time he thought about visiting violence on people.

If it had not been for him, there may not be the remains of the Jaffa Lighthouse at Kingston. Because of his drive and enthusiasm and the time he is prepared to spend, it is there now. He has over a long period of time been an

adviser to all Governments in this State because he is respected for his views. I would like to think and hope that a lot of other members in the farming community would take a leaf out of his book and retain more vegetation, because he has assured me that the amount of vegetation he has retained on his property has meant that his farm has remained viable, that he has had less damage done to it by pests, that he has been able to control what has happened there, and that it has been less expensive to run. That is his view, and anybody who knows him would know he runs a very credible and viable grazing property in the South-East.

As I said, I support our national conservation strategy because if we do not carry it out we are going to turn our country into another desert; it may be a desert not of drifting sands but of areas where people will not go. In all aspects of our community life we need to ensure that the interests of people are balanced against those of our country and if we allow the interests of our people to override those of our country, we are going to leave a desert to the people who follow.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the motion and the amendment, which has a different and stronger meaning and which I am glad the Minister proposes to support rather than merely noting the strategy. I read the document with very great interest and it will come as no surprise to members of the House to know that I read it with a very close eye to the relationship of conservation of our environment and heritage to the goals of the tourism industry. I was particularly pleased to see that the very first words of the strategy read:

Development and conservation are but different expressions of the one process.

That statement must be enormously heartening to those who wish to see the beauty and the resources of our country conserved and also to those who recognise the statement which is contained in paragraph 3 of the introduction, which states:

Growth in economic activity for the enhancement of the quality of human life and in particular the generation of employment can be obtained without continuous growth in the use of resources by the more appropriate use of these resources.

Having read the whole document, and having heard some of the criticisms from people who describe it as a fairly simplistic set of guidelines, I ask those people to imagine being confronted with the problem of developing a national strategy, to imagine starting from scratch, which is in effect what the conference group which prepared this document did. Then consider what has been done in terms of the agreement reached in regard to goals and strategies, and this national conservation strategy document has to be regarded as most important and a triumph for discussion, consultation and agreement between people who do not always have the same ideas but who recognise that they are approaching the same goal from a different perspective.

The document notes that national conservation strategy cannot be a static thing: it must be dynamic and should be reviewed and modified from time to time to take into account changing circumstances, new knowledge and emerging community attitudes. We have only to consider the strength of feeling in the community today and the changing social, economic and cultural attitudes of Australia to recognise that it would probably not have been possible 10, or certainly 20, years ago to put together a document like this and that it will also be necessary in the future to regularly update it.

The document makes the point that Australia is the driest inhabited continent in the world. Not only is it the driest inhabited continent: it is also, I suggest, the continent that

is most subjected to extremes of climate. In the words of the old bush ballad, it is a country where 'The creeks run dry or loft feet high and it is either drought or plenty'. Australia as a nation has had to cope with this extraordinary conflict between droughts and plenty and to adapt its industries and in some cases, particularly in the case of those who live outside cities, its lifestyle to make sure that we can endure and where necessary conquer these difficulties.

The strategy refers to the fact that many Australian plants and animals are endangered and some species have become extinct: others have increased in numbers to nuisance levels. The habitats of many species have either been destroyed or are severely affected by human activities and by introduced animals and plants; some fisheries stocks are declining because of overharvesting and changes to the aquatic environment. The strategy also states:

Conservation and development are fundamentally linked by their dependence on living resources. Both conservation and sustainable development require an attitude of stewardship, especially towards those plants, animals and micro-organisms and the non-living resources on which they depend that could be destroyed if only short term human interests are pursued. To provide for today's needs as well as to conserve the stock of living resources for tomorrow, both conservation and development are necessary.

The perspective from which I would like to examine the strategy is that of the tourism industry and the goals of tourism. The reason that I see an extraordinarily close interlinking between the goals of tourism and the need of people for recreation in the true meaning of the word, recreation, and refreshment is very much linked to the fact that Australia is largely an urbanised community; that means that when people seek holidays and recreation they tend to go outside cities and more and more are yearning for the refreshment that comes from immediate personal contact with the natural environment. In his book *Man and the Murray*, Peter Davis, in the final chapter headed 'Australians Live in Cities', examines this great need of modern day people to be close to nature. Referring to the work of Professor Stephen Boyden, biologist of the Australian National University, he states:

The crux of Stephen Boyden's thesis is that although our culture can change rapidly our genetic inheritance changes very much more slowly; that although in the period of about 10 000 years we have radically transformed our lifestyle and environment from that of hunter-gatherer in a natural landscape to technological man living in a city, each one of us still inherits pretty much unchanged the genetic programming of primeval man. There has simply not yet been time enough for the biological processes of evolution and natural selection to operate so that the human species can become well adapted to the transformed environment of the city.

He also states:

If we are to help and know ourselves, we must, at least occasionally, have access to that unspoiled natural environment of river and forest, of mountain and plain in which our species evolved and in which we individually have our roots.

That says as well as anyone could say that it is essential to our survival that natural environments be conserved, if not only for our physical survival also for our emotional and spiritual survival. The need for people to get away from cities is becoming so marked: the emergence of adventure holidays and the great popularity of camping and caravanning in remote regions of the State are testimony to that fact.

Mr Lewis: What about window boxes?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, indeed. As the member for Mallee says, even a pot of geraniums in the city can bring a sense of oneness with nature. It helps life in the city for many people to become not so much more bearable, but very much more pleasant. In the *Review of Tourism of South Australia* which was conducted by Rob Tonge and Associates in 1980 under the Liberal Government some points were made which are very much related to the national conservation strategy document. On page 17 of the review it is stated:

The State of South Australia has the advantage of a general lack of exploitation and over-exposure and a refreshing, natural charm as yet unspoilt by the deprivations of unimaginative, unskilled and unscrupulous developers. The environment is, by and large, healthy and pleasing. Offence to the eyes, ears, and senses is as yet minimal.

There is a potential wealth of varied and subtle attractions the discriminating visitor to South Australia which can be shared with the high volume of intrastate tourists. There is an understated but unique beauty to its coastline and hills and continual reminder of much of the history of South Australia.

Still commenting on South Australia's tourism product and the reasons why the State at that time, and indeed still had not begun to realise the tourist potential, the report states two of the reasons why the potential has not yet achieved. It states:

The often 'dilettante' approach to the preservation and presentation of historical buildings, sites and industrial archaeology. The 'precious' nature of some conservation authorities and the lack of considered planning for the reception and enlightenment of visitors.

I was made very much more aware of this lack of consideration for the reception and enlightenment of visitors during the recent phone-in that I conducted. So many people said, 'If only there was more information available for us in national parks. If only historic sites were well documented or better documented.' Certainly, I give credit to the previous Administrations and to the present one for their efforts to improve information services, but the reality is that we have a long way to go. It has always been my view that the modern conservation movement has grown out of tourism itself. It is when people visit places of unique natural beauty that they become captivated and become committed and, in effect, turn into conservationists.

I fear, however, that many of them fail to recognise the fact that they originally became committed simply as visitors and they tend to adopt, as the Tonge report describes it, rather precious approach to other people, a 'Keep out', 'Hands off', and 'Don't touch' approach to the environment. That negative approach must be turned around to ensure that, although access to fragile areas is controlled, at all times people should be encouraged to see and experience more and, in doing so, to learn more about the natural environment. After a visit to Marineland one mother rang me and said, 'I don't want my children just to see someone throw a bucket of fish at penguins.' I want them to be told why a penguin eats fish, what is the nature of the penguin, how it develops, and where its habitat is.'

