HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 August 1985

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

PETITIONS: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 454 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on preschool education were presented by the Hons B.C. Eastick and D.C. Wotton.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 18, 26, 32, 48, 49, 50, 52, 87, 88, 94, 98, 102, 108, 114, 117, 120, and 132.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On Thursday last I undertook to provide a full report to the House concerning alleged attempts to cover up financial mismanagement at the Lyell McEwin Health Service. These allegations were raised—in rather curious circumstances—by the Leader of the Opposition and several of his colleagues in this House and by the Liberal Leader in another place. They based their questions on a front page report in the *News* of 22 August 1985. Under the headline 'Uproar over Hospital Cover-up', the *News* purported to reveal that the hospital and the South Australian Health Commission had attempted to cover up an auditor's allegations of falsifying records and gross financial bungling. The Minister of Health in another place is making a detailed statement.

I table a number of documents associated with the Minister's statement:

1. The auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission on the Lyell McEwin Community Health Service and the Lyell McEwin Hospital for the year ended 30 June 1983. This report, dated 12 March 1984, states that the standard of the accounting and financial function was inadequate.

2. The auditor's statement to the board of management of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for the year ended June 1983, also dated 12 March 1984. This was subsequently published in the hospital's annual report.

3. Four interim reports to the board of management which were prepared as part of the auditor's report to the Health Commission. These reports cover the period 1982-83 and are dated 27 June 1983, 7 September 1983, 27 October 1983, and 12 December 1983.

4. A memorandum sent to the Chairman of the Health Commission by the Executive Director of the Central Sector, which clearly outlines the action taken by the Health Commission in the wake of the auditor's interim report of 27 June 1983. This memorandum is dated 26 August 1985 and strenuously refutes the allegations made against the commission.

5. The auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission for 1981-82.

6. The auditor's report to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for 1981-82. Neither of these reports contains references to the matters brought to light by the commission's own officers in their subsequent investigations.

7. The auditor's interim report for 1979-80, dated 19 June 1980.

8. Auditor's interim report for 1981-82, dated 7 April 1982. Both of these reports contained a list of the inadequacies of the administration at the hospital, but were not acted upon.

9. Auditor's report to the South Australian Health Commission for 1983-84, dated 26 November 1984.

10. Auditor's report to the Lyell McEwin board of management for 1983-84, dated 26 November 1984.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Pursuant to Statute—

Coast Protection Act, 1972—Regulations—
Coastal Protection Districts (Revocation)
South East Coast Protection District.

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
Redevelopment—Rendelsham Primary School.
Borrow Pit—Hundred of Pyap.
Erection of Classroom—Loxton High School.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

Pursuant to Statute—

Dentists Act, 1984—Dental Regulations, 1985.

Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Low Alcohol Beers.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Regulations—One Plate System.

Nurses Act, 1984—Regulations—Nurses Board Elections.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Pursuant to Statute—

Electoral Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Betting Control Board—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings):

Pursuant to Statute—

Architects Act, 1939—By-law 38—Promotion of Services.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RAILWAYS COLLISION

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I wish to give this House a report sent to me by the Chairman of the State Transport Authority on the unfortunate collision between two trains eight days ago on the Noarlunga Centre line. The report states:

On Monday 19 August, a collision occurred between the 7.11 a.m. train from Adelaide to Noarlunga Centre, and the 7.29 a.m. train, also to Noarlunga Centre. The accident occurred at the 20.5 kilometre mark between Marino Rocks and Hallett Cove.

A formal inquiry was begun immediately into the incident, evidence was taken from the train crews of both movements, and authority rollingstock and electrical engineers.

The statements, reports and detailed evidence taken all correspond to indicate the following:

1. All signals were operating correctly before the collision.
2. The light indications on all signals were clear, and signal alignment was correct.
3. The braking on the 2000 class train was functioning correctly.
4. The leading movement, a 'red hen' train, was actually stationary when the collision occurred, due to mechanical failure.
5. The locomotive engineman on the second train did not stop at permissive signal No. 187. Had he proceeded past signal 187 in accordance with the safeworking rules, he would have been able to bring his train to a standstill behind the preceding movement. The driver of the second train was responsible for the collision. He has been disciplined by being removed from main line working for three months.

A report on the damage caused and cost of repairs will be prepared when full details are available. The usual procedures involving accident compensation for those injured in the collision will apply.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICIES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In April 1983 I established the School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee to undertake a comprehensive review of school transport policies. It was the first such major review of school transport for nearly 30 years. After receiving 175 formal submissions and meeting over an extensive period, the task was completed and presented to me in May this year. I provided the Education Department with the initial opportunity to examine its implications and, having received their advice, I now table the report and authorise its public release. The report is being made available for public comment and a schedule is now being prepared for implementing changes. Release of the recommendations does not of course mean they have all been accepted, as each of them is being examined in the interests of both good economic management and the need for choice in education.

One recommendation which I have already attended to concerns the use of spare capacity on existing bus services to enable students to attend a school which is not necessarily the one closest to their home. I have approved a modified version of the recommendation contained in the report. An exchange of letters between the students' families and the Education Department will make it clearly understood that, when spare capacity no longer exists, the right to free bus travel to the more distant school also ceases. Students will then have to make private arrangements or opt to return to their local school, using its free bus service. This approach will make planning much easier. Without clear policies, about 100 complaints arise each year, mainly because of different perceptions of the rights of students and their families. We cannot afford to have so much uncertainty in what is a big operation.

Each day 25 500 students travel by school buses run under an annual budget of about $13 million in operating costs, and involving a fleet of 412 departmental and 295 contract buses. This and other recommendations in the report deserve careful consideration.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATIONS 5RM AND 5AU

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Last week in this House I made certain allegations relating to the issue of a press statement by the member for Bragg regarding the negotiations for the purchase by Festival City Broadcasters of regional stations 5RM and 5AU. The member for Bragg subsequently issued a denial of those allegations, but not an explanation of the circumstances surrounding the press statement. I now call on the honourable member to explain, without equivocation, the following—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted. I call for order.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: How does the member explain his awareness of the negotiations—

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: A point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask you to rule whether this is in fact a ministerial statement. In the statement he is calling on the member for Bragg—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to other members by their title or district.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I thought I said 'the Minister'. The Minister is calling on the member for Bragg to explain a series of events. I would not have thought that that came within the purview of a ministerial statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The Minister was given leave. I have explained over and over again that honourable members on either side will not change the Standing Orders which they impose upon me. Those orders I am carrying out.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On the same point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to a ruling by your predecessor against the member for Davenport, who was then a Minister, and who was then making a similar type of ministerial statement containing material of a political nature, and Mr Speaker Eastick at that stage withdrew leave.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take some advice on that. This is the situation: leave having been granted by honourable members, I am not in a situation where I am prepared to withdraw leave. I repeat that I am carrying out Standing Orders imposed on me by honourable members.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: How does the member explain his awareness of the negotiations when only a few people directly involved were in possession of the information? Who was the member for Bragg's informant?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: How does the member explain and what was his motive in issuing a press statement on Wednesday 19 June stating that negotiations had been finalised, when in actual fact the agreement was not finalised until Friday 21 June? In providing the necessary explanation, I challenge the member for Bragg to show how his premature news release was made in the interests of racing in South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TOILET ROLL HOLDERS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Last Thursday, the member for Light asked, in a frivolous fashion, whether I could detail the ultimate destination of 150 stainless steel toilet roll holders custom designed for the new Remand Centre and which are now superfluous to the Minister's requirements. Judging by the guffawing and embarrassed whisper-

ings emanating from the Opposition benches during the asking of the question, one can only assume that collectively members opposite must have a juvenile fascination for toilet humour. To answer in the same tone as that in which the question was asked, I can now say I have got to the bottom of this mess precipitated by the member for Light.

It seems that the private contractors involved in the Remand Centre authorised production of the toilet roll holders before obtaining approval from the Department of Housing and Construction, the project managers. These holders are part of a larger framework of stainless steel tubing supporting the hand basin in each cell. As with all stainless steel components, the department requires a sample of an item to be provided before authorisation to manufacture is given. The department had not seen a sample of the holder that was apparently manufactured.

In fact, the department had varied its order on 9 May and viewed a sample of the revised design only on 15 August. Partial approval was granted on 19 August. Any production of holders was not on the instructions of my department, as the member for Light said in the House. Someone in the private area obviously jumped the gun. Furthermore, neither I nor my department is sitting on these holders, as the member for Light put it. The department is not in possession of them, we have never seen them, and we do not intend to pay for them. In answer to a further question from the member for Light, there are no pieces of equipment ordered for the Remand Centre that are lying idle.

I resent the continual attempts by the Opposition to paint professional people in the employ of the Public Service as inefficient and wasteful. Officers of the Department of Housing and Construction are dedicated and highly trained. Our project managers know full well the brief of the Bannon Government to eliminate waste in the public sector. They share that goal. The Remand Centre, for example, is on schedule and looks like finishing below estimates—a tribute to the new Department of Housing and Construction.

If the Labor Party were to single out every mistake or inefficiency that occurs in the private sector, our list would surpass the list that the Liberal Party is attempting to compile in relation to the public sector. Certainly, we could add this saga of the toilet roll holders to the private sector list. But that is not the style of this Government. We are simply happy that our excellent record in housing and construction has reduced the Opposition spokesman to asking toilet talk questions about toilet roll holders. I believe that, in the eyes of the electorate, the member for Light has well and truly flushed himself down the drain on this one.

QUESTION TIME

ENDURO EVENT

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport confirm that he presented a submission to the Premier and Cabinet supporting a proposal to hold the world six day Enduro motorcycle event in South Australia in 1988? The world six day Enduro event is the Olympics of auto cycling. The last event in Holland in 1984 attracted 500 000 spectators and participants from 32 countries. The event has been staged since 1913, but never before in the Southern Hemisphere.

Australia has been given the opportunity to host the 1988 Enduro, and the South Australian Government has been asked to give its support for staging the event in the Barossa Valley, where the Australian National 24 hour Enduro has been held for the past five years with the full support of local government, police and local residents. I have been informed that research by the Department of Recreation and Sport has supported proposals to stage the event in the Barossa Valley, and I ask the Minister whether his department's submission has received Cabinet approval.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer is 'No'.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That remark is unparliamentary, and I ask the Leader to withdraw forthwith.

Mr OLSEN: At your request, Sir, I withdraw.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MAYES: Will the Premier advise what is the Government's policy on privatisation of State public instrumentalities and assets, particularly in the light of proposals to privatise the Commonwealth Bank, OTC, Aussat, TAA, ANL, Telecom, and the Pipeline Authority, made at federal level? Recent media reports have referred to extensive proposals by the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Peacock, on the question of privatising Government instrumentalities, such as the Commonwealth Bank, and have also reported comments by the State Opposition, which appears to apply these proposals to State instrumentalities. I refer to an article by Peter Ward in the *Australian* of 9 August at page 9—

Mr Lewis interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I call the honourable member for Mallee to order and again I repeat, having done so, that the next step is that any breach by any honourable member will be met by a warning followed by a naming, if necessary.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Sir, past practice when members have transgressed has been somewhat different from the approach you are now adopting. Could you, Sir, explain under what Standing Order, or where in *Erskine May*, you can determine the ruling you have now given?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, but for the last time I clarify it. I am forced, by the disgraceful behaviour of the House over the last 12 months, to adopt the approach that I am now adopting. The honourable member for Unley.

Mr MAYES: The article states:

> Sacrosanct and popular State institutions such as the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission are exempt, he says, at this stage—

referring to the Leader of the Opposition—

> 'The day they don't trade on a commercial basis the same as anyone else out there in the market place is the day they are to be privatised,' he said.

I further refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of last week written by Dennis Atkins and quoting Mr Hall:

> Mr Hall, a former SA Premier, now the member for Boothby, told a seminar for young students that he would not vote for a policy of selling off Qantas or the Commonwealth Bank...And in an interview later, Mr Hall echoed the words of Liberal President Mr John Valder when he said privatisation proposals were sidetrack issues. 'They are one-off issues as far as the Budget is concerned for the getting of capital out of the sale of an institution,' he said.

Mr OSWALD: I rise on a point of order. In asking his question, the honourable member has referred to statutory authorities and organisations which have no responsibility to the Premier of this State. While I acknowledge that the Premier has a right to answer questions relating to statutory authorities or organisations in this State, I submit that any reference to Telecom, the Commonwealth Bank or anything outside the Premier's jurisdiction should be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I answer the honourable member's point. In so far as the Premier was asked to comment directly on

bodies that clearly are not under his authority, he has no right to do so. In so far as those bodies—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra will cease interjecting while the Speaker is on his feet. In so far as the actions of those bodies are ancillary to the main function, then reference to them may be made in an ancillary way. The honourable member for Unley.