The presentation of flora, fauna and the environment itself is so extremely important to the enhancement of the visitor experience and to the foundation on which we base our future attitudes to nature itself that the more we can do to inform and enlighten people about the environment the more they will gain joy from being within it and the more responsibly they will treat it.

In South Australia we have an extraordinary range of beauty to enjoy. The coastline of this State is unlike that of any other in Australia, mainly because of the existence of the three principal peninsulas. We have the Murray River and its associated wet lands; the Coorong; the Flinders Ranges and their magnificent gorges; the arid land and the salt lakes; the desert; the coastal dunes and the beaches; the fossils; the caves; the lakes and lagoons; and the geology of our coastline. Indeed, many South Australians would not be aware that the geological structures on the eastern side of Gulf St Vincent, from Port Wakefield south to Cape Jervis and beyond to the Murray mouth, contain virtually every example of geological structure known to man. That in itself is an enormous asset to our State. The vegetation, the natural bushland, the flora and fauna: we have so much, yet we take so much of it for granted.

The experience that perhaps brought home to me more than any other the effect of the natural environment on individuals when visiting from another locality occurred when I was on the Barrier Reef some years ago. I was lying face down on the beach, enjoying the sun and dreaming of nothing when I heard a voice not far from me. A young man flopped on to the beach next to his friend and in a voice absolutely vibrant with emotion said, in an English accent, 'This has been the most wonderful day of my life. I have been swimming over the reef. It is like fairyland. I never thought anything so beautiful could exist.' It was easy to see that he had been so stirred by the beauty of the reef that it would affect him for the rest of his life, just as some of us, during the summer holidays to which most South Australians are accustomed, will look at the sea and gain refreshment, will walk through a pine forest and experience a peace that it is impossible to experience in the city, or will camp under the stars in the outback and realise that we are part of something much bigger than humankind, a part of the whole scheme of nature. The national conservation strategy is designed to ensure that that recognition is translated into practical action. Paragraph 10 of the introduction to the strategy states:

Consideration of the strategy and its implementation will take place within Australia's Federal, Constitutional, legislative and administrative framework. In addition, the implementation of NCSA recommendations should have regard for social, economic, cultural and other relevant goals.

Every elected member should note those words with care. The respective roles of the Commonwealth, the States and local government bodies, in terms of the implementation of the strategy, are extremely important. Arguments, debates, recrimination and fights over who is responsible for what can only slow down and, worse still, endanger the implementation of the strategy. I am becoming more and more conscious of the roles of the State Governments and local government in the preservation of the environment, both the built and the natural environment, and I firmly believe that much more education, which need not be dull but which can be presented in the form of entertainment, especially in the tourism sense, is required if Australians are to honour their obligations under this strategy.

Nevertheless, I believe that the genuine goodwill is there, and that belief was very much reinforced in my mind as a result of the tourism phone-in that I conducted. If Governments respond to that, we can look forward to the implementation of the strategy in a co-operative and positive spirit. I support the motion.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I support the motion. The origins of the National Conservation Strategy go back to the launching, in March 1980 by the then Prime Minister, of the World Conservation Strategy, which showed that over-exploitation of resources, loss of genetic density, and damage to ecological processes and life support systems, dangerously reduce the earth's capacity to support its people. The World Conservation Strategy sought a new partnership between conservation and development to meet human needs now without jeopardising the future. It called on each country to prepare a national conservation strategy tailored to its own problems and characteristic cultural and economic conditions.

The history of the development of an Australian national conservation strategy has been adequately covered by previous speakers and I therefore do not intend to cover the history of the development of this strategy in Australia. However, I shall refer to some of the objectives of the strategy and the principles, goals and priority national actions. The strategy has four main objectives. The first is to maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems such

as soil regeneration and protection, the recycling of nutrients, and the cleansing of waters on which human survival and development depend. Secondly, the strategy aims to preserve genetic diversity: that is the range of genetic materials found in the world's organisms on which depends the breeding programmes so necessary for the protection and improvement of cultivated plants and domestic animals, as well as scientific advances, technical innovation and the securing of many industries that use living resources.

The third objective of the strategy is to ensure the sustainable utilisation of species and eco-systems, notably fish and other wild life, forests and grazing land which support millions of rural communities as well as major industries. That aspect has been amply covered by my colleague the member for Florey.

The fourth objective is to maintain and enhance environmental qualities which make the earth a pleasant place on which to live and which meet aesthetic and recreational needs. These objectives do not change in character or cease to be important at State borders. They are national in scope, and it is in the national interest that they be achieved throughout the country. The nation as a whole, as well as the individual States and Territories, stands to benefit as a result. The National Conservation Strategy Conference, having reached a consensus on a strategy recommended its adoption and implementation by the Commonwealth and State Grants, as well as local government and other organisations and individuals concerned with the development and conservation of Australia's living resources.

Throughout the process of the strategy's formulation the aim was to present a strategy which could form the basis of Government action. The South Australian Government was the first Government in Australia to announce its endorsement of the national conservation strategy for Australia. Other Governments have since followed this action. The South Australian Government's endorsement of the national strategy signifies its agreement with its objectives and the related strategic principles.

The principles of the strategy have a vital role to play in meeting the aim of all Governments to achieve a high standard of living and quality of life for all Australian citizens. The formulation of the strategy is certainly among the most significant events in the history of the environmental management of Australia, and previous speakers have certainly supported that statement. It provides a basis for very substantial studies and for the management of the Australian environment. The strategy is entitled to be seen not as a symbol of pious hopes but rather as a concrete manifestation of a changing approach to our environment.

The achievement of environmentally sound development implies that individuals will seek to achieve balance, but only to the extent that their values guide them. The strategy can play a key role in increasing people's awareness and understanding of the concept of ecologically sustainable development. I believe that non-Government organisations have a key role to play in the promotion of this theme in order to educate the community. Unless the community can come to agreement about the nexus between economic development and the environment, then each issue will continue to be fought on its merits, and at the end of the day one side or the other may win the battle but we will be no closer to achieving a lasting peace.

If we can reach an understanding about the basic issues involved and an agreement on our objectives, which I believe this strategy does, we will have a framework for resolving any differences that exist. The strategy could be perceived as being not merely a set of idealistic principles but rather as a treaty between competing interests. Unlike previous measures that may have outlined similar things in relation to the environment, this strategy has the advantage of having

been thrashed out over a long process of interaction between the various interests.

This process of the derivation of achieving a plan between the various interests involved is most significant. Governments, businesses and conservationists can be confident that it represents an agreed position. However, I believe that the real test for Governments will be the extent to which they can internalise the provisions of the plan in the management of living resources. In this regard the South Australian Government has undertaken various measures. The Government has decided to implement the strategy through the following measures: within the past few weeks heads of departments have been advised that Cabinet submissions with significant implications for natural resources should include consideration of their compatibility with the strategy. A further key consideration concerns forward planning by departments and authorities. Departmental heads have been asked to reflect to the maximum practical extent the principles of the strategy in the forward plans of their departments.

The Parliament would be aware that the Government is taking additional significant actions in furthering the objectives of the strategy. A major programme of national park purchases is being implemented. At this point I would like to congratulate the Minister for Environment and Planning on the very key role that he has played in this aspect of implementing the strategy. An intensive programme of investigation on how best to control the impact of contaminants on the natural environment is being carried out by an inter-departmental committee. Improved co-ordination of the interaction between land use policies and water management is also occurring.

I think that no discussion of a strategy can take place in South Australia without reference to the impact that the strategy will have on the long-term future of tourism in this State. It seems to me that we are now looking much further into the future in relation to tourism being a viable long-term industry to sustain the economic development of South Australia. In considering this area, I think it is important to note the findings of the report of the working party on tourist development and management on Kangaroo Island. Environmental objectives (and this includes conservation objectives) for the future development of Kangaroo Island are set out on page 6 of the report. These are particularly significant. The objectives are:

To ensure that the growth and development of tourism is consistent with the conservation and enhancement of the Island's natural environment and character.

To preserve buildings or sites of architectural, historical, Aboriginal, archaeological or cultural significance.

To preserve vegetation and land forms of historical, scientific, or particular visual interest.

To conserve landscape and panoramic views and the wilderness qualities of the coastline.

To encourage innovative and environmentally sensitive development that has regard to the environmental qualities of the specific site in which it is to be located.

To encourage preservation and awareness of the Island's natural and cultural heritage.

Those objectives fit in extremely well with the National Conservation Strategy. The working party's report also lists several Government objectives which relate specifically to conservation. These are:

To provide agreed guidelines for the management and encouragement of tourism development consistent with the desired future character.

To recognise and balance the competing and conflicting objectives of all groups impacted by tourism.

To monitor tourism impact and implement appropriate management measures as required.

I believe that those objectives apply not only to the future development of Kangaroo Island: they are particularly relevant to the preservation of our natural heritage and to the

conservation of other significant South Australian tourist attractions, and I refer particularly to the Flinders Ranges and to their majesty and beauty, and also there is the Murray River and all aspects of it from the Riverland right down to the Coorong. I think the points that I have read out would apply just as much to those areas as they do to Kangaroo Island. The South-East, particularly the area around Mount Gambier, is also one of significant tourism potential and beauty, as indeed, too, are the magnificent coastline areas that surround South Australia.

This strategy is particularly relevant for the development of tourism for South Australia. The tourism industry is working towards implementing a tourism policy which reflects the importance of conserving and preserving the history of South Australia not only in its natural environment but also through buildings and other history such as Aboriginal history and the history of the natural environment.

In conclusion, I read the last paragraph of the Conservation Strategy for Australia, entitled 'The Future':

The success of the NCSA will depend on continuing government and public support and on establishing ways of evaluating its implementation, on ensuring that it continues to be updated and on involving the Australian community in its further development and application.

I have no doubt that the strategy deserves the bipartisan support of the members of this House and indeed of all members of this Parliament. In this State much has been achieved in resolving some of the major environmental issues and in putting our house in order. The strategy provides a framework for achieving more and we will and can achieve more.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Those responsible for the preparation of the document 'A National Conservation Strategy for Australia' certainly are to be commended. However, there is far more to the conservation needs of Australia than the preparation of the document. There needs to be absolute dedication on the part of Australians and, above all else, there needs to be absolute dedication to the cause as set out in this document by Governments, particularly State and Federal Governments. I refer to two paragraphs in the statement by the Prime Minister in the foreword:

The initiative to prepare a National Conservation Strategy for Australia has been welcomed by all political Parties. A commitment to implement, in co-operation with the States and Territories, a National Conservation Strategy to protect Australia's renewable natural resources was an important part of the Australian Labor Party 1982 platform. . .

My personal view of conservation is a pragmatic one. Renewable resources provide the basis for much of our national income today and we are relying on them to continue to do so in years to come. Unless we conserve them for sustainable development it will be our children and their children who will pay the price of our neglect.

I could not agree more with the comments of the Prime Minister. However, I would hate to think that in the statement he has made he is only paying lip service to what is contained within this document, because one must be reminded that the first thing the Prime Minister did on coming to Government was to wipe out the bi-centennial water resources programme. If we turn to page 10 of the report before us in the section 'Why a national conservation strategy?' the following comment is made:

Australia is the driest inhabited continent and the quantity, quality and location of water influences how and where development may occur. Some river systems, wetlands and underground

water resources are severely degraded. Water and soil salinity are now widespread problems.

That is spelt out quite clearly in this document, yet the first action of the present Federal Government was to completely cut off funds from the necessary work that has to be carried out to correct the very problem that is highlighted in this document.

We know that irrigation is, as the member for Florey stated, an important part of our day to day requirements. Everyone takes for granted that there will be fresh fruit and vegetables available on the table, and most of the fresh fruit and vegetables are produced under irrigation. I am the first to agree that efficient, modern irrigation systems have to be implemented and installed. Antiquated, inefficient irrigation is one of the major contributors to salinity in our river systems, but to implement modern irrigation practices to reduce that saline build-up in our river systems it is necessary that we have effective modern irrigation distribution systems that provide water to the boundary of the property of the irrigator on a full time basis so that that irrigator can effectively implement improved irrigation practices. Improved irrigation practices means that water is supplied seven days a week, 24 hours a day and that the irrigator is in a position to apply the correct amount of water per day when it is needed to replace the lost water in the soil.

In other words, the necessary water content of the soil needs to be replaced every two or three days, and with modern irrigation systems and practices that can be done. However, if the water is not readily available to the irrigator then the modern irrigation practices cannot be operated, ground water mounds will build up, and thus salination of our rivers and degradation of our forested areas will occur. Much of the damage that we see around us today has developed over the last 150 to 200 years. In fact, since European occupation of Australia from the very early days the degradation that we see around us commenced. It is very necessary, if we are serious about this problem and about conservation, that to retrieve our position from the damage that has been done a great deal of money will need to be spent by Government.

It is certainly not going to make the job any easier if Governments, on one hand, pay lip service to a document such as this, which sets out in very clear terms what needs to be done but at the same time are not prepared to provide the necessary funds so that the damage can be rectified. We find here in South Australia that most of the irrigation systems that are privately operated (and certainly private irrigation schemes have been rehabilitated) operate as efficient irrigation undertakings. The only really inefficient irrigation undertakings left in South Australia are those operated by the State Government.

Unfortunately, the State Government terminated its rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution systems in the Riverland. If Governments are serious about this document they will do something to correct the situation that they are perpetuating more so than anyone else in the community. As I said, most of the private irrigation areas have been rehabilitated: they are operating efficiently; and they have dramatically reduced the saline effects on the environment. Now it is up to the Government to show good faith and to do likewise. I only trust that the content of this document will be acknowledged and that more than lip service will be paid to it by both State and Federal Governments.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): It is hard to know where to start on an occasion like this in such a debate, but after some thought I believe that the most appropriate place would be to observe the fact that, on this occasion, we have unanimous support for the proposition before the Chamber, save for

the amendment moved by the member for Murray, which would ensure that there is no mistaking the attitude of the Chamber if the motion is passed. Since no-one spoke against it, I have no doubt that it will. The Minister himself has undertaken to second the amendment, which means that the House will be endorsing the National Conservation Strategy for Australia as a statement.