Mr MAYES: Thank you, Sir. I have finished my question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My Government's policy is quite clear in this area. It is obviously a distinction that is being drawn increasingly between the policies being propounded by the Leader of the Opposition—I must say with the less than wholehearted support of many of those in his own ranks, quite rightly, for privatisation—and those of a Government that believes in an active and progressive public sector working in cooperation and partnership, and sometimes competition, with the private sector.

I think banking is a classic example of that. There is no question at all that our community benefits enormously from owning a State Bank which is able not only to provide services in the public interest to people in South Australia but which is also able, by reason of its profitable operation as was so strikingly revealed last Thursday, to supply to the State Treasury money which in turn allows us to provide services to people and at the same time to lower the tax burden.

That is just one example of a properly competitive State institution, operating under no special privileges, with a particular public brief and charter, which takes its place in the marketplace effectively. There are others, such as the State Government Insurance Commission, which has generated, apart from the services it supplies, many millions of dollars investment in this State by reason of its existence.

Honourable members opposite are now propounding this policy of the quick fix—the selling off of assets in order to gain some short-term capital moneys which they can use to prop up their budget deficits in other areas and, incidentally, it is no new policy for them because in the period of the Tonkin Government massive injections of capital funds were used in order to prop up the recurrent budget.

In this past financial year my Government, for the first time, was not forced to take recourse to that sort of propping up. That was the kind of fix that the Tonkin Government attempted to cover its financial incompetence. Now there is a new one—the sale of the century—which will result in big promises for the next four years of the supposed Liberal Administration and which will be paid for by selling off, on a once only basis, at bargain prices no doubt, our State assets.

In drawing attention to this policy, let me also restate my Government's view about cooperative ventures in relation to public and private sector activity. For instance, a classic example is that in relation to the proposed new power supply recommended to the Government by the Stewart Committee. That is an example of the public interest being protected by a public utility working in cooperation and partnership with a private organisation. Two particular deposits are being looked at for the most appropriate economic result for this State: one is privately owned.

It is not the intention of the State to compulsorily acquire or in any other way divest those private interests of that deposit or asset that it has, but we suggest it should be used in the public interest. The other is publicly owned. Again, it is not our suggestion that this be sold off willy nilly to the private sector to take whatever profits it likes and leave the hapless public with the residue. What has been devised is a joint venture arrangement that will use the skills and capabilities of both sectors to look at the most productive way of developing the most appropriate deposit.

There will be those opportunities constantly arising and they will certainly be taken by my Government, as they should be taken. However, in terms of ultimate community control and ultimate right of ownership of our assets, we will not back away from that. Members opposite had better make up their minds and spell out specifics. As Mr Steele Hall, federal member (a former senator and former Premier of this State), said:

> Those who are talking about privatisation owe a public explanation of how far they want to go. Those Australians who are performing valuable public service should not have to work under the silly threat that they might be privatised.

We have had few specifics from the honourable member: the whole of it is there in the melting pot. In this context, I refer to a statement made by another member of the Liberal Party—a prominent senator—Senator Alan Missen of Victoria, who prepared a thoughtful paper entitled 'The Winter of our Discontent', in which he stated:

> 'Privatisation', that ugly modern word, is in vogue and seen as a panacea for everything.

Certainly, it is a panacea for a badly thought out public policy and rash and extravagent promises that cannot be kept. Senator Missen's paper continues:

> Others have no such merits, such as the proposed sale of the Commonwealth Bank (a necessary instrument, a watchdog, to keep private banks from ignoring public needs). Privatisation of Telecom and Australia Post are other dubious examples . . . Even the selling off of profitable parts of these enterprises will leave the ordinary citizen with a vast burden to pay for uneconomic (but necessary) services.

That is one thing that the Opposition in this State has focused on: somehow it will save the public money by selling off the profitable parts that contribute to State revenue and allow us to keep some control on the overall tax burden. The paper continues:

> We are left to wonder whether such enthusiasm for privatisation is warranted when one considers large subsidies that would have to be paid to successors of Telecom or TAA in paying for the provision of necessary services to the outback.

Indeed, it is extraordinary that a Party that supposedly represents rural, and regional interests has a bar of this policy, because they would be the people most directly and immediately impacted by such a policy. Senator Missen continues:

> Meanwhile, the speeches of Liberals extolling the virtues of privatisation are notably lacking in detail, both as to the reasons for disposal of public assets (save for an assertion of greater efficiency) and also as to the methods to be adopted.

It is about time that members opposite came clean about their policy and said what they intend to sell off in the sale of the century. However, I suppose that the bottom line is that it is an academic question as they will not be given the opportunity.

ENDURO EVENT

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Did the Minister of Transport, as Minister of Tourism before the most recent Cabinet reshuffle, give his support to a proposal by the Department of Tourism for Government funding to support a bid to stage the world six day Enduro event in South Australia in 1988, on the basis that the event would be conservatively worth $5.5 million to South Australia's tourist industry? I have been told that the Department of Tourism produced a benefits and disbenefits analysis of this proposal, which recommended that the Government should provide $25 000 to support the bid by the Auto Cycle Council of Australia to stage this prestigious event in the Barossa Valley. The department's decision was based on, among other factors, a conservative estimate that the event

would be worth $5.5 million to South Australia, that it would attract 6 000 international visitors, and that, if it were to be held in this State rather than in Queensland or Victoria, it would attract $100 000 from the Bicentennial Authority.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I did not have direct discussions with the people involved, but with my own department, which had been contacted by the organisers about the benefits that a six day Enduro event might have for South Australia. When I was Minister of Tourism, my only direct involvement was to seek to arrange an opportunity for the organisers to speak with me and, hopefully, the Premier. However, when I became Minister of Transport I was no longer involved in the discussions. So, the direct answer to the honourable member is, 'that', I was not involved, although I was contacted by the Department of Tourism, which indicated that people were anxious to speak to me about the six day Enduro event.

I point out that I have read some of the documentation. I believe that some of the figures in relation to patronage by interstate and international visitors to South Australia for the six day Enduro were somewhat exaggerated, and I commented on that. As the honourable member has directed this question to me (although it might well have been directed to the Premier), I should point out that the Government has not knocked back the six day Enduro event, which is obviously what members opposite are trying to imply. As my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport has already pointed out, he has not received a submission from the organisers involved: so, a submission has not been received. However, the Government has set up a working party to examine the economic, tourist, and environmental impacts of the event. The working party has been asked to report to the Government by 18 September.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The working party has been asked to report to Government by 18 September. It consists of officers of the Department of Recreation and Sport, the promoters, that is, Eric White and Associates, and the Adelaide Convention Bureau. The Enduro event has been offered to Australia as a bicentennial event, and South Australia is interested to have a proper look at the viability of the event. As this is of interest to the House and the people of South Australia generally, I point out that the reason that Eric White and Associates have selected South Australia is because of our proven record in relation to the Grand Prix and the three-day equestrian event. South Australia and this Government have performed magnificently in arranging key world events. Therefore, now when people want to come to Australia to stage world standard events it is South Australia that they want to come to. It is because of the Government's policies in South Australia that that is happening. Therefore, we do not need the advice or encouragement of members opposite. We have a proven record and we will continue to perform for the people of South Australia.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr GREGORY: Has the Deputy Premier heard of Opposition plans to sell or lease some of the State's more popular national parks as part of its privatisation policy?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Amid the noise, I could not hear the question. Will the honourable member please repeat it.

Mr GREGORY: Has the Deputy Premier heard of Opposition plans to sell or lease some of the State's more popular national parks as part of the privatisation program? My question is based on an understanding that amongst the list of publicly known enterprises being considered by the Opposition for lease or sale are national parks, and in particular the Cleland Conservation Park.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can well understand the embarrassment of the Opposition, hidden as it is under a thin veneer of risibility in this matter. If there is such a list, I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he should produce it as soon as possible, because I can well understand why there should be fears like this expressed in the community. The Opposition has to remember that there are at least three things to which people can point that would indicate that such an outcome, grotesque though it may seem to reasonable people, could be a live option for a Liberal Government.

First of all there is the sheer vagueness of the proposals relating to privatisation, and that is a matter to which the Premier has already referred. All community assets are under notice of privatisation until such time as the Leader of the Opposition might clear the air, in the remote chance that he shall be in a position to do anything.

Secondly, the Hon. Ian Tuxworth recently publicly indicated his support for selling off portions of the Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory. He is from the same ideological camp as honourable gentlemen opposite. Finally, I point out that in the national parks area, during the last time the Liberal Party occupied the Treasury benches, it attempted and in fact succeeded in its own bit of privatisation: remember the golf course at the Belair Recreation Reserve, so it has happened and one can well understand why people should be concerned that a more ambitious scheme might be in mind.

It is not possible to carry out the responsibilities which are enjoined upon the Minister and indeed upon Government under the National Parks and Wildlife Act with the sort of scheme about which people are concerned. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition and his shadow Minister in this matter that, if they want to clear the air, they should do so as quickly as possible.

ENDURO EVENT

Mr BECKER: This question is supplementary to those asked by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Coles. I should also point out that I am patron of the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia and I declare my pecuniary interest. Is the Premier aware that consultants engaged by the 20 000 member Auto Cycle Council of Australia, in their bid to stage the world six day Enduro event in the Barossa Valley in 1988, sought expert advice from his own department, the Department of Tourism, the Department of Recreation and Sport, local government, the Bicentennial Authority, the Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau, Qantas and Ansett, and, if so, why did he reject the advice of his own department and all of these other authorities by agreeing to the decision of his own Minister of Tourism, who has had less than a month's experience in the tourism portfolio, that South Australia should be deprived of the $5.5 million that would come into the State if we were to host this prestigious world championship? When was the working party that has just been announced by the Minister of Transport appointed and will this result in delaying the likelihood of this event coming to South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am surprised at the question asked by the honourable member. First, when I saw him get to his feet, I thought that he was going to deal with what we were told by members opposite was the great issue of the day, one in which he had a role, and I refer to the

Lyell McEwin Hospital matter. Apparently, that matter, which was going to be pursued to the end, has been forgotten. I can understand why the member for Hanson is not constrained to ask that question. Having done a very successful white-ant job on one of his colleagues in the shadow Cabinet whose record of mismanagement in her portfolio in Government has been exposed, he is obviously under orders to keep quiet. Having done his job of white-anting and undermining, and no doubt causing the mayhem that was intended, he is sitting there rather smugly.

The honourable member now asks a question not on that but on a subject already dealt with. Just about every facet of the question has already been answered in a statement made a moment ago by my colleague the Minister of Transport, who put certain information before the House. I suppose the member for Hanson is demonstrating that he was given a prepared question to ask and that he does not have the flexibility to sort out that it has already been dealt with; he should have screwed up the question and placed it in the wastepaper basket. A fine display of backbench flexibility!

I suggest that it was perhaps the shadow Minister of Tourism who is getting her own back by giving the member for Hanson a dolly question to bowl up. The prospect of holding the Enduro event has not been knocked back, abolished or rejected. In fact, the Minister of Transport has put the current state of play before the House: that is, the Government has set up a working party to examine the economic, tourist and environmental impact. It was done in consequence of a formal Cabinet discussion of the matter by my colleague in another place, the Minister of Tourism.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: When?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Following the Cabinet discussion.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: When was the Cabinet discussion?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Quite recently. I point out that this proposition was put before the Government by a group of consultants. The Minister of Recreation and Sport—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister of Recreation and Sport obviously has made a preliminary assessment of the proposal. My colleague the Minister of Transport (at that time Minister of Tourism) was also aware of it. As he has said, a meeting was requested with me, as Premier, to further discuss the matter. I said that, in the absence of further information in support of the proposal, it would be premature for me to deal with it. At that time there was a change of portfolio. Obviously, the new Minister of Tourism wanted to assess the proposition. That has occurred and we are now taking action as a result of that. It is extraordinary that, all that having been placed before the House by my colleague, an identical question has been read from a typed sheet immediately afterwards.

I repeat: the working party has been asked to report by 18 September. There are no delays or problems in that. As well as sport and recreation officers, the promoters—I am not sure at whose expense, but I think they were commissioned by the motorcycle group that will be sponsoring the event—have spent many thousands of dollars drawing up the proposals. The promoters will be involved, as will the Adelaide Convention Bureau. The Government expects to receive a report which will provide a basis for action. We must assess the finances, the feasibility and the environmental impact on the Barossa Valley.

I would be interested to receive feedback from the member for Kavel if at some stage that proves necessary. The intests of local government and the local community must be looked at. In that context I remind the House that, when we are promoting and sponsoring the Grand Prix in Adelaide, it is members opposite who constantly raise local objections, agitation, and support opposition from councils and others in an attempt to undermine the event. I would have thought that, if in fact that was not a hypocritical undermining but a sincere desire to assist local residents, those self-same interests should be looked at in support of this event. It is a massive event involving many thousands of motorbikes in the Barossa Valley. Clearly, there are environmental and social impacts which will have to be studied. It is responsible for the Government to do that before making any commitment. They are the facts of the situation, and that is where we are at the moment. The matter is being pursued, and the Government will announce its decision when it is able to make one.

SPECIAL PROJECTS UNIT

Mr FERGUSON: My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Is the Minister satisfied that proper planning procedures have been observed on all occasions where the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department has been involved in the development of applications for planning approval?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can only assume that the honourable member is referring to an editorial that appeared in the Adelaide *Advertiser* this morning. My comments are set in this context. The *Advertiser* has a fine record of rational discussion of issues of the day. It is in that respect, and probably has been for many years, the second best newspaper in the nation and we are spared the sort of 'pop' journalism, for example, that Sydney people have to suffer both in the morning and in the afternoon from their newspapers.

I therefore read with quite some interest and dismay this departure from that tradition this morning. This strange mishmash of purple prose, of statements which at best are plainly wrong and at worst are quite meaningless, would, I imagine, be received by members of the South Australian Planning Commission, the City of Adelaide, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission and most local government authorities as a gross insult, because it alleges—or says straight-out, in effect—that where there is a proposition for development, if the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department is involved, however tangentially, these development control authorities just roll over and cop it. That is what is said here about Mr Stephen Hains, Mr Anders and Mr Cook, members of the Planning Commission, the people appointed to that body by the Liberal Government, the people reappointed to that body for longer terms by this Government. That is being alleged by the City of Adelaide and various planning and development control authorities that have had to deal with propositions that have had some examination by the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department. I will deal with one or two matters in the editorial. The first is this:

> The Special Projects Unit in the Premier's Department, an unelected body—

it is not clear what is the force of that statement—

> has vested in itself such power that it can secretly develop plans and at the last minute—

I do not know what time frame is being referred to there—

> present them publicly as though for mere rubber-stamping.

That is the allegation. If the Premier's Special Projects Unit is involved, it is rubber stamped no matter who it happens to be. Whether it be a local government authority somewhere, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, or the

South Australian Planning Commission, some sort of signal is given that, because the Special Projects Unit is involved, approval will be automatic. The editorial continues:

> Even the Adelaide City Council's approval last night for the Rundle Mall proposal, despite the City of Adelaide plan, does not justify planning by stealth.

Where is the stealth involved? How is it that one can in any way say that involvement of the Special Projects Unit involves stealth? It is perfectly open to any planning authority to place a proposal on public exhibition and, in certain circumstances, both Acts require that that should occur.

The involvement of the Special Projects Unit does not in any way interfere with those powers. The editorial continues (and this is the bit that I cannot understand at all):

> When there is any criticism of such projects—criticism that time and access to the facts must make shallow—a little cosmetic change here and there keeps it at bay until the bulldozers render it redundant.

If I could have a translation into English of that statement I would be very grateful to the translator.

The plain fact is that the Special Projects Unit is not in any way a development control authority. No-one can point to any proposition with which it has been involved where any aspect of the normal planning procedures have been set aside. I heard an interjection a little while ago about Victor Harbor. I would have thought that Victor Harbor was a very good example of the way in which the Special Projects Unit is able to put together propositions which are environmentally and in an amenity sense far more realistic than are some of the propositions that come forward, without in any way setting aside any of the necessary independent procedures for approval.

The member for Alexandra would well know that there is a special planning body which operates in respect of the township of Victor Harbor and that that is part of a process which was initiated when the Hon. Murray Hill at one stage sacked the corporation down there. We know that that committee is chaired by a senior and well respected industrialist in South Australia—a person who was prominently associated with both the brewery and the Adelaide *News* for a long time. There is no suggestion that people like that would in any way draw back from their responsibilities under the legislation that is committed to them.

However, the plain facts of the matter are that there was a proposition that was placed before Victor Harbor, prior to the setting up of this body, for a shopping centre which was quite outside the rules of the game and what the planning documents had in mind. The Government was very concerned about this. Of course, Victor Harbor had already knocked back that original proposition, and it was not possible to get a re-examination of it.

The Special Projects Unit got in there and was able to put together a proposition for the further development of the existing shopping facilities in the town. Part of that was the building of a new primary school which I believe has also been extremely well received by the people of Victor Harbor.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The point is that it has been well received in relation to that matter. The Special Projects Unit—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —was able to put together a proposition which has been very well received but which, nonetheless, still has to go through the normal planning procedures. I make the point that I believe I bear some responsibility here. A journalist from the *Advertiser* rang me late last week and interviewed me about this matter. Obviously, I was not able to get the message across. Former schoolteachers always admit some responsibility, when their pupils fail, that perhaps they have not been as effective as teachers as they might have been. I assume that a good deal of this arises from a misunderstanding of how the planning process operates.

However, I make the point that there has been no interference with the planning procedures: there has been no interference with the Planning Act except as amended in this place. The Planning Act was brought down by a Liberal Government. We have attempted to amend it successfully in certain respects.

I conclude by saying that from time to time the *Advertiser* uses as its guru (its spokesman on these planning and development matters) a gentleman who was very prominently associated with the City of Adelaide for quite some time and who has roundly criticised the Act and the planning procedures in this State as being far too bureaucratic and too decentralised.

Part of the implication there has been that this Government has some sort of responsibility in this area, or that somehow the new Planning Act differs quite considerably from the Planning Act that it replaced when in fact there is a great deal of similarity at those two points. However, I do not think that the editorial writers of the *Advertiser* can have it both ways: do they support the contentions of that expert who from time to time is given a great deal of space in their columns to complain about what is seen as excessively bureaucratic procedures that obtain under the planning procedure, or do they now support the sort of thrust of the comments that are being made? Can we have some clarification, please?

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say when the Government will introduce legislation to reform workers compensation? Will it incorporate demands being made by the Trades and Labor Council? Last Friday's decision by the Trades and Labor Council has confirmed the completely misleading nature of the Government's taxpayer funded advertising of its workers compensation proposals. Last Friday, the Trades and Labor Council refused even to support the scheme in principle. I understand that the unions are demanding significant changes to key aspects of the Government's proposals, including those relating to common law and the level of benefits for injured workers. Last week, the Premier refused to give the House a commitment that the legislation would be introduced before the pending election. In view of this decision by the Trades and Labour Council, can the Premier indicate a timetable for the legislation, and will he say whether the Bill will incorporate the demands of the union, as occurred in Victoria?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At this stage I cannot say when the legislation will be introduced. As the honourable member knows, the White Paper has been published and circulated, and it is being considered. Two major employer organisations (the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Metal Industries Association of South Australia) have given their support in broad terms to the White Paper, but they have said that one or two matters of detail may have to be adjusted. However, the broad principles remain intact as a result of their consideration. They have not bowed to vested interests and pressure groups as members opposite appear to have done in some of their public statements in this area of compensation. The honourable member has misinterpreted the decision by the Trades and Labor Council and, if he read it carefully and knew something of the background, he would understand the process of consideration of the council. A series of meetings are to be held and

the package has in no way been rejected. In fact, the statement referred to made positive comments and also rejected arguments being put by two specific interest groups that it was considered should not be involved in the actual considerations. All of that suggests that the consultation process is proceeding well and, as soon as we can introduce the legislation, it will be introduced.

RATE CONCESSIONS

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what stage deliberations have reached on requests to grant pensioner remissions on water, sewerage and council rates, especially to eligible pensioners occupying unit accommodation in resident funded retirement villages? Since mid-1984, I have made representations about this matter on behalf of residents of the Sturt Retirement Village and the Executor Trustee and Agency Company. The Sturt Retirement Village, a commercial undertaking of Pioneer Homes, comprises 36 self-contained living units and incorporates communal facilities. The total complex is covered by one certificate of title, and occupation rights are granted in the form of a licence.

The residents, who have paid an average of about $50 000, contribute to a maintenance fund from which rates and taxes are paid. The purchase right of residents has excluded them from being classified as living in their principal place of residence and has disadvantaged them as regards pensioner remissions, as they are required to pay land tax, water, sewerage and council rates, without remissions that would have been available had they enjoyed title to the land. This has placed a heavy burden on the residents, many of whom have sold their home or principal place of residence to purchase a unit for security in old age, relying on their age pension as their only source of income. I believe that there are a number of these complexes being developed in the metropolitan area and that a growing number of aged persons are being placed at the disadvantage to which I have referred.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I thank the honourable member for the question and I take the opportunity to pay the highest possible tribute to her pursuit of this matter. True, the honourable member has been trying to obtain this remission for people in her district, but the results of her endeavours will benefit pensioners throughout the State who are in such circumstances. I am delighted to tell the honourable member and the House that Cabinet, having received my submission, has approved the following arrangement.

First, pensioner remissions for water, sewerage and council rates will be granted to pensioners who are the beneficial owners of units within resident funded retirement developments, such as the Sturt Retirement Village, and who satisfy the general income requirements of the pensioner remission scheme. These remissions will be provided on application by the individual and will be effective from 1 July 1985. The criteria under the Rates and Taxes Remission Act will be amended to provide clearly for these remissions. I again pay the highest tribute to the honourable member for her pursuit of the matter and give her credit for bringing into operation this arrangement, which will benefit not only people in the Sturt Retirement Village but other pensioners throughout the State.

CLEVE-KIMBA ROAD

Mr BLACKER: Has the Minister of Transport investigated a problem that has been experienced on the Cleve-Kimba road concerning access for the Cleve Area School bus? Further, has this road been taken over by the Highways Department as a rural arterial road or does the responsibility for the road still remain with local government? I understand that the road was to be taken over by the Highways Deprtment as a rural arterial road and that the maintenance and reconstruction of the road were therefore to become the responsibility of the Highways Department. I understand that that was to take place on 1 July but that, because of an administrative hiccup, the actual documentation had not been completed. During the rains in early August, the road suffered considerable damage, especially in the area of the Cleve hills where reconstruction work was in progress.

The road became impassable and the school bus had to be diverted around Mangalo, which meant that students had almost an extra hour's travel on the bus. I am now told that the road is not yet passable for the school bus and that the bus is still being diverted around Mangalo. The concern originally expressed to me was that, because no one was legally responsible for the road at that time, no remedial action was being taken. Will the Minister say what is the present position and when it is expected that the bus will be able to travel on that road again?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for speaking about this matter both to the Minister of Education and to me and for bringing our attention to the problem, especially as it concerns the school bus not being able to traverse its normal route. The fact that the bus must go via Mangalo results in additional time and cost in running the bus. I gave the honourable member an undertaking that I would consider this matter to see whether I could give him an early report on the Government's intention concerning funding in this area but, unfortunately, the allocation of road funds is still being considered. It was hoped that the change from the local to the arterial road, to which the honourable member referred, would be effective as from 1 July but arrangements have not been finalised: the documentation has not been authorised and the signatures have not been obtained. Therefore, at present the control of the road is still with the local council: it is still a local road and it will remain so and under the authority of the local council until the changes have been effected.

This will be done as early as practicable. The department and local government are working on this matter at the moment, and, as soon as I am in a position to advise the honourable member of the change and to provide details of the funding that goes with that change, I will do so. In the meantime, I am prepared to acknowledge the representations that the honourable member has made to me as Minister of Transport and to my colleague. We are aware of the problem that exists, and the position will be remedied as quickly as possible.

BUILDING INDEMNITY FUND

Mr M.J. EVANS: I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare in his capacity as Acting Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will the Minister assure this House that a building indemnity fund will be brought into operation as a matter of urgency to protect the public from the consequences of a builder going into liquidation? As the Minister would be aware, a receiver has been appointed to manage the affairs of Challenge Homes Pty Ltd, leaving up to 60 families with little or no protection for the significant sums that they have invested in their partly built homes.

Although the standard form HIA contract used by Challenge Homes contains a requirement for the builder to take out insolvency insurance, I am informed that, in relation to many recent contracts, the company has failed to comply with this contractual requirement, leaving the owners with-

out protection. Building indemnity fund legislation was enacted by Parliament over 10 years ago, but to date this has not been brought into operation. Had it been brought into operation, the present crisis would not have occurred.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to again give the assurance that I publicly gave last week, namely, that the necessary regulations will be brought down as a matter of urgency. Last week I intimated that there was further legislation (subsequent to that to which the honourable member has referred). That legislation has been the subject of prolonged discussions with a number of community groups, particularly the insurance industry and local government bodies.

A considerable shift has occurred in responsibility at law for building matters and local government liability for approvals that is given in the course of construction of dwellings and other buildings, and that also has had to be taken into account. I stated last week that any people who are affected, or who believe that they are affected, by the operations of the building company referred to should as a matter of urgency contact the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs to seek advice from that department on their rights and ascertain what should be done immediately and in the longer term to protect their interests.