The lamentable fact is that there is not one journalist in the gallery listening to that. So often we find journalists writing about the proceedings of Parliament and the debates between politicians, focussing their attention on nothing more than the most controversial aspects of conflicting opinion. Why is it that in this instance they cannot at least take the trouble, as we are, to listen and report that we agree? They seldom report agreement on Bills where it takes merely a matter of seconds to put the measure before the Chamber, where there is no dissension about the thrust of the proposition and the Bill is passed on the voices. That is not reported. One never sees on the television news or barely ever sees a mention of it anywhere buried in the readers pages of the daily newspapers, or hardly ever finds it mentioned in any of the readers periodicals of a weekly or monthly nature. The public find that they have an impression of politicians that they are always carping at one another and disagreeing. When we agree and take the trouble to spell out our reasons for so doing, the least the journalists could do if they were being responsible is listen and report that accurately. So, I lament the fact that there appears to be nobody interested that we do agree and want to place that agreement on record and in some detail.

Having made that commencement, I proceed to address the proposition of the debate, that is, the National Conservation Strategy for Australia as contained in the document emanating from the conference held in Canberra in June 1983. I preface my remarks by referring honourable members and the general public at large to a statement made in probably the best known book in the world. I refer to verse 28, chapter 1 of Genesis in the Bible which follows the verse which records the creation of man comprising male and female. Verse 28 states:

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

I do not think that the Bible in that context means that *homo sapiens*, as one of the species in the whole of creation, ought to simply stuff up every animal that it could so that the only place we would ever find them would be standing as a taxidermist would have them—lifeless and in a museum—and having every plant equally so mounted in a botanist's collection. No, indeed, that verse charges man with the responsibility, during the course of each individual's lifetime, of taking an attitude of stewardship responsibly toward the preservation of the totality of creation, knowing that like no other creature man is supreme in terms of intelligence. That subject can be debated by people who want to impute a particular intellectual capacity to one or other species other than *homo sapiens*, but I dispute the fact that there is any other species capable of greater wisdom or folly than *homo sapiens*.

Having made that point, I refer now to the document about which I make the point as a good general statement supported by everyone in this Parliament, but one which is so vague that as a report it would enable any of us to do almost anything in the name of conservation. In some instances I find that quite undesirable. Those instances to which I refer would be best illustrated when I identify them in the context of the text of the document by passing through it. People who have, to use the words of the member for Coles, a precious attitude to the surroundings in which

they live, the scenery and the more easily seen parts of it that are living, tend to sicken me in that they ignore the total fabric of the living part of this planet of which we are a part. Funnelweb spiders are just as important as are hydrangeas or, for that matter, fir trees. They are indeed one of the species of the total spectrum.

We must not ever forget that, so the precious view of things is a sickening view if it is taken to its conclusion because such people would advocate that, where dead limbs, twigs and leaves fall as litter beneath short, unattractive mallee scrub, by comparison with the majestic, tall, straight trunks of the species to be found in higher rainfall areas, it is seen to be rubbish when, in fact, it is not. The litter under the mallee scrub is a vital part of the total eco-system in that locality as is the majestic appearance of those tall trees and the associated birds and animals in the other eco-system of the tropical rain forest or the cool temperate rain forest.

We ought not to overlook that or try to say that the twigs, leaves and dead branches need to be raked up and burned so that the place is tidy. That is ridiculous, yet those who have a precious attitude to the environment would have no hesitation about decrying anybody who left the necrotic debris wherever there is plant life beneath such plant life as leaving the place strewn with rubbish. It is regrettable, and they need to rethink their attitude.

I now refer to the booklet. In the first instance I make a plea for the kind of thing that is not often done, must be done and costs very little in this unique continent of ours. It is a harsh continent and things do not happen in regular rhythms, seasonal functions and regular fluctuations as they do in other places less prone to ambient extremes. In the opening is a picture of the Tanami Desert. You, Mr Speaker, would know as well as I know that, for the first time since the European settlement in this continent, the Tanami Desert looks very much like coastal marshes or the marshes along the Darling River after a flood. The desert is under water and has never been under water before. As a matter of urgency we ought to encourage the Commonwealth Government to set aside a few hundred thousand dollars, and get some biologists, botanists and aquatic biologists as well as other people who are experts in Australian native flora and fauna organised as teams to go into the Tanami and engage in the kind of investigation, observation, cataloguing and taxonomic surveys which can only be done at this time.

There would no doubt to my mind emerge a list of several hundred species previously unknown and unlisted as a result of that exercise. We would become more aware of the kind of genetic diversity there really is not only in terms of the varieties but more particularly in terms of the total number of species which live in this continent and which emerge only when favourable conditions allow them. It will be a pity if no-one does anything about that in that the opportunity will probably be lost again for several decades if not hundreds of years.

At this point I want to support the remarks that have been made by previous speakers. Outstanding speeches were made by the Minister and the member for Murray, but I was quite astonished and pleasantly surprised by the contribution from the member for Florey—not that I ever considered him incapable of such perception and penetration of a subject of that nature—no, Mr Speaker.

Since his arrival here, however, he has indicated that capacity only in the course of conversation. This has been the first contribution of that kind he has ever made on his feet in this place and I think that it is noteworthy and ought to be acknowledged as an essential part of the function of this place that members of it give not only other members but the totality of the State's constituents—the electors abroad—some insight into their willingness to contribute to the functioning of the place in the way that the member for

Florey has done probably for the first time in the speech he made on this topic today. As usual, the member for Coles was lucid and relevant in the remarks she made about the value of retaining as much as possible of the beauty of Australia in terms of native flora and fauna in their natural state as well as the built environment to ensure that Australia has a reputation for being not only a place compassionate and interested in long-term survival of *homo sapiens* living here but other species as well and, more importantly, an interesting destination to tourists—people who take recreation and pride in their recreation and who enjoy from their recreation, those who live here as well as those who will be attracted to the continent from overseas.

The member for Mawson also made a significant and worthwhile contribution in the form of a read speech. However, she acknowledged that she was reading during the course of her remarks. As I have said before and I will say again: I lament the fact that members of two years standing and more in this place still find it necessary to read word for word the speeches they make here. Doing so destroys the impact that those speeches can have on the minds of the people listening, and it destroys their relevance as a record of the spontaneous perceptions emanating from the minds of the members of this time when some historian or student of history decides to examine the record in *Hansard* at some future time. Read speeches are like books: they are interesting to read but bloody boring to listen to unless one is capable of dissecting the detail that they contain.

The regrettable aspect of the member for Mawson's speech was, however, that she would have us all believe that only the Labor Party—and the present Labor Government indeed—has done anything about conservation when in fact all of us here know that the previous Governments in this State in recent times have all, regardless of their political colour, contributed to the continuing development of a public awareness of the need for conservation as part of a consideration given to every decision that is made politically as to the direction we will take tomorrow in building a better tomorrow than today. Conservation, of course, is not just scenery, and many of the members who have spoken already have tended to indicate that that is their perception of what it means. They think of the macro scene such as we see on the cover (and indeed it is a wrap-around cover) of the document—a beautiful scene which is the Brindabella Range, according to the photographic credits, in New South Wales. It is a beautiful scene, but I would like to point out to honourable members that conservation is about the micro environment as well and it is as vital for us to ensure that those things not seen or those other things that we may not wish to see or have any contact with survive since they are an essential part of the total fabric of life in all its forms on this continent and on this planet.