I point out to the honourable member and the House that a voluntary code is in existence. That is evidenced in Housing Industry Association standard contacts. There is a provision there for indemnity insurance where a builder dies or becomes insolvent, and that is followed by most builders in this State. In the instance referred to, I understand that the building company put a line through that clause in a number of contracts; in other circumstances the company agreed to provide that insurance, although it could not place it with an insurance company, and that therefore left the consumers without that form of coverage. When the regulations have passed through Parliament and the legislation is proclaimed, mandatory obligations will be placed on builders to provide that form of insurance in this State.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 3.25 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address, and such other members as care to accompany me, to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

[Sitting suspended from 3.15 to 3.32 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech adopted by this House, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the fourth session of the Forty-fifth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all the matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing on your deliberations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: During Question Time this afternoon the Premier made what I considered to be an unfair and unwarranted attack on me. I wish to explain to the Premier and to the House that I was unable to ask any questions concerning the Lyell McEwin Hospital, because question on notice No. 32 still remains on the Notice Paper. My question is: what were the findings of the auditor's audit of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for the years ended 30 June 1983 and 1984, and what remedial action has been taken?

It is necessary for me to check the tabling of the documents that were laid in the House today by the Premier. I also wish to check those documents because the Minister of Health wrote to me on 1 August, which letter I received on 13 August, wherein he gave me three paragraphs concerning the auditor's findings. I would like to read the letter, because I think it is most important. The letter states:

The Lyell McEwin Health Service received a qualified auditor's report for the year ended 30 June 1983. The auditor, Mr D.J. Venn, partner of Dean, Newbery and Partners—Chartered Accountants—stated that in his opinion the accounting and financial functions including the overall system of financial internal control of the health service was inadequate. In particular, Mr Venn was not prepared to state that the balance of outstanding debtors, as at 30 June 1983, could be relied upon as being the total amount recoverable as of that date. It was also stated that in his opinion the service had not adhered to the 1982-83 revenue collection guidelines for hospitals as formally outlined by the South Australian Health Commission. For the year ended 30 June 1984 the auditor qualified the financial statements in that he was not prepared to state that the details relating to the reconciliation of outstanding patient accounts, and the categorisation of those accounts, could be relied on.

As all members know, questions on notice are answered through the Cabinet system: Cabinet approves the answers, which are then tabled in Parliament, so my concern to check the documents tabled today is, first, whether the Minister misled me in his reply of 1 August and, second, whether he attempted to cover up the issue by bypassing the Cabinet system of Government.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 498.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In supporting the second reading, I reaffirm that the Opposition supports the Grand Prix. We have recently been criticised for questioning a few factors of the Grand Prix, but principally our questions have related to costs. I think any Opposition has the right to ask those sorts of questions, particularly when you have two official publications, published within two months of each other, which talk about the cost of the Grand Prix and the total cost given differs by some $4 million. As I said in my Address in Reply speech, the official report to Parliament put the cost of the Grand Prix at just over $11 million and the document 'Adelaide Alive' put the approximate cost of the Grand Prix at some $15 million. I think that it is the right and privilege of the Opposition to question those sorts of costs and those questions have not yet been answered by this Government.

The reason this Bill is before the House is because of the poor drafting of the original Bill by the Government in its obvious haste to establish the board and the consequences flowing therefrom. The question of proprietary rights and its consequent inclusion in the Bill was not correctly set out, in other words, what we have is a situation where we now have a closing of the gate after the horse has bolted. Basically, I am concerned to protect the people who have

legally manufactured or ordered products, as they have taken outside advice to manufacture goods which they are going to sell at retail level. Both small and large business are involved in this area, so we have the total broad spectrum of business that is concerned about any retrospective legislation.

I think it is important that we protect any future entrepreneurial effort both within and outside any licensing arrangements. I think it is absolutely critical that people know exactly where they stand with any licensing arrangement. Again, this should have been spelt out clearly in the original legislation.

Obviously, the Opposition recognises the need to protect the logo and any official names. That sort of protection has been set out within the Jubilee 150 Board legislation. The logo has been clearly defined and I am not critical of the board for not having the logo in the original Bill, because obviously at that stage it had not been designed, but it seems quite unusual that some nine months later we are being asked to register that official logo for the first time.

In relation to official names, it is again disappointing that this problem was not dealt with in the original Bill. I am also surprised that the board has taken such a narrow attitude towards the granting of licences and has not taken the opportunity to spread the use of licences broadly instead of granting licences at a fairly high cost to only one individual in a particular area.

I am concerned that there is a threat to businesses that have legitimately taken legal advice, had this advice ratified by several lawyers to check that they were within the prescription of the Bill, only to find that they have now been subjected to threats and letters, when obviously there was no legal backing to those threats. If there were some legal backing, we would not have this Bill before us today. I believe that the threats made by members of the office staff of the Grand Prix board to retailers is unwarranted and I would like to point out that that is the sort of thing that discourages small business entrepreneurs who wish to be involved in this profit-making venture. As the Premier has often stated, one of the major reasons for having the Grand Prix in Adelaide is for the economic spin-off to our State.

Of course, the major beneficiaries will be small businesses. If they are to be threatened with action at this point, having looked at the law previously and found that they could proceed, it is quite untenable. As I said earlier, we support the use of the logo and the use of official words. As is noted in relation to the amendments made in another place, there has been a considerable extension in the use of official words, and I support that wholeheartedly. However, there are a couple of problems in relation to the official names.

The use of the names 'Australian', 'Adelaide' and 'Grand Prix' either singularly or in any combination concerns us. We intend to hold out any amendment which would signal the introduction of any combination of those names in the Bill. As I said, the names 'Australian' and 'Adelaide' are obviously in common usage. No-one would be able to register those names as trademarks. As we know, 'Grand Prix' has a very broad connotation and is used in tennis, on bikes, sweat shirts, sandshoes and boat races. In fact, it was mentioned only the other day that we now have a Grand Prix yacht race, and it is also used for motorcycle races; people are running small lotteries known as 'Grand Prix Lotteries', and the other day the *News* began the 'Adelaide Grand Prix Report; and I suppose organisations such as Rotary will organise Grand Prix barbecues. Will all those events come within the terms of the Bill? We do not support that, and it is important that we make that clear.

I am concerned that legitimate traders, who have manufactured products within the law, are now being accused of producing pirate products, and the suggestion is that they are breaking a licensing contract. The legal advice that they have received from the highest sources suggests that that is quite incorrect and that any use of those names by anyone should not be condemned by Parliament. It has been suggested to these people that they will have been pirating once this Bill has passed. Again, that is pre-empting Parliament, and I think that should be noted.

As I said earlier, there is no question about the legality of some of the products being used in relation to the law as it stands at the moment. Clearly, those traders have their rights and they should be allowed to continue. I congratulate the Government on recognising that there is a need for some retrospectivity in this area. I note that the retrospectivity provided for in the Bill has been accepted by the Government.

I have spoken about the proscribing of names or logos by regulation many times in this House. I appeal to the Government again to place within the Bill any other regulation or proscribing of names so that they can all be fully discussed. The Government would be aware that regulations can only be looked at by Parliament when we are sitting. There could be a situation within the next three months before the Grand Prix is run when this House may not be sitting, for whatever reason, and therefore cannot consider any objection to the regulations.

The other area of concern is that, if we go outside the original scope of the legislation and become too strong in relation to the licensing of goods, people may manufacture items in other States and offer them for sale in this State. As we all know, there is no law to prevent anyone from manufacturing goods in another State and then offering them for sale in this State, because there is a constitutional right to transfer goods across State boundaries. I am concerned that small manufacturers who are currently involved in this dispute may be forced to manufacture their goods interstate. I think that would be a tragedy for our State.

In his reply, I ask the Minister to spell out how the licensing system is working, what sort of requirements exist for any of the licensing deals, what is the flexibility, and what up-front payments are required (are standard payments required or are they negotiable)? A major concern of the small operators is what does the licensing system really entail?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the Bill and certainly endorse the excellent speech made by my colleague the member for Bragg, who has effectively covered the substantive points of the Bill. Obviously, my interest in the Bill relates to its very beneficial effect on the tourist industry in this State as a result of this event. However, I share the reservations of the member for Bragg, and I should think anyone who views these matters from a commonsense point of view would regard the designating of the names 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix' as being restricted to those who have licences to hold them.

I believe that those names are in such common usage that it would be very difficult for people, even those with the best will in the world, to avoid the use of those names. I refer particularly to restaurants, hotels and those in the hospitality industry generally who may hold functions on the eve of the Grand Prix and who might find themselves at odds with the law as it is now about to be written. They could be barred from describing their functions as Australian Formula One Grand Prix dinner, celebration or cocktail party. I doubt whether that is the Government's intention, but that will be the effect of the legislation if it is passed. I have no quarrel with the specific expressions 'Adelaide Alive' and 'Fair Dinkum Formula One' because quite obviously they are titles designed exclusively for Adelaide.

They are not in general use and they are virtually in the form of a slogan.

It is interesting to look at today's edition of the *News* and query whether upon the passage of the Bill the *News* will be breaking the law in using the term 'Adelaide Grand Prix Report'. The *News* does not use the Grand Prix logo but uses a design of its own. There is nothing to stop anyone from using the black and white checkered flag, but they cannot use it in the form of the logo with the flying kangaroo.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It all depends on one's point of view and location. I can see nothing to stop a hotel or any member of the hospitality industry describing its function as an Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix dinner. I would be surprised and disappointed if the Government were to prosecute any member of the hospitality industry that engaged in such publicity. It would seem that there would be literally no other way to accurately describe functions held on that weekend, not to mention the number of goods and services that may also be provided. I have noted in some retail stores a windcheater which certainly would be well within the law and which is an extremely imaginative use of the event to sell goods. It simply states, 'Adelaide, Vroom Vroom'.

The member for Bragg has covered the point and I do not wish to be repetitive. I simply query the definition in clause 2 which states that 'official Grand Prix insignia' means the names 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix', as it will be literally impossible to police and extraordinarily embarrassing for the Government if it does pursue charges against people who unwittingly use such words (and there will be many of them). One could also conclude by reiterating the criticism of the member for Bragg that the Government was lax in introducing the original legislation and failing to take account of that issue. At the same time I acknowledge that the Parliament itself did not raise the issue.

Mr Hamilton: Perhaps the Opposition was lax in not picking it up.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have pointed out that Parliament itself was lax in not raising the issue. It is a lesson for the future and one that I hope will be taken account of.

In conclusion, I hope for the sake of the success of the Grand Prix that this legislation is workable. I hope that the ordinary small business, which is entitled to and we hope will make a profit out of this event, is not going to be penalised by a legalistic system that will make it very difficult for small business to profit in the way that we all want it to do.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I support the proposition as it is, although not with enthusiasm. That is true of my colleagues who have spoken. I do not accept the argument put up by the member for Coles that Parliament was lax in not picking up the issue and that we should have covered the right of the board to preserve certain names in the manufacture of foods or in advertising. I thought that the purpose of the Grand Prix was not only to have people come here to view it but also to encourage entrepreneurs in this State to make and create goods and ideas for advertising, promotion and publicity, as well as jobs in this State for the benefit of this State. Suddenly, we say that there is a problem and that some people have thought of ideas and ways to make money or ways to create jobs, or ways of using material that others have to make, thereby creating jobs further down the line. We do not like it, because the board is not getting as much as it should.

Let me draw a comparison. When we gave the marketing of the Grand Prix to a marketing firm, we were virtually obliged to give it to that firm because the Packer organisation had world control of publicity for all Grand Prix. By registering his name through the world organisation he had our State and every other Grand Prix promoter as a country or business well and truly entwined and not able to play the free market. That is why we lost the major part of the printing for the Grand Prix and will lose most of the rest of it to an Eastern States printery in which the Packer organisation has a major interest, if not total control.

Today we are saying that we want to do the same with certain words on behalf of a board that we have set up to promote the Grand Prix in South Australia within and outside the State, and perhaps manage and control it in relation to the development of the track and whatever else goes with it. We do not want only to preserve the official insignia but try to preserve words that are simply in common use. Some smart high school students may decide to produce T-shirts using their own facilities carrying the words 'Australian Grand Prix'. They are likely to be questioned as to whether they bought the shirt with or without the writing. I do not know whether they would be liable in law if they have printed it on the T-shirt themselves. If they wanted to walk around the streets promoting the Grand Prix and be a part of the scene whilst saving cost to themselves by using a T-shirt that they already own, I do not know whether they would be liable. However, they could be questioned if they used without the board's permission any words that we decide to make unlawful.

I can understand the board's concern. I wonder how the Jubilee 150 will fare, because the local Apex Club in Stirling has painted the official insignia for the Jubilee 150 on a hitching post. I hope that that insignia is not registered to the point where the local Apex Club is liable: my son painted the sign and he may have a problem. We should not go overboard because someone happens to use the words in a way that we had not expected them to be used. The time period is so short that the more people who promote it the better. If they are making a buck out of it, what does it matter? If we failed as a Parliament to pick it up, as some people have suggested, bad luck! I did not fail. I was quite happy to let as many people as possible use the words. It does not worry me as that is the way it should be.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member suggests that I am not paying for it. The more business we can create in this State the better. The point has been made that, if we impose too many restrictions here, people can manufacture goods over the border and bring them in, and we will have problems. If they manufacture and sell over the border to the thousands of people we hope will come here, we will lose. A South Australian manufacturer may have to pay more, because he has to pay something to the board for the licence. Those who manufacture goods over the border perhaps have friends to whom they can send gifts. People can buy them at a cheaper rate.

If I am wrong in that assumption, someone should tell me, although I do not believe that I am. I believe that that is the way it will work. I say, 'Good luck!' We have simply protected a few words for the sake of the board to give it a few more dollars. When we look at the amount involved compared with what we are spending as a State, it would be peanuts. People in the Eastern States can manufacture what they like, sell it to people coming here, or even advertise through the post. People can use mail orders, and we would have difficulty stopping them as it would be quite lawful. What we are doing is a bit of a joke. I have no real opposition to it as I do not believe that it will achieve a lot.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Although I will support the Bill, I express concern at the attempt being made by the Government well after the horse has bolted suddenly to start putting clamps on local companies in the way in which they have used the words 'Australian Formula One Grand Prix', 'Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix' and other appropriate words. I am also concerned (and other members have already expressed their concern) that this will impose restrictions upon South Australian companies.

It does not impose the same restrictions upon companies interstate manufacturing goods interstate because, of course, South Australian law does not apply in other States. Certainly, there is every chance that interstate companies will then flog the products very widely. I would not be at all surprised to find that some of them might come to South Australia. Certainly, interstate companies will take advantage of the Grand Prix and this State will miss out completely.

I have already expressed reservation about the extent to which orders for formal contract work for the Grand Prix board, initiated by this Government, have gone interstate. On a previous occasion I expressed my concern about the fact that the auctioneering of various State Government number plates, organised by the Department of Transport, is being given to an interstate rather than to a South Australian auctioneer, who has assured me that he has the full experience and capability to carry out auctioneering of those number plates. A South Australian company will auction some of the historic number plates in October. If it is good enough for a South Australian company in October, why is it not good enough for a South Australian company as part of the Grand Prix?

I reveal today that huge orders for Grand Prix clothing have also been placed with interstate firms. That clothing could have been produced here in South Australia: nylon jackets, cloth caps and T-shirts are being manufactured in New South Wales and Victoria, even though there are South Australian companies with a capability to do that work. Half a million T-shirts being made and printed for the Adelaide Grand Prix will be distributed throughout Australia. These T-shirts are being made in Victoria, although the printing is being done in South Australia.

Mr Ferguson: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would think that the honourable member would say 'Hear, hear!' to the fact that they should be manufactured in South Australia. That is where the real value is. It is hopeless for the honourable member opposite, who has, as we know, a history in the printing union, to support that printing union but to turn down the South Australian workforce and manufacturers when it comes to making the garments.

The T-shirts are being mainly made by Maryborough and Nile—two company names. Special Australian Grand Prix nylon jackets and cloth caps are being made by Sunburster Sportswear of Lismore, in northern New South Wales, yet some South Australian companies have assured me that they have not even been approached to make these Grand Prix products.

I have been in touch personally with the apparel manufacturers organisation, which is part of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and have been given names of South Australian companies that make these products. I have been in touch with some of them, and they assure me that they have not been approached to make the products although they have the capabilities to do so. They have not even been asked for a price.

I ask the Minister responsible for this legislation what is the logic of our Premier launching on Sunday a $12 million export drive when his own Government will not ensure that we use South Australian companies for a local product? It makes an absolute mockery of what the Premier said on Sunday that we have a five year program to build up local manufacturing industry when in the same week we find that his Government has allowed a $500 000 order for T-shirts for the Adelaide Grand Prix to go to several Victorian companies, for the nylon jackets and the cotton caps to go to a New South Wales company, and for the auctioneering of the historic number plates (issued directly by his own Department of Transport) to go to a New South Wales company.

The Labor Party of this State has the hide to stand up and say as its slogan 'We want South Australia to win', yet it gives contract after contract to companies interstate even without asking companies in this State to participate. At the same time, the Premier launches a $12 million campaign to increase exports of South Australian manufactured products. That is how much sincerity there is in the recent policy announcements of the Premier as he leads up to this election.

We can place as much faith in those promises before the election as we can place on his previous promise before the last one that he would not increase taxation or introduce any new taxes. The list of contracts gets longer and longer for work being done interstate for the Grand Prix: the catering contracts have gone to an interstate firm; half the publicity and promotion work contract has gone to an interstate firm; auctioneering of special number plates and printing of colour publicity material has gone interstate. The manufacture of some 500 000 T-shirts, which is a significant order, and all the nylon jackets is to be done interstate, and the Minister is trying to make something of the fact that some of them have gone to South Australia. I am aware of that.

Let me go out to the companies that manufacture these things and tell them that the Minister and Labor Party members are trying to defend and in fact support the policy at present of giving these contracts to New South Wales and Victorian companies. That is what I will do: I will indicate that the Minister sat there with a smile on his face and said that it was good stuff and showed a bit of entrepreneural flair on his Government's behalf. Perhaps the Minister might like to tell us in his reply where the grandstand structural support material is being manufactured. Could he indicate what State it will come from? Is it coming predominantly from South Australia?

I challenge him to give us that answer in his reply. It is ironic that those contracts and the work are going interstate. The member for Henley Beach is trying to defend and promote his Government's policy. It is ironic that this work is going interstate while the Government has introduced into Parliament special legislation to restrict opportunities for South Australian companies to make goods related to the Grand Prix.

I assure the House that I support the Grand Prix: at the same time I support South Australian industry and employment for South Australians. I will stand up and criticise any Government that does not give a South Australian company a fair and reasonable chance to participate in a South Australian event such as the Grand Prix although, if a company puts in a tender price that is unrealistically high and cannot meet the standard, it deserves not to get the job. I am not trying to defend weak and inefficient industry that is too expensive. However, companies must at least be given a chance.

I am told by those companies that they have not been given the chance; they have not even been invited to participate or put forward a price. As I said, I will support the Bill but it concerns me that this move will be a further nail in the coffin of local companies trying to produce goods in competition with interstate firms. I would be far more

willing to support this Bill if the South Australian Government had been a little keener to make sure that South Australian companies secured the contracts right from the very beginning, but it has not done that. Again, it makes an absolute mockery of the Labor Party slogan for this State, 'We want South Australia to win'.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill, although at times it was hard to realise that members opposite were supporting it. This is an important matter that needs to be clarified. Members opposite seem to be raising a conflict between, on the one hand, having laws or regulations with respect to protection of the intellectual property vested in the Grand Prix and flowing to the benefit of this State and, on the other hand, letting free market forces flow. That is where some members seem to have difficulty in coming to grips with how far the law should go.

This is the first opportunity that any Australian State has had to conduct such an event, and undoubtedly there will be teething difficulties in establishing the law and trading practices surrounding an event of this magnitude. However, the provisions with respect to retrospectivity and other elements of the legislation have been thoroughly debated in another place and clarified there.

I give notice that in Committee I intend to move an amendment to include two further groups of words. The member for Bragg referred to the use of common words, and his points would be valid if those words were used in an isolated way. However, the words 'Adelaide' and 'Australian' are protected as they are used together with the words 'Grand Prix' and not in an isolated way. This matter was debated in another place, and I understand that the Opposition spokesman sought further clarification from the Government regarding the use of those words. Since then, we have received from the Chief Executive Officer of the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport a clear statement on the availability of the use of the words 'Australian Grand Prix' and the protection of the name of the event to be conducted in this State. His telex, headed 'Australian Grand Prix', states:

> The Confederation of Australian Motor Sport is the organisation appointed by the Federation International de l'Automobile (the FIA is the only international sporting power governing four wheel motor sport), as the controlling body of motor sport in Australia. We hereby confirm the motor racing event titled 'Australian Grand Prix' can only be held once per year in Australia and is sanctioned only through the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport. This sanction has been granted to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board whilst a formula one event is being promoted by that board.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> J.A. Keeffe, Chief Executive Officer, Confederation of Australian Motor Sport.

So, that is why we believe that the grouping of the words is valid. Indeed, a perusal of the debate in another place will further explain the reason why amendments are being moved in this place in the form that they are.

I now refer to some of the matters that have been raised by members opposite. First, the member for Davenport strayed far from the reality of the letting of contracts by the Grand Prix Board. In this respect I refer to the general licensing provisions of the board. I understand that those provisions are indeed negotiable. This is one area where this State will receive, through the Grand Prix Board, substantial revenue which will allow for the recompense of money spent on staging this event. On any perusal of the facts, it is clear that the South Australian community and a wide range of businesses in this State will be given a considerable fillip by this activity and that such benefits will flow on to the citizens of South Australia.

As many as 32 licensing agreements have been approved at this stage, and others are about to be approved or are being considered. In this respect, a minimum royalty must be guaranteed and that minimum royalty will be based on estimated minimum gross sales. Generally, the overall requirement is 10 per cent based on gross sales. Certain considerations have been taken into account in the licensing. For instance, it is required that there be quality control of goods that are to bear the logo and to be identified with the Grand Prix. There must be appropriate outlets: that is, the proper spread and an ability to sell the goods across the community. Preference is given to those companies that are based in Adelaide, using materials that have been manufactured in this State, or employing staff from this State. Indeed, the overall majority of licensees have fulfilled those conditions.

The member for Bragg referred to certain clothing and other apparel items. However, I take issue with him when he says that manufacturers have not been approached. After all, this is an area of entrepreneurial activity, and everyone in the community should be able to use initiative in selling goods. Manufacturers should be able to get into the swim and see what they can do to promote their own product. I therefore reject the argument advanced by the honourable member, as well as his assertion that South Australian firms are being overlooked. If a licence holder has received a large order, that order comes from the market place and not from the Government. The Government is not in the business of buying T-shirts or silver spoons, etc. The market place will buy them on the basis of where they can get the best deal and the best product. It is the cut and thrust of the market place that determines that sort of issue.

For the record, I have the following list of licences that have been granted to South Australian firms. A licence has been granted to a firm in Mile End to produce hats and caps. A firm in Stepney has been granted a licence to produce jackets, knit shirts, track pants and rugby tops. An Adelaide firm has been licensed to produce ties and scarves bearing the logo; a Stirling firm, sweat shirts and T-shirts; a St Agnes firm, T-shirts bearing the insignia and logo. So it goes on: many South Australian firms have been licensed to sell goods in connection with the Grand Prix.

A licence has been granted to a South Australian firm to sell beer in bottles bearing the logo, and another has been licensed to sell souvenir envelopes. Other examples include the following: a Wayville firm has been licensed to sell flags and bunting; a North Adelaide firm, cigarette lighters and show bags; a Glen Osmond firm, posters; a Mile End South firm, stickers and labels; a Para Hills West firm, wall plaques; an Adelaide liquor firm, Grand Prix port; another Adelaide firm, pewter tankards; an Adelaide firm, copper wall plaques; a Glynde firm, souvenirs including teaspoons, lapel pins, rulers, coasters, stubbie holders, beer steins, postcards, erasers, litter bags, and wallets; a Reynella firm, wines and champagne; an Adelaide firm, jewellery and medallions.

So, members will see that there is substantial involvement of local industry, and I suggest that this is a matter of market forces and the cut and thrust of the market place. Obviously, the Grand Prix Board is giving a weighting to local firms wherever it can. Concerning major development contracts, a perusal of the facts, if members opposite want to peruse them, will show that local labour and local materials are being used wherever possible.

While a number of these firms have their head office in another State, every effort is being made to maximise local labour, whether in relation to materials for the grandstands, track construction or catering, etc. It is interesting to note the undertakings given by the catering firm to employ local labour and to use foodstuffs made here. Training programs are being undertaken at Regency Park School of Food and

Catering and at other places to train people to serve visitors who come to South Australia for the Grand Prix.

The facts do not bear out the allegations made by the member for Davenport. His comments this afternoon indicate the sort of destructive and negative criticism of this project by the Opposition, and that does the business community and manufacturing sector of this State no credit at all. The Government dissociates itself completely from that sort of carping criticism.

The member for Bragg referred to the application of this law across the country. First, I suggest that the copyright law, providing for a protection of property, is a federal law, which applies across the nation. If firms outside South Australia manufacture goods and attempt to sell them in this State, contrary to the provisions of the laws of this State, those firms will run the gauntlet of the law. We stand by the laws that we make here, and if the interpretation applied by the member for Fisher and other members is applied, indeed a large part of the legislation enacted by this Parliament would be rendered inoperable.

We do not operate on that basis in this federation: this Parliament does have substantial powers to enact laws, and as a Parliament we uphold those powers. Throughout the country different provisions apply from State to State, and, therefore, if the circumstances as outlined by members opposite were maintained, State Parliaments would have very little power indeed.