I would, therefore, wish to relate again to some of the pretties that are not macro but micro and the pleasure that I have got from micro photography over the years of small living organisms that are visible to the eye with the assistance of low power magnification, and not only that kind of photography of small life on dry land, as it were, in all the eco systems that can be found above the water level but my interest also in under-water photography through scuba diving and snorkelling. I point out that some consideration ought to be given to the effects that developments of every kind have on those micro flora and micro organisms that are not usually noticed or spoken about whenever the word conservation is considered or the topic discussed. It is a pity that the schools in their programmes do not cover that also—more about that in a minute.

I want to turn again to the text of the booklet and make some comments as many of the general remarks I had planned to make are foxes already shot by other speakers.

Repetition will not be useful. We see that the strategy first outlines the elements which are definitions, objectives and principles and then gives us some insight into what the definitions mean. I quote the booklet, as follows:

Conservation is . . . the management of human use of the biosphere so that it may yield the greatest sustainable benefit to present generations while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations. Thus conservation is positive, embracing preservation, maintenance, sustainable utilisation, restoration and enhancement of the natural environment.

That is quite a mouthful. I would like to repeat it, but will not do so because of the shortness of time. It continues:

Living resource conservation is specifically concerned with plants, animals and micro-organisms.

I have emphasised the importance of micro-organisms. I had wished to further expand that but I will not; I will satisfy myself with the fact that I have drawn it to the attention of honourable members as being an important part of the total environment. It is not only interesting and entertaining to those who bother to take a curious look at it, but it is also vital in the process of genetic engineering to ensure that, where we decide to use genetic engineering in the future for medical and other scientific reasons, we have as far as possible an undisturbed range of microflora which we can examine and from the most appropriate of which we can select the genetic functions that we wish to integrate into other organisms for the preparation of medicines and other scientific organic chemicals. The statement continues:

Development is the modification of the biosphere and the application of human, financial, living and non-living resources. For development to be sustainable it must take account of social and ecological factors, as well as economic ones; and of the living and non-living resource base.

That definition covers the lot, and it is a good thing that it does so. It ought to. The time taken in its preparation indicates that the job was thorough and precise. To provide for today's needs, as well as to conserve a stock of living resources for tomorrow, both conservation and development are necessary. We cannot possibly expect to sustain a civilised existence for *homo sapiens* unless we accept and acknowledge that. The paper then looks at objectives and points out that:

To maintain and enhance environmental qualities which make the earth a pleasant place to live in and which meet aesthetic needs as well as recreational needs as an important part of it.

I am disappointed that the terminology used in a number of places is too diverse and generalised to enable a specific interpretation of real meaning to be drawn from that terminology. It will be quoted in future, I am sure, by heretics from both sides of an argument to justify their attitudes. If that is what consensus means, then consensus be damned! What we need is a statement of highest common factors, not lowest common denominators. Highest common factors are those parts of the spectrum of opinion which are agreed by all, not statements which embrace the pet theories of everybody, excluding none. It seems to me that too often the terminology used is the latter, where it ought to have been the former.

The member for Chaffey has drawn attention to one place in which Government has ignored its responsibilities as would be defined by the priority of national requirements on page 16 of the document. I could cite a number of other instances, the most glaring of which is the MIA and the way in which it collapsed in the 1920s because of the inappropriate irrigation development that was undertaken on soils which were far too shallow and in which ground water levels built up to the extent that the saline water ultimately resulted in phytophthora taking the deciduous and citrus plantations, almost to a tree, across thousands of acres. Given the constraints of time, I will press on and point out that under the priority of national requirements,

point (i), the statement is to 'preserve the genetic diversity of Australia's plant and animal species and ecosystems and those of introduced species which support plant and animal based industries'.

I am a little disturbed by that, because it illustrates the point to which I was referring earlier wherein some fanatics could argue that stud breeding of animals is against the national conservation strategy because it seeks in the short run to select those genes and enhance their proliferation through the populations which give the characteristics that are thought to be the most desirable in that species in this day and age and that, therefore, stud breeding is inappropriate because there is too much proliferation of too few genes.

If that is ever used as an argument against primary production, especially in the development of appropriate new varieties of cereal plants and other fruit and vegetables, or animal species, be they fowl or beast, I for one will be very disappointed. I do not think that we should ever have allowed that kind of interpretation to potentially be introduced into a statement of this kind and of this importance. It will destroy the faith, confidence and belief of necessity which a majority of primary producers and others engaged in that kind of industry have at the present time in the need for a national conservation strategy for this nation.

The only other matter to which I wish to briefly refer is that under the heading 'Priority National Actions, Improving the Capacity to Manage', we see point 27 (a) as follows:

Develop and support informal education and information programmes

and point (b):

Review, strengthen and develop in schools environmental education programmes which have regard for the basic objectives and principles of the NCSA.

That kind of statement is so bland and dangerous as to enable and justify the fanatical fringe groups associated with the conservation movement who have a rather precious attitude to conservation and so on, and an unrealistic non-factual attitude to obtain funds from Government sources, from taxpayers, and proliferate their views to the detriment and the perpetration of an ignorance of school-going children in our population.

I refer to idiot fringe groups like CANE, which will use and quote that as the basis upon which they seek grants from the Government, which is foolish enough to give them the money, by whatever mechanism, to print and publish that sort of stupidity. We have seen in recent times the kinds of things that such groups are prepared to print and distribute to the community on the steps of Parliament House. The stuff that they have been saying about the water in the Great Artesian Basin being made available to the Western Mining Corporation is utter piffle, and even the member for Mitchell (The Hon. R.G. Payne) has acknowledged the lies which are being spread abroad by that organisation. Yet I find members of it and its advocates in schools, and I regret that. It is stupid to encourage it. These clauses and this proposition enable them to claim some imprimatur of respectability. Point 29, which relates to legislation and regulations, refers to the following in Part A:

Through a process of consultation with conservation, industry and other interested groups, further develop and publish environmental standards, codes of practice and guidelines for the purpose of better implementing the goals as set out in the NCSA.

We encouraged that, but this Government has not done so.

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I want to make two comments in summing up. The first is that the Minister who has just resumed his seat has perhaps introduced one or two elements which are

contrary in intention to the sort of spirit which has characterised the debate up to now. The honourable member should know it is not possible in debates arising out of a national conservation strategy to ignore any significant groups involved in the conservation scene or to dismiss them as ratbag groups. All those groups have legitimate viewpoints to put, and it is important that they have the opportunity to put them. That is all I want to say in relation to the matter.

Secondly, the Government supports the amendment moved by the member for Murray. In fact, it is in precisely the form of the motion that I intended to move. I took advice and was given to understand that the more usual form for something like this would be 'take note of'. I am happy that the motion has emerged in the form that the honourable member requires: after all, the Government has fully endorsed the National Conservation Strategy in the form that I have indicated to the House, and it is only appropriate that the House should echo that endorsement.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for service by post as an additional method of service of Local Court summonses. The usual method of serving summonses in South Australia, as prescribed by the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, is by the plaintiff, by the court bailiff, or by a private process server. The majority of summonses are not served personally on the defendant but are left with some other person in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Generally speaking, similar provisions exist throughout Australia and are clearly necessary in order to ensure that there is a reasonable degree of success. Insistence upon personal service in every instance would do nothing but ensure the failure of existing modes of service and ultimately frustrate persons seeking redress. However, personal service has a number of advantages. For example, when successful it offers the assurance that the process is actually brought to the attention of the defendant; personal contact in some instances results in prompt settlement of the claim, and personal service provides the defendant with the opportunity of seeking clarification of the meaning and purpose of the process. These advantages disappear where non personal service is effected, and non personal service is by far the most common means of effecting service.