The member for Coles referred to the pernicious interpretation (if I can put it that way) by those who have authority vested in them under this legislation. Proposed new section 28a (2) refers to 'a person who, without the consent of the board, in the course of a trade or business . . .', and thus we are dealing with those people who are using this logo as a central or essential point in the conduct of a trade or business. We are not about to prosecute the mothers club of a school because they have a dance or a dinner on the night of the Grand Prix. This applies to any other legitimate advancement of the cause of the Grand Prix and its general and accepted promotion, which is welcomed by the Government. That is the Government's intention, as indeed has been described in the Bill. With those comments I trust that I have replied adequately to the queries raised by the Opposition. Once again I thank members for their support of this measure, and I foreshadow the amendments that I will move in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 1, line 25— After 'expressions' insert ' "Australian Grand Prix", "Adelaide Grand Prix" '.

During the second reading debate I explained to members the Government's intention in this respect.

Mr INGERSON: The Opposition opposes the amendment. As I said during the second reading debate, the Opposition sees no logic in the inclusion of the expressions 'Australian Grand Prix' and 'Adelaide Grand Prix' in the definition to which the amendment refers. The Opposition believes that these are simply words in common usage and that they apply in a far more general sense than purely and simply to motor racing. Accordingly, the Opposition opposes this amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter (teller), M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Payne and Wright. Noes—Messrs Mathwin and Oswald.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Insertion of new ss. 28a and 28b.'

Mr INGERSON: Earlier in his explanation on trade and goods the Minister did not cover the situation pertaining to the use of services, for example, the *Advertiser* and the *News*. Are those companies exempted from the use of official insignia, in other words, newspapers generally?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I do not think that there can be any hard and fast rule; this is a matter of interpretation. As I explained, it needs to be in the course of a trade or business and the use of that needs to be examined in each set of circumstances. However, I think that there is a relatively clear distinction between the sale and manufacture of goods bearing the logo, insignia or some other identification relating to the Grand Prix and those who use that by way of information, such as in the case of newspapers, or incidental to some other course of business. One must be considered as general promotion (and that is welcomed), whilst the other is a trading practice in order to improve profits and should therefore be liable to the impost under this legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 5, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIVE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 507.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I wish to outline the reasons for my Party introducing this Bill to control the clearance of vegetation. It is very necessary to conserve vegetation in South Australia—it is not as though there is a lot left to conserve. In 1983 a magazine called *Habitat* published an article which referred to halting the decline of South Australian bushland. It made a number of references to the clearance of bushland in Australia and South Australia in particular. The article stated:

> The broadscale clearance of native vegetation since European settlement for crop and pasture development has markedly altered the landscape in South Australia.

In his work the author assessed aerial photographs that were taken during 1945 and again during the period between 1968 and 1972. The result of that research showed that there had been an intensive clearance of native vegetation. The article went on to state:

> . . . clearing has been intensive with few substantial areas of native vegetation remaining. In the Mt Lofty Ranges, 96 per cent of the original vegetation has been cleared and in the lower South-East 93 per cent.

As one can imagine, this had a considerable effect on the native fauna, because it removed its habitat. The article went on to state:

> In the Mount Lofty Ranges almost half the original species of mammals have become rare or extinct. In the lower South-East at least 10 native mammals are believed to have become extinct, five very rare and another 10 species uncommon due to the loss of habitat.
>
> In parts of the Mallee, clearing has not been so extensive with substantial areas of vegetation remaining. Although 92 per cent of the original vegetation has been cleared from Yorke Peninsula, on Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island the figures are much

lower, 62 per cent and 57 per cent respectively. Overall 75 per cent of the agricultural regions had been cleared by the mid-1970s. In much of the remaining vegetation the understorey has been degraded by grazing.

The clearance has also had another effect: when clearing land, in many areas the farmers left large trees in order to provide shelter for the stock, but since the clearance there has been a considerable decline in the number of these remaining trees. The author took sample sites of 1 000 hectares in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the lower South-East. The article further stated that since 1945 there had been between an 8 and 32 per cent decline, with an average of 17 per cent. Of course, in the wine growing areas of Padthaway, Coonawarra and Keppoch there has been a significant decrease in the number of trees because of secondary clearance due to vineyard development.

The author also made the secondary point that, with the advent of large machinery in farming production, it meant that the trunks of trees left in paddocks had been removed so that the larger machinery could move around more easily. The article made some very significant comments in relation to what was happening and the need to retain our trees and native vegetation.

In conjunction with another person, the author of the earlier article had another article published in the December 1984 *Habitat* in which they went into greater detail about the tree decline in South Australia. They referred to the earlier work and then went on in more detail. I think it is interesting to note that the article stated:

Tree losses since the 1940s varied from eight to 32 per cent, with losses as high as 64 per cent at one site in the South-East.

The authors also stated that they believed that the red gum and the blue gum were considered to be the longest lived and were well able to withstand agricultural land-use pressures. They then went on to refer to what they considered were a number of factors that caused tree decline. They refer to insect attack. When trees were left in isolation in the paddocks, instead of being in close association with similar eucalypts and other trees, they were subject to concentrated attack by insects, with a disastrous effect on the trees.

The secondary clearance meant that trees were being felled, not only to allow the use of large agricultural or farming machinery but also to provide sleepers and timber. The animals using the paddocks, particularly cattle and horses, were ringbarking the trees. The other aspect is that there is a tendency by the people clearing the land to leave the largest and oldest of the trees. We know that trees, like everything on earth, as they age, die. It may have been wiser to leave the younger trees and remove the older, larger trees. That did not happen; consequently, we have a decline in numbers as a result of old age.

The other reason is that some trees can coexist only with others of the same species. When trees of that species are removed, those remaining die. In fact, many *Eucalyptus Leucoxylon* have died because they were left in paddocks with no natural association. Further, a lot of Australian flora is sensitive to artificial fertiliser. The build-up of stock excreta has increased the nutrient level of the soil and has brought about some tree decline. Root trampling is another cause. Mistletoe and wildlife damage also has an effect, but not as much. There are implications from the tree decline. Studies reveal that tree decline occurred over the past 50 years but appeared to accelerate since the late 1960s.

As trees are lost from the rural landscape and not replaced, the environment becomes less favourable to those remaining. The fewer the trees, the greater the damage by insects; the greater the stock pressure and exposure; the less natural habitat for predators and the greater the likelihood of soil salting and erosion. Without corrective action, the rate of decline can be expected to continue to increase in the future. The present status of farm trees in South Australia indicates a need for increased community awareness of their value and current demise. The replacement of lost and dying trees is imperative if the rate of decline is to be stopped. It is not a phenomenon associated only with South Australia; throughout the world there seems to be an approach to the removal of trees, principally because the trees are used as fuel, particularly in the more primitive agricultural communities.

I have an article that refers to an area in Upper Volta, where a ring of trees 80 miles wide has been removed just to feed cooking fires of Quagadougo, the capital of Upper Volta. The slash and burn farmers have reduced most of upland Haiti to a rocky irreclaimable skeleton. Each year floods stream off the denuded Himalayan hillsides and kill thousands of people in India and Bangladesh. Brazilwood has vanished from Brazil, where the smoke of a torched jungle blinds pilots flying thousands of feet above the Amazon. The article states that the trees are falling faster than nature and man can replace them. Up to half the world's woodlands may have vanished since 1950. Yearly losses are running at between 1 per cent and 2 per cent, or between 25 million and 50 million acres. It is safe to say that an area of trees the size of Cuba is destroyed each year.

The issue goes far beyond millions of acres of lost trees. Land haphazardly cleared for farms and grazing—the single leading cause of deforestation—typically replaces rich jungles with useless, hard baked scrub. Hills stripped for firewood—the principal fuel for three fourths of humanity—lead to floods that ravage lowlands and silt that clogs dams and irrigation canals. Cut and run logging yields meager profits and leaves a trail of ruin. This is not new. The article makes the point that Plato, in the fourth century B.C. in Greece, said:

Our land is like the skeleton of a body wasted by disease.

The other aspect is that the Sahara Desert is a classic example of the growth of a desert caused by denuding the land of native vegetation.

I suppose most of us have heard the story of the woodcutter who turned up at a logging camp a few years ago. The boss was shorthanded so he was taken on and shown his chainsaw. 'No thanks,' he said, and pulled a broadaxe from his swag. By the end of the day the old boy had felled 25 giant blackbutts, far more than the chainsaw gang. 'Where'd you learn to cut down trees like that?' asked the boss. 'In the Sahara,' grunted the fellow. 'But there aren't any trees in the Sahara,' said the boss, scratching his head. The old-timer replied, 'Here was where I started.' When one looks at our geological history, it can be seen that the Sahara Desert once had a lush carpet of growth. According to contemporary literature, the Sahara Desert is marching into Southern Africa at the rate of about 50 kilometres a year. That is one reason why the people of Ethiopa and the Sudan are suffering starvation and privation at the moment. They have removed the trees and the undergrowth and anything that could burn to cook their meals.

It has been estimated that the cost of cooking a meal is sometimes six times the price of the food they cook. It means that the topsoil is removed and it is just not replaced. It is suggested that every time a windstorm on Eyre Peninsula results in the removal of topsoil, it takes three or four times to get the topsoil back. It is something that cannot be replaced naturally. Fortunately, the Australian farming community has realised that the land is very valuable. One only has to look at the prices in the farming journals to see that farming properties throughout South Australia are expensive to buy. If the soil is abused, the property becomes worthless. At the moment, the farming community is looking at this with some interest.

One of the problems with land clearance in our country is that, when the natural vegetation is cleared, a series of other problems is created and there is a tendency to damage the land. Whilst water and wind erosion can take away topsoil at the rate of 200 tonnes a hectare per year (according to an article), salinity can creep in, particularly in relation to irrigation. That is not new; people knew about that thousands of years ago. When the Romans defeated Carthage in 146 BC they levelled the city and sowed salt into the soil and ploughed it in so that no-one could live there ever again. While we have not put salt in our soil in Australia, some of our efforts in relation to irrigation have had quite disastrous effects.

It is not something that is restricted to South Australia and Australia. It has happened in America where the uncontrolled clearance of land, uncontrolled irrigation and uncontrolled use and removal of underground water supplies has resulted in subsidence—up to 12 inches in some places—and an increase in salt to the extent that people can no longer plant the crops that they were planting previously. There is no easy solution. A lot of care is needed.

During the latter part of last week I was interested to hear members opposite speaking about this matter, saying that the farmer was not to blame. Who cleared the land? The farming community certainly cleared it. I know, from the first rush for agricultural and grazing land in our State, that, with the periodic rainfall, land in low rainfall areas can look very good, while at other times it can look damn awful.

I have seen claypans in the Mid-North which should never have been farmed for wheat, but were. A crop was taken off, and the following year was a very dry year. In the normal year—not the abnormal year when it was wet—the wind blew the soil away, and today it is a claypan. I was told by a friend that at one time that land had grass on it, that they had grown a crop of wheat, and that was all. That can be the repeated throughout the areas of land beyond Goyder's line. People familiar with the history of South Australia recall that Goyder marked that line by identification of the change in vegetation over a short period and he was able to work out where the line went. Unfortunately, some of the powers that be at that time refused to accept his advice. Consequently, when one travels through that country, one can see the ruins of farms and attempts to farm land that should never have been farmed. It is not reversible.

The member for Alexandra made the point that scrub will regenerate. Areas of national park in Belair have been trampled and much of the vegetation will never regenerate: it is no longer there to do so. The only thing we can do in reclaiming the land is to plant extensively. We cannot look at putting in a few dollars a year. It will require a considerable investment of money each year by the farming community to ensure that its asset—its land—stays valuable.

It is also very important that we have legislation to control the clearing of land. Whilst the farmers own the land, they produce within Australia a considerable amount of product sold overseas. As we are repeatedly being told, they provide more than half the wealth of the country through exports. I think that the resource they use, which is actually Australia—our land—is in their care. If it is being ill-treated or abused, legislation should stop that. That is why we have legislation to control pests, whether animals or plants, and why we have legislation on soil conservation. When one looks at the Soil Conservation Act one finds that it provides assistance and funding for farmers who want to participate in soil conservation. It also provides for a requirement to force the reluctant farmer into something if he is not going to do it. His carelessness may cause problems for others, and it is important that that be done.

I refer to a reprint from the *Age* in which Professor John Burton, speaking at a natural resources seminar at the New England University, Armidale, made this point, which I find quite ironic:

> We as a group are very much like a committee of experts sitting in the grand ballroom of the Titanic and gravely discussing the issue of whether or not there is sufficient research evidence to prove that icebergs are dangerous to shipping.

That was at a workshop on the benefits of trees to farmers. Of course, he meant that, if they keep talking but do nothing, they are blind to what is going on around them. He went on to state:

> For God's sake. It's as plain as the nose on anybody's face that we have a land degradation problem in Australia, and we don't need any more research evidence to prove that simple fact. Furthermore, it is a problem of major proportions and immediate urgency. It is not going to be solved by spending half a million dollars a year on a national tree program and two million more on a national soil conservation program: it can only be solved by spending hundreds of millions of dollars. And we don't need any more esoteric research to prove that, either.