In addition, the relatively high cost of bailiff or process server service must be considered. Costs of bailiff service vary from \$5 to \$15 per summons plus a distance allowance. Service by bailiff is a slow and relatively inefficient means of service, given the volumes involved and the time and effort required to achieve success, file 'proofs of service', etc. Similar comments may be made in respect of service by private process server.

Service by post offers the potential for significant improvement in both respects. First, cost to the user would be greatly reduced and, secondly, the established Australia Post infrastructure allows for speedy and reliable delivery anywhere in the State. The postal service is utilised daily for the purpose of the safe despatch and delivery of letters, valuables, negotiable instruments and other documents to persons right throughout Australia, and is an integral part of the nation's communication system.

While not denigrating the present modes of service, there exists potential for abuse. Allegations are made not infrequently of process servers leaving processes with children under the age of 14 years; placing processes under doors and other places; leaving summonses at the wrong address; falsifying affidavits of service and attempt to exert improper influence over defendants in order to intimidate them into paying, regardless of their rights in the matter.

With proper legislative and administrative safeguards and controls, service by post is potentially far less expensive, faster, less invasive of privacy, easier to administer and more effective than current methods of service. Having regard to the deficiencies of the present modes of service, it was considered that the range of options for service should be expanded. In the light of complaints received and the difficulties being experienced by bailiffs of the court and private process servers alike, the view was taken that an improved service was required.

Service by post is proposed as a viable option and which, because of its speed, low cost and effectiveness should prove to be successful in meeting the demands of the users of the court system. In developing this proposal the Government was most concerned to ensure that the correct balance of the rights of plaintiffs and defendants was achieved and that those rights were adequately protected. The Bill accommodates each of the criteria specified and when enacted will provide an improved method of service of originating local courts process for persons who choose to resort to this particular mode of service in preference to the present means of service which will of course continue to exist.

To investigate this matter, a study was undertaken by officers of the Courts Department. They began by evaluating existing service procedures. Methods of service of civil originating processes have been the subject of study by a number of notable authorities in recent times. The more prominent of these were the Australian Law Reform Commission and the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia. The findings and comments of these reports were found to be most useful. The advantages of personal service as opposed to other methods of service were closely considered. Several major points need to be made about current methods of service: First, it must be clearly understood that most processes are not served personally, but are left with another person.

Secondly, a high proportion of processes issued (somewhere in the vicinity of 70 per cent) are returned to the plaintiff for service. Rates for service by private process servers vary but it is understood that they are usually more expensive than the rates charged for court-bailiff service.

Thirdly, some authorities have commented upon the fact that service by bailiff or process server may be seen as an invasion of the defendant's privacy. This point was particularly made by the New South Wales Privacy Committee in its study on Privacy Aspects of Debt Collection (Background Paper No. 49, 1978). Of even greater significance is the potential for a process server or bailiff to abuse the system; a matter which I touched upon earlier.

Fourthly, one of the greater deficiencies of the present system is the difficulty and cost in managing the bailiff system. Bailiffs are employed on a fee for service basis and therefore derive their principal income from other sources.

Therein lies the dilemma. A full-time bailiff system of permanently employed officers would impose a financial burden either upon the community at large or the user of the service, depending upon the basis of employment.

Introducing better supervision and control of bailiffs would reduce the cost effectiveness of the service without the benefit of a perceptive improvement in the service. Furthermore, in high volume courts it is not always possible to provide prompt, regular and automatic feedback to plaintiffs on the progress towards service. This in turn creates dissatisfaction and, at peak periods, a 'snowballing' effect brought about by the subsequent inquiries. In the past this situation has been a major cause of frequent complaints from users, including the legal profession. However, changes in internal procedures have resulted in substantial improvements. The difficulties confronted by the bailiffs and the courts can be better appreciated when it is considered that court bailiffs are often asked to serve processes when all other attempts by plaintiffs have failed.

Significant benefits are seen in attempting to reduce the incidence of service of originating process by bailiffs so that they may concentrate their time and efforts towards the service and execution of enforcement processes. Presently, the remuneration paid to bailiffs is under review. It is inevitable that persons undertaking this work will not do so without fair recompense for their efforts. This of course will add to the cost of the service. Service by post will provide a speedier and more effective alternative, at a mere fraction of the cost. Indeed, it is proposed to absorb the cost of service by post in the fee paid for issue of the process so that, in effect, service by post will be free. All other modes of service must continue to attract a cost to the user so that the burden does not fall upon the public purse.

In evaluating the concept of service by post as an alternative to existing methods of service the officers found that a number of reports examined have argued that service by post is a means of redressing the very problems and disadvantages associated with the existing methods of service. A notable source of support for this argument was found in the working paper on the Local Courts Act, 1904-1982, and rules, published by the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia. There is strong evidence to support that service by post is potentially less expensive, faster, less invasive of privacy and far easier to administer than current modes of service. Moreover, depending upon the controls applied and type of postal service chosen, service by post avoids the circumstances which give rise to abuse, and inherent in other modes. The exact measure of the improvement will depend to a large extent upon the system chosen.

Both certified mail and registered mail have been found to be more expensive and less effective. Interstate and overseas experience indicate that about 20-30 per cent of summonses posted by certified mail are returned to the court. Service, often the same address, is carried out subsequently by the bailiff. The comparable statistic for ordinary mail is about 5 per cent. Amongst other things, the inconvenience attached to claiming registered and certified documents is thought to contribute to this situation as opposed to the ease of clearing a letterbox at the address for postage shown on the face of the summons to be served. The best information which was obtained during the study is that actual problems as distinct from perceived problems should not be great. Indeed, it is confidently expected that service by post will bring about a reduction in the incidence of faulty service, given the potential for abuse and error in the other methods of service.

The comparison between certified mail, registered mail and ordinary mail occupied the thought of the officers during the course of the study. The success rate for registered

mail is 65 per cent to 70 per cent on the first attempt, and 70 per cent to 80 per cent in the case of certified mail. It is difficult to envisage any improvement in this success rate. Thus in a high percentage of cases, service by these methods is significantly slower and more expensive than with ordinary mail. This issue has been addressed by both the Australian Law Reform Commission and the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia, both of which support the introduction of service by post using prepaid ordinary mail.

It is interesting to note that the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia also draws attention to the successful use of an equivalent system in the English County Court and the Supreme Court of England and Wales. The fact that ordinary mail is apparently successful in achieving service is in many respects not surprising given that it is a universally accepted means of conveying written communications for most private and business purposes. Arguably, ordinary mail is an even more reliable method of bringing a notice to the attention of the addressee than merely leaving it with some other person at the address.

In the consideration of the implementation of service by post, the practical issues associated therewith were canvassed with a view to ensuring that the system would achieve the goals set, and to ensure that there were no disadvantages to either the plaintiff or the defendant.

First, the plaintiff will have the right to choose the method of service. It is recognised that there may be instances where service by post will not be appropriate. By adding this to the existing range of options, the potential for effective service is surely enhanced. Second, the Clerk of Court or a member of the court staff will attend to the posting of the summons in an envelope, clearly marked with a return address in case the summons should not reach its destination. This will ensure that ineffectual service will come to notice quickly and letters will not be sent to the 'dead letter office'. No other person will be empowered to effect service by post, thus the potential for abuse is eliminated. Third, there are penalties for persons who knowingly provide incorrect information for the purpose of service or who are recklessly indifferent in providing such information. Fourth, upon an order being made to set aside a judgment on the basis of non receipt of a summons which was posted there are provisions for the awarding of costs against plaintiffs where incorrect information has been given or where the plaintiff was responsible for the summons not coming to the attention of the defendant.

Fifth, there is provision for deferral of execution where a defendant claims that the summons was never received. Sixth, there is provision to deem the summons to be served immediately upon a judgment being set aside on the grounds that the summons which was posted was not received, so that there is no abuse of the system by defendants. Seventh, where a summons is returned unserved or the Clerk of the Court has good reason to believe that the summons did not come to the attention of the defendant, provision exists for service to be deemed not to have occurred. Eighth, service at postal addresses is provided for in the Bill, in accordance with normal commercial practice. Ninth, provision is made to protect the parties where postal disruptions occur. Tenth, the cost of the proceedings will be reduced by reason of absorbing the cost of service by post in the fee for issue. Eleventh, officers of the Courts Department are presently creating a set of procedures to closely monitor the system so that injustices do not occur and to ensure that any 'teething' problems are detected and remedied promptly.

In introducing service by post it is proposed also to abolish the special summons. Views on this proposal were canvassed widely and no significant objections were raised by anyone, including the Law Society. Furthermore, the

principal Act will be amended to provide a common period for the defendant to appear to a summons, namely, 21 days. In the case of summonses served by ordinary post, this period will begin to run from the date of posting by the officers of the court. The design and language of summons forms will be greatly simplified and adequate information will accompany summonses so that defendants will be well acquainted with their rights. Bailiffs will be required to provide a notice to persons who claim they have not received the summons and be prevented from proceeding with any execution until the expiration of a period to be prescribed by the Rules of Court. This will enable defendants to take such action as is considered by him or her to be appropriate. The Rules of Court and administrative procedures which are to be implemented in support of the legislation will ensure that the concept is implemented and conducted in a proper and effective manner, so that maximum advantages accrue to litigants. This amending Bill will not be debated until February to enable public discussion on its terms to take place.

Clause 1 provides for the short title. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 inserts transitional provisions that are necessary by virtue of proposed amendments contained in this Bill. It may be noted that if an ordinary summons is issued before the amending Act comes into force but not served, the plaintiff will have the option of returning the summons to the clerk so that service by post may be effected. Clause 4 contains amendments to section 25 of the Act and is concerned with the setting aside of judgments obtained by default. It is proposed to specify in the principal Act that a judgment obtained by default should not be set aside unless the defendant establishes that he did not receive the summons in the action or that he has a defence on the merits to the action. When considering the proposal concerning a defence on the merits, it must be borne in mind that the time for entering an appearance is to be extended under another provision of this Bill and that the use of special summonses is being discontinued, and so it is considered reasonable that, except in cases of non-service, the defendant be required to show that he at least considers that he has some defence to the action before he can successfully apply to have a judgment set aside.

Furthermore, it is considered that potential defendants should be given protection against plaintiffs who recklessly state addresses for service in summonses. It is therefore proposed to make provision for a court, where it appears that a plaintiff was responsible for the summons not coming to the notice of the defendant, to order that the plaintiff pay the costs of a defendant who has had to apply to set aside any judgment obtained on his alleged default (unless the court otherwise directs). In addition, to provide for further fairness in the proceedings, the section will provide that upon the granting of an application to set aside a judgment unless the court otherwise directs, service of the summons will be deemed to have been effected at the time that the judgment is set aside and the defendant will be required to appear within seven days. Administrative arrangements will be made so that a copy of the summons will be available for the defendant at the hearing. This will obviate the need for the plaintiff to re-serve the summons and may remove some incentive for defendants to make frivolous applications.

Clause 5 is intended to make two amendments to section 26 of the Act, which is concerned with the duties of clerks. The first amendment is consequential upon the fact that not all summonses are now to be served personally. The second amendment provides express power for a clerk to delegate a power or function under this Act. Obviously, clerks already allow assistant clerks to perform some of

their functions, but it is thought to be appropriate at this time to make specific provision in this regard. A delegation will not derogate from the powers exercisable personally by the clerk and will be revocable at will.

Clause 6 effects various amendments to that section of the Act that is concerned with the duties of bailiffs. The most significant amendment provides for the insertion of new subsections that will require a bailiff executing a warrant, where the defendant claims that he has not been served with a summons in the action, to serve on the defendant a notice summarising the procedures available to set aside a judgment or suspend the execution of a warrant and then to refrain from executing the warrant for a prescribed period. It is acknowledged that a defendant may not receive a summons sent by post just as a defendant presently may not receive a summons left for him. Accordingly, if the defendant makes such a claim, it is thought to be reasonable that execution of the warrant be suspended for some little time to allow the defendant to apply for relief.

Clause 7 relates to section 80 of the Act. Of particular note is a proposed amendment that will make it an offence for a plaintiff, intentionally or recklessly, to state in a summons an incorrect address for service. Clause 8 provides amendments to section 83 of the Act that are consequential upon the abolition of special summonses. Clause 9 will repeal sections 91 and 92 of the Act. Section 91 is the section that allows for special summonses to issue in prescribed cases. Section 92 (relating to how service of a summons is to be effected and proved) is to be subsumed into new provisions dealing with modes of services and proof of service.

Clause 10 will replace the existing section 94 with two new sections relating to the service of a summons. The most significant reform relates to the provision of service by post, which will be effected by the clerk of the court out of which the summons is issued. Service will be deemed to have been effected at the time of posting unless the summons is returned undelivered or the clerk considers, on the basis of information received by him, that there is substantial reason to doubt that the summons has come to the attention of the defendant. If service does prove ineffectual, any judgment in default will be set aside, the clerk will notify the plaintiff of the fact of non-service, and service by post will not be able to be re-attempted at the same address unless the clerk is satisfied that the plaintiff has made further inquiries to confirm the correctness of the address. Provision will also be made for the situation where, by reason of delays in the delivery of mail, it is expedient to direct that summonses served by post be deemed to have been served at times that are different to the times of posting, notice of this will be given in the *Gazette*.

Clause 11 makes an amendment to section 95 to provide consistency of terminology. Clause 12 provides for the insertion of a new section relating to the record of service of a summons. Service of a summons by post shall be recorded by the clerk making an endorsement on the file copy of the summons. Other provisions are similar to those presently appearing in the Act. Clause 13 will amend section 96 so as to allow a notification endorsed on a file copy of a summons that service of the summons was effected by post to be accepted as proof of such service. Clause 14 amends section 97 of the Act so that the time for entering an appearance to an ordinary summons will be twenty-one days. It is considered that there is merit in establishing a single period of service for all summonses within the State. Periods of fourteen or twenty-one days are common in other States. Whilst an extended period has the disadvantage that it slightly delays the signing of judgment where this is necessary, it will be fairer for the defendant, giving him more time to consider his alternatives and seek advice. In

the context of service by post, the period will allow ample time for the summons to be brought to the attention of the defendant, or to be returned to the court. Special provision has been made for country areas.