He asked what is the point of clearing land if we have to spend millions of dollars to replant. Much extensive clearing has taken place without much thought, and there now has to be a rehabilitation.

Everyone knows that, looking at the run-off from a creek one sees silt, mud and suspended solids in the water. It is all rich earth from some farmland, orchard or garden somewhere up the creek. If that water had to run through the filtering processes of appropriately and strategically placed scrub and forest, it would be a lot clearer. Many of the suspended solids would have been kept back and those solids are the most fertile part of the farmland.

The professor went on to say that the situation can be reversed, as I believe it can. It was fairly important to quote his concluding words to the workshop, as follows:

> To encourage you and support you in this activity, let me leave you with the words of the late Groucho Marx ringing in your ears: 'Why should I do anything for posterity? It has never done anything for me'.

How wrong can anyone be? We are all here today because somebody some time ago determined to do something about this State. The laws used in the past to allow the clearing of our natural vegetation, going to a taxation bounty for clearing, obviously worked too well. We now have to reverse that process.

The fundamental difference in this matter between the Opposition and our Party in this matter is compensation. It is pleasing that the United Farmers and Stockowners, the people who represent the farming community in an industrial sense, rather than negotiate with the Government have come up with an acceptable arrangement, one which when passed into law would be very workable. It will see the retention of our natural flora and fauna and, possibly in the future, it will mean that, in the retention of vegetation, more thought will be given to regenerating and replanting of trees. Let us not run away with the idea that we will regenerate and recreate the land that has been cleared, because it is physically impossible to do that, to have the mix of trees, shrubs, herbs, and so on, that make up the whole of the natural area. I support the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This legislation is a belated attempt to patch up one of the worst examples in South Australian history of mislegislation and incompetence on the part of the Bannon Government. It has clearly shown a bungling by the Government—a shortsighted and pigheaded approach. There has been no consultation prior to implementation of legislation with the people whom it affected. It has been like a bull let loose in a china shop, and damage has been done to helpless people of South Australia who have suffered in so many ways. They have suffered through the

closure of farms, forced sales, hardship, trauma, and even family break-ups. That is what this Government has to look back on and has to answer for to the people of South Australia.

Once again, it has been the Liberal Party that has foreseen this. From the moment the Minister announced the native vegetation restrictions back in May of 1983, the Liberal Party could see the potential damage, and it brought in legislation in the other place to correct the damage that had been done. In fact, we see here a mirror image of the legislation introduced into the other place quite some time ago.

I am amazed that the Minister for Environment and Planning is still able to sit in this House, holding that ministerial portfolio. Under normal circumstances, he should have been relieved of his position because of the way in which this matter has been mishandled from the word go. In fact, I thought that this is what we would see, as I read a little article in last week's *Sunday Mail* in Gavin Easom's column:

> Remember how this column first alerted South Australia that former Deputy Premier Jack Wright faced an early retirement? Now I say another Minister in the State Cabinet will be battling to stand at the next election.

I thought it was the Minister for Environment and Planning!

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Not even going to stand at the next election?

Mr MEIER: That is what I thought, because the Minister must be an embarrassment to his Premier, his Leader, but I noticed the last sentence:

> In fact, if doctors' advice is heeded, there's a shock resignation on the cards.

I concede that at least the Minister for Environment and Planning seems fit and healthy, so I realise that it must mean some other Minister on the front benches.

However, I wonder why the Government has mismanaged this legislation since it first tried to grapple with it more than two years ago. What damage has been done? The report of the select committee certainly identified some negative factors that have emerged from the native vegetation restrictions. Considering some complaints, we see first that not only did the Government not help to retain native vegetation but it appears that many landholders who had decided to retain their native vegetation for many years to come panicked and decided to apply for clearances so that they could at least clear the land as soon as possible, because this Government would stop them from doing so.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: When they didn't want to clear anyway; you are insulting them.

Mr MEIER: I am not insulting them; it is a select committee report, which states:

> An unfortunate result of the application of clearance controls is that a number of applications have been received from landowners who in the normal course of events would not have sought approval to clear land . . . these landholders have been triggered into making an application to clear. In these cases applications, where successful, have led to the clearance of land which may not otherwise have been cleared.

So much for that argument! It is almost mind-boggling to see some of the complaints about the system. The major areas of complaint were that it was unfair for landowners to bear the total cost of conserving remaining vegetation on their properties. This fact is at least recognised in the Bill.

However, to sidetrack for a moment, I ask why the Government could not see that earlier. Why could it not have carried out an election commitment to consult with the people, recognising that it would have to have been with a few specific individuals, to realise that people cannot hold onto their land and be expected to pay for the State's heritage if they do not have that sort of money? Complaint was also made that some officers of the Department of Environment and Planning treated landowners in a totally unacceptable manner and were not prepared to discuss applications with them in a sympathetic or rational way. The committee reported that:

> . . . officers of the Department of Environment and Planning failed to take account of the landowner's management problems created by the decision and, in some cases, refused to discuss that aspect of the application.

A further complaint was that:

> . . . if they did not accept the offer made by the department they would not receive any approval for clearing at all. This amounted to virtual blackmail, and many of the so-called successful negotiations between landowners and the department were in fact on an all or nothing basis. In many cases landowners were discouraged by officers from accompanying them on field inspections . . . A number of landholders gave evidence to the select committee that they were misled as to the time frame within which applications to clear would be finalised. In some cases, when a landowner was informed that advice would be received in a matter of days or weeks, periods of 12 months or more have elapsed with no further response from the department . . . landowners were not provided with adequate reasons for the decision of the Department of Environment and Planning when refused permission to clear. In many cases a duplicated letter was received which gave no specific detail to the individual landowner but rather gave an indication of certain varieties of plants or birds which may exist.

There are many criticisms about how the matter has been mishandled since its inception, and I could cite more. What could have occurred? I believe that the Commonwealth Employment Program could have been used. We have seen the unemployed voluntarily coming forward and saying that they would like to do voluntary work for their unemployment benefits—and that is very heartening. It would be easy for the Government to say, 'Why don't we put our emphasis on reafforestation?' I listened with some interest to the member for Florey giving a background on how much of the native vegetation has disappeared over the years. To some extent he made some salient points; but in other areas I question what he said.

Recently, it was brought to my attention that the Adelaide Plains has never had as much vegetation on it as it has now since white man first came to this country. If that observation is correct, it indicates that the farmers are not solely responsible for clearing the land because much of it was cleared before the white man arrived. In fact, we are taking account of that and reafforesting many areas that need it.

I believe that the CEP scheme provides an excellent opportunity for unemployed persons in rural areas to undertake tree planting programs. It is possible that this could be applied to city areas, but I will deal with the rural area because we are dealing with native vegetation clearance in that area. Such a program gives unemployed persons in the rural area an opportunity to give their community something back for what they receive, and it would probably create a real interest for those people. I am aware that people are presently undertaking such tree planting programs. In fact, Greening Australia is doing a marvellous job. An organisation that was formerly named The Men of the Trees, and the current name escapes me—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Trees for Life.

Mr MEIER: Yes. The Trees for Life group is planting thousands of trees in rural areas and encouraging farmers to look after them after they have been planted. I am also aware that Rotary, Lions and other service organisations have conducted tree planting programs. In fact, I was pleased to be involved in two such programs, one back in the late 1970s on southern Yorke Peninsula where one tree per day was planted. Those trees have grown a lot since that time.

Only this year in central Yorke Peninsula well over 400 trees have been planted in the past few months. That type of program is a positive step forward. After all, what is the use of our retaining native vegetation when farmers are

going broke if, in order to see that vegetation, one must travel through hundreds of miles of virtually barren landscape so that, when one reaches the vegetation, one has been so bored by the trip that one is ready to turn around to come home? On the other hand, one may stay for a few days and enjoy the environment.

I believe we can create in most of our environment conditions that are somewhat similar to those in areas of native vegetation. The member for Florey says that it is a non-reversible situation in certain respects and that we cannot duplicate a natural vegetation environment. He is correct to some extent, but we can go jolly close. Indeed, people who have studied rain forests would appreciate that migratory groups have used rain forests probably for centuries and looked after those forests so that, although trees have been cleared for agricultural cropping, over a period the land reverts to its natural state. I believe that it is difficult to tell the areas that were cleared in previous years from those that have never been cleared. So, our South Australian environment can become very much like a natural environment although it might not be as extensive.

We have to weigh our economic considerations with our environmental considerations, and I am upset when people give the impression that, ideally, they would like everyone in South Australia to get out of the State because they want it to revert to its natural state. Ideally, maybe that is the best we can hope for, but who wants that? I do not because I am a South Australian, and I believe that every South Australian would not want it, either. We have to live here and co-exist with the natural environment.

This Government has placed far too much emphasis on retention of vegetation and has panicked by saying, 'We will stop anyone from cutting down another tree.' The year 1983 was named as the cut-off point, but that was not the right way to handle the problem. Certainly, we had to consider preserving as much of the natural environment as we could. Indeed, the previous Government with its voluntary heritage agreements was on the right track and went a long way to encouraging farmers to look after their environment. While talking about encouragement, it is a tragedy that the Bannon Government, with the current Minister of Environment and Planning, has driven a wedge between the farming community and the Government. That wedge has created a gap that will take years and years to bridge because, according to certain reports, there is no confidence between the farmers and the Government.

In this respect, I refer members to the latest edition of the *Farmer and Stockowner*, in which Mr Don Pfitzner (Senior Vice-President) is reported as saying that it was common knowledge that the original legislation did not and would not work for many and varied reasons. I quote an editorial from the *Advertiser* of 10 January 1985, which said:

> It is a pity that the State Government did not in the first place thoroughly think through its actions on the clearance on native vegetation. The result has been nearly two years of parliamentary and court battles, and widespread passions, misunderstandings and defiance. The political mess was epitomised by last month's emergency legislation in reaction to a High Court decision. Doubtless much of the wrangling is democracy in action, but democracy does not have to be so painful.

Well stated! I quote an article by Mike O'Reilly in the *News* of July 1985, which said:

> A major rift between farmers and the Environment Department was caused by enforced conservation measures, it has been claimed. South Australian farmers were tired of being forced into retaining vegetation on properties adjoining conservation parks, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australian spokesman, Mr Denys Slee, today told a National Parks and Wildlife Service conference.
>
> 'It is unfortunate that we are going through a period when "park" has become a four-letter world in the vocabulary of many South Australian farmers,' Mr Slee said.
>
> Mr Slee said the State Government's Native Vegetation Clearance regulations was the worst piece of legislation he had seen in a decade of work for South Australian farmers. 'The regulations represent outdated principles of Government by regulation and penalty,' he said. 'The preferred course should have been to achieve conservation goals by cooperation and incentives.'

That person has a lot of background and his word needs to be noted. He recognises that the cooperation has been missing and that confrontation has been to the fore. It is a tragedy to this State and, therefore, through this legislation we will have to try to clear up the mess and re-establish some liaison and understanding between the farming community and Government departments and, in particular, between the farmers and the Bannon Government. But they will not have to wait too long for that, because the Bannon Government will not be with us for very much longer. Nevertheless, Government departments and the public servants will continue under the new Government.

What added insult to the Government's original legislation was that it came at a time when rural costs were escalating. They have continued to escalate, particularly through those past two years. Many small farmers with whom I speak—one-car owners and probably in debt more than they are in the liquid situation—find that $6 000 is not unusual for fuel costs; superphosphate costs are near $6 000; and chemicals cost many thousands of dollars.

What does it cost to buy a new header these days? I had the opportunity to speak with a farmer some weeks ago who had decided to trade in his 10-year-old header on a new one. I said, 'Did you get a good deal?' He said, 'I don't think it was, really.' I asked him, 'What sort of money are new headers these days?' He said, 'This one here—$160 000.' So, farmers have to try to earn a reasonable amount to try to cover those costs. Yet, we saw this Government during this same period of escalating costs come in and decide that some farmers could not go jump in the lake but go jump in the bush or go jump in the native vegetation, because that native vegetation would stay.

I refer to two specific examples of constituents in the area that I represent who were trapped by the Government's legislation. First, a farmer with a property on southern Yorke Peninsula bought several thousand acres so that when his sons reached working age they would be provided for in future years. Most of the area concerned was uncleared and, although he had to pay top dollar for it, he felt that it was worth going into debt in order to purchase it. I did not actually ask him about his financial position, but his debt would amount to tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars.

Suddenly, like a bomb out of the sky, the native vegetation clearance controls were implemented. This farmer was prepared to cooperate: he submitted his application to clear the land. He had surveyed the area that he wanted to clear in the immediate future and had worked out the arable and non-arable (rocky outcrop) areas. In fact, the ratio of the land that he wanted to clear to that which he was prepared to retain with native vegetation was agreed to by the appropriate department. But, in the department's reply to his submission this farmer found that many of his recommendations had been ignored and that in fact permission had been granted for him to clear the rocky outcrop areas—useless for crop growing—while the areas suitable for crop growing could not be cleared of native vegetation. He subsequently discovered that many of the decisions in this regard had been made with the use of aerial photographs, decisions having been made along the lines that circles here and squares there looked quite nice from the air.