Clause 15 repeals section 106 of the Act and is consequential upon the abolition of special summonses. Clause 16 will insert a new section 107 into the Act. The new section is a revamp of the present section and provides that where the claim is for a liquidated amount (with or without interest), the plaintiff can, in default of the defendant entering an appearance, sign judgment for the amount of the claim plus interest. (Where the claim is for an amount other than a liquidated amount, the matter must be set down for an assessment of damages under section 108). Clause 17 makes a consequential amendment of section 109 of the Act.

Clause 18 is intended to effect an amendment to the form of an unsatisfied judgment summons so that it will include a statement that sets out the procedures available to apply to set aside the judgment to which the summons relates. As with the amendment to the procedures on the execution of a warrant, this amendment has been inserted to ensure that a defendant who in fact is not served with a summons is properly aware of the alternatives available to him once enforcement proceedings are taken. However, unlike the procedure on the execution of a warrant, service of the unsatisfied judgment will not be withheld. The summons will stress that if the defendant does not apply to have the judgment set aside he will be obliged to attend at the hearing. Clause 19 makes a consequential amendment to section 218 providing for the service of a summons issued under Part X of the Act for the recovery of premises.

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

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Explanation of Bill

This amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act, 1981, is the culmination of a considerable period of discussion with the Law Society of South Australia. The amendments are of a varied nature. The principal matters dealt with are as follows: Provision is made for the distribution of moneys paid as interest on solicitors' trust accounts. From 1 July 1983 interest has been paid on moneys held in solicitors' trust accounts. This money is not paid to the solicitors themselves but is paid to the Law Society which, following discussions as to the appropriate application of the moneys so received, has agreed to apply 50 per cent of the money to the Legal Services Commission with part of the additional funding being used to give financial aid to community legal centres; 40 per cent to the Guarantee Fund; and 10 per cent to a Law Foundation to be established in this State.

This basic agreement with the Law Society has been incorporated into the new section 57a of the Legal Practitioners Act. The percentages to be applied to each area have been fixed as agreed at the outset and it is only possible for the percentages to be altered by agreement between the society and the Attorney-General. The apportionment of funds as between the Legal Services Commission on the one hand and community legal centres on the other and

the conditions on which such funds are applied is left to the direction of the Attorney-General.

The 10 per cent of the moneys is to be payable to a person to be applied in or in relation to the provision of legal services to the community or a section of the community or shall be applied for the purposes of legal research and education. It is the intention that this money will be directed to a Law Foundation which the Law Society intends to establish in this State. The foundation has not yet been constituted. Specific provision has been made to ensure that legal practitioners maintain their trust accounts at banks which will pay interest on the account.

Section 73 of the principal Act provides for confidentiality in relation to the work of the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee. The Law Society considers that for the smooth running of the Act there should be a proper exchange of information between the complaints committee and the council and inspectors appointed under Part III of Division V. The present section 73 is seen by the society as a substantial obstacle to a proper flow of information. Section 73 has accordingly been amended to provide that the complaints committee may disclose information to the Law Society Council, a person or committee to whom the council has delegated its power to appoint inspectors and to the inspectors themselves.

It has been found, in the course of investigations conducted under the Act, that books, accounts, documents or writings relevant to a practitioner whose conduct is under investigation may be in the custody of a wider range of persons than just the practitioner or his employees. Section 76 has been widened to include former employers, employees or partners, the Legal Services Commission or another practitioner who may have instructed the practitioner whose affairs are under investigation and the manager of a bank with whom the practitioner deposited moneys.

Provision is made for the non-renewal of practising certificates of those practitioners who fail to submit an auditor's report as required by the principal Act. The Bill also provides for the Registrar of the Supreme Court to exercise some of the minor powers of the court, subject to any rule, order or direction of the court and subject to appeal to a judge by an aggrieved party.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 adds a new subsection to section 18 of the principal Act. The new provision will mean that a practitioner will not be able to continue in practice until he has submitted a copy of an auditor's report as required by the Act. Clause 4 amends section 29 of the principal Act in order to allow the court's approval to alterations of memorandum and articles of a company that is a legal practitioner to be given by the Registrar. The change will increase the efficiency of the court by reducing the work load of the Judges and Masters.

Clause 5 amends section 31 of the principal Act by replacing subsection (6) with two new subsections. The new subsections retain the substance of the existing subsection and incorporate a requirement that banks pay interests on trust accounts at or above a level determined by the Law Society. Clause 6 amends section 33 of the principal Act. As with the amendment made by clause 4 this is an extension of the jurisdiction of the court in a straightforward matter to the Registrar. In both cases new subsection (3) provides a right of appeal to a judge against the decision of the Registrar. Clause 7 amends section 35. New subsection (3a) provides that an auditor or inspector may make copies of documents produced as required by the section. It has general application and consequently the specific requirement in subsection (3) as to bank documents is deleted by paragraph (a).

Clause 8 makes an amendment to section 42 of the principal Act which will allow the Registrar of the Supreme Court to tax and settle bills of costs. This ability should

improve the efficiency of the court. Once again an appeal lies to a judge against a decision of the Registrar. Clause 9 amends section 52 of the principal Act by inserting a regulation making power in relation to fees payable to the Law Society in respect of the Society's costs of administration. Clause 10 makes minor changes to section 54 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) makes it clear that 'an approved bank' must pay interest at or above the rate determined by the Law Society. New subsection (3) gives the Society explicit power to make and revoke determinations for that purpose.

Clause 11 enacts new section 57a of the principal Act. The amendment made by clause 5 to section 31 (6) will ensure that interest will be paid on solicitors' trust accounts. Section 57a sets out how this interest will be used. Subsection (1) requires the interest to be paid to the Society and subsection (2) provides the manner in which the Society must deal with it. Subsection (3) allows the Attorney-General to vary the conditions upon which money is paid to the recipients referred to in subsection (2) and allows him, with the approval of the Society, to vary the proportions in which the recipients referred to in 2 (a), (b) and (c) respectively will share the money available.

Subsection (4) will allow the Attorney-General to vary the manner in which the money referred to in paragraph 2 (a) may be distributed amongst the recipients referred to

in that paragraph without the approval of the Law Society. It is proposed that the 10 per cent referred to in paragraph (2) (c) will be paid to a law foundation that will be established by the Law Society. As it has not yet been established it is impossible to refer to it by name but subsection (5) limits the purposes for which that money may be applied.

Clause 12 amends section 60 so that claims against the guarantee fund may be made in respect of defaults occurring on or after 4 December 1969, instead of 1 January 1975. Recent cases of professional default have shown that such a change is necessary: 4 December 1969 was the day on which the guarantee fund came into existence. Clause 13 amends section 73 to widen the category of persons to whom information acquired by the complaints committee can be divulged. Clause 14 amends section 76 to widen the categories of person whose documents are subject to inspection.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 February at 2 p.m.