At a later time some people did go to the farmer's property to look at the situation. A lot of water has passed under the bridge since then. That farmer will be very pleased with this legislation and, hopefully, he can now get on with trying to make a living and look after his family. At the same time he will still retain large sections of native vegetation. He was quite happy to retain 10 per cent: I think he indicated to me that he would not mind increasing that to 15 or 20 per cent. I suppose that we have a compromise here

of 12.5 per cent retention, with which the farmer in question will be quite happy.

He was absolutely infuriated and incensed beyond all normal reason when he was told that he could not clear much of his land; he could not clear much of his decent land—only the rocky outcrop areas. This farmer indicated to me that the officers concerned must have thought that he was not too bright. However, this man has been on the land long enough to know what should or should not be conserved.

I now refer to a second constituent, a farmer with a property nearer to central Yorke Peninsula. I had the opportunity to visit both these properties and I spent the better part of a day on them having a look at the native vegetation areas and cleared areas. In relation to the property on central Yorke Peninsula, I was most impressed with the way the farmer had managed his property for tens of years. He has cleared certain sections but has left marvellous belts of trees. He has recognised the damaging effect of wind on his barley crops and, accordingly, has left adequate belts of trees for shelter. He is a really conservation conscious farmer. There was an area that he had let go for some five years or so. To me the area looked a little like overgrown stubble. He pointed that area out to me and asked me whether I realised that he was unable to clear that area. I said that it looked as though he should not have to clear it as it was virtually cleared already, but he then told me that that was secondary growth.

He said, 'It comes within the restrictions on native vegetation clearance and, therefore, I would have to seek special permission to clear that secondary growth,' although it was only a few years old. I said, 'Well, that should not be any problem, should it?' and he said, 'I had already made initial representations, and the answer has come back, "No, we won't let you clear it".' There seemed to be no common sense—it was conspicuous by its absence. My constituent has made some progress in the past 12 months, and he and his sons will probably be very pleased to note that these measures will come into operation.

I emphasise that I want to see our State revegetated wherever possible. The District of Goyder is one of the areas that has been cleared more than any other area under Goyder's line, and massive reafforestation is required. I am 100 per cent behind that, and I have personally been involved in the planting of many trees already.

Mr Trainer: Hear, hear!

Mr MEIER: The honourable member reminds me of a project at Mallala, where he represented the Premier on the 'Greening of the State' project. Both the member for Ascot Park and I had the privilege of planting several trees in that area. I want to see those projects continued, and I hope that in the next 10 years, or perhaps in the next 20 years if things go wrong, there will be a widespread greening of the whole of the District of Goyder and preferably the whole of South Australia.

However, we must be realistic: let us not cut people's incomes by half or a quarter. Let us not break up families, but apply some common sense and undertake consultation before Governments, with their eyes closed, move in with bulldozers and with no idea of the consequences, as this Government has done. We will support the Bill, but I believe that there could have been a much better system much earlier had people listened and consulted prior to May 1983.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): First, I thank the Minister for carrying over the debate into this week. The Bill was brought before the House last Tuesday, and at that time I had had no opportunity whatsoever to consult with anyone in my district. I wrote to the Minister and asked whether he would give me and other members at least the weekend to consider the Bill, and I am very grateful that he agreed.

The management of native vegetation in this State has been a matter of considerable debate over the past decade. In 1976 the first report was brought forward, unfortunately with the result that many people panicked and there was wholesale clearance without due respect for the areas of native vegetation. In some cases, as has already been said today, areas were cleared that would not normally have been cleared. That is of concern to every citizen of South Australia, and I certainly share that concern. In fact, I consulted with the Minister on a couple of occasions when I saw that unrealistic and impractical action was being taken. But the panic button had been pressed, contractors had been brought in and large trees had been chained down. Many of the skeletons (if we can call them that) of those trees are still there as a reminder of the effects of the report. I refer particularly to areas on Lower Eyre Peninsula without identifying a specific area or a person.

This Bill was introduced in a different way—by surprise. The Minister would probably recall that I was the first member of Parliament in his office after the news came over the air (in my case, while I was driving to Parliament House). I was in the Minister's office within 20 minutes, and I thank him for not kicking me out then and there. I was concerned because of the effects in my district. The District of Flinders and, more particularly, Eyre Peninsula, has a higher percentage of native vegetation than any other area of the State. As such, with the population distribution as it is, it has been the farmers in my electorate who have had to carry the brunt of the management of native vegetation and its retention as a State heritage item, as I think it is.

I suppose that, if the land in my electorate had been developed at the same time as other areas of the State, we would have all been in the situation quoted earlier today, with 93 per cent of some areas being denuded of native vegetation. I do not think any member would relish that situation. The balance of nature is such that the land would be impossible to restore, and the only way it could be restored is by retaining block areas where native vegetation still existed and which it was hoped were large enough to preserve the native fauna and flora.

I believe that the legislation has been mismanaged. We can all be wise in hindsight, but if we had to go through the whole exercise again I do not think any one of us would act in the same way. Be that as it may, native vegetation management is with us and it is something with which we all agree. It gets back to how it should be implemented and, more particularly, who should pay for it. That really has been the only argument in this whole exercise.

When the regulations came into force on 12 May 1983, any retention of scrub was solely at the expense of the landholder who happened to be fortunate or unfortunate enough to have native vegetation left on his property. That is where the whole system broke down, because it meant that only a relatively few would be responsible for maintaining native vegetation (as I say, as a State heritage item) at their own personal and individual cost. That is where I believe the whole system was immoral, and it is certainly unfair that that should have been allowed to eventuate.

The Government of the day was quite happy to hit those people in that way; it was quite happy to see financial hardships imposed on some people, and more particularly to see the future livelihood of the younger generation taken away from them when it had been planned for by their parents.

Certain members of Parliament have been responsible for clearing land. I have cleared a few hundred acres of land on a block I had at Butler Tanks, and I believe that I acted

responsibly in the clearing of that land. I sought Government advice and every assurance available at that time. When I was advised which areas I could and could not clear, I believed that that advice (for instance, how far up a sandhill one should clear) was too generous, so I stayed at least a chain further out from the suggested boundary. I believe that my approach to vegetation clearance has been realistic and practical.

I listened with great interest to what the member for Florey said, and I think I must commend him for much of his speech. I think it was a reasonable assessment of the historical transition involving land usage over many generations. He quoted examples from other areas and countries, and mentioned problems associated with sand drift, and salinity. I think those problems are easily understood, but where do we draw the line? It could easily be said that, for the sake of native vegetation, we should not have farming at all; we should have left the whole of the State and nation in its native state. Obviously, that would not have been a practical thing to do.

There must be the ability not only to produce food and clothing for mankind but to retain areas of native vegetation so that our flora and fauna can be retained, hopefully for all time. It has been suggested that a number of Australian species of wildlife have already disappeared. I think that that is understood, and more is the pity for that. If any of us had an opportunity to do something about that, we would be the first to respond. The pressures of economic development and of providing food and clothing have resulted in land development. Every one of us is sitting here wearing (and later this evening will enjoy) some produce of the land because of man's demands to feed and clothe himself.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: We will also enjoy beverages that come from the land.

Mr Peterson: Milk.

Mr BLACKER: I was, of course, referring to milk. We all need to establish in our minds just where we are going. I have complained several times about this legislation, because one small section of the community has been told by the rest of the State that it should not only finance the retention of native vegetation, but forgo any potential income from that land and pay the rates and taxes on it.

I think that you, Mr Acting Speaker, and everyone here would agree that that is grossly unfair. It would place upon a small section of the community a burden that it does not have the ability to absorb. It is fair to say that most people involved in farming had either a father/son arrangement or the sons, who did not have their own land because of its high cost, in conjunction with their work on the family farm, worked on a scrub block which they had bought and which they cleared to bring into production over a period of from five to 20 years.

That is how Eyre Peninsula was developed. Many people in the Mount Hope, Brimpton Lake area worked on the wharves at Port Adelaide in what are now the electorates of the members for Semaphore and Price. Those people worked on the wharves during the depression, because there was no such thing as social security benefits. They would work for anyone who would give them a bed and a meal. Many people—I will not name them in this House—who worked for farmers for bed, food and clothing eventually acquired scrub blocks, which were virtually given to them, as they could get such blocks for next to nothing. They would clear those blocks in the off period after having worked for farmers during the season, and eventually they became farmers.

I have the highest respect for those people, bearing in mind that many of them were penniless when they went to that area, but now they and their families own most of that country around Brimpton Lake. It is to their credit that they did this. If this legislation had been in force at that time they would not have been able to do that. They may have been able to gain unemployment benefits elsewhere, but that is another story.

All of the matters relating to this legislation have been adequately debated. My views on this matter are widely known. Although I commend the legislation, because it is the first time we have been able to debate it on the floor of Parliament, which is a plus and something which should have happened years ago, I do not believe that it will necessarily answer all the problems that members of this House think it will answer. I am pleased that the Minister has indicated that he will bring this legislation back for review within 12 months. However, I note with concern that that promise is not embodied in the Bill. I accept the Minister's explanation in relation to this matter, but point out that he will have the *Hansard* record of this debate drawn to his attention if he does not bring this legislation back for review within 12 months.

The Government, the United Farmers and Stockowners and farmers generally are not 100 per cent sure how it will work. I welcome the fact that the legislation is coming in, first, because it is being debated on the floor of Parliament and, secondly, because it is an attempt to provide some compensation to those people who will be affected. That is where the anomalies will come out. The question is whether people will be adequately compensated and whether they will consider it fair compensation.

Another point is whether local government will be unfairly involved. I do not like what I see in relation to the Heritage Act Amendment Bill. I appreciate that that is not the Bill we are debating now, but I do not like that aspect. It will unfairly disadvantage those councils which have native vegetation left in their areas, but city councils and the like will not contribute at all to native vegetation management. That is not fair and I do not believe that councils in the bush really know what it is all about yet. It is because of that concern that I raise the point now, and no doubt it will come up again later in the evening.

The clearing of land is a matter at which we should look. I wonder just how much we should blame this Parliament, or our predecessors, for the clearing of land, because much of the land was released with the proviso that certain acreages had to be cleared within given periods.

Another problem concerning land clearance arose not long after the settlement of the white man here, because of the introduction of the rabbit from our native country. The rabbit has caused countless millions of dollars of devastation. We then had the legislation preceding the Vertebrate Pests Act which required the destruction of rabbits. In some cases many thousands of acres of native vegetation—not in one block, but over an area—had to be destroyed in order to eliminate the rabbits. That was before the advent of myxomatosis, when the only real way of eradicating rabbits was by ripping. That involved the complete clearing of native vegetation on, above and around the rabbit warrens. Even then, it was difficult to get a good kill.

My first real experience with rabbits was in an area where they had eaten 90 acres of my crop. I had to get into a small scrubby knoll and virtually wipe out a third of that area in order to get to the warrens. First, I was obliged to maintain coverage from a soil conservation view. Secondly, I was obliged to get rid of the rabbits. Thirdly, I wanted an income from that land. I did not want to sow grain just to feed the rabbits. I was faced by that dilemma. The combination of those aspects has brought about excessive land clearance over a period.

In regard to the rabbits and the legislative requirement of Parliament that, where blocks of land were released to

individual farmers, certain acreages had to be cleared, I suggest that clearing has been carried out for economic reasons. We could philosophise all night, but even 25 or 30 years ago the position was different. I illustrate this by reference to our family farm of 1 200 acres in the Cummins area. It provided an excellent living for our family. We had a married sharefarmer, who had a large family, and he, too, had an excellent living. We also engaged casual labour for shearing, hay carting, harvest and so forth. Therefore, that block provided the equivalent of three family incomes. That same block is now owned by my younger brother who has acquired a 1 000-acre block alongside it and is working another 1 200 acres on lease. He works 3 400 acres with the help of one man. Twelve years ago those 3 400 acres would have provided a living for eight families.

They are the economic pressures that have been placed on the agricultural areas of this State. Taking the whole thing one step further, people talk about unemployment. The unemployment figures on Eyre Peninsula at the moment are exactly parallel to those of 25 years ago. If we got back to employment opportunities that were available on the land 25 years ago, we would not have an unemployment problem on Eyre Peninsula; such is the ability of the land to be able to provide jobs if the economic circumstances allow us to do that. Many of the mistakes that our forefathers and perhaps we made on various occasions were regrettable. There is no point in our going back and pointing the finger at anyone. We would all do it differently if given the opportunity, but why should that small section of the community pay the cost?

I hope that this legislation will, to some degree, equalise the situation. I do not believe that it will solve the problems that exist. This legislation will be first tested only a few weeks after it has been in operation and we will probably find that a lot of problems develop as a result. The United Farmers and Stockowners Association is relatively pleased with the compromise that has been reached. I, too, am pleased that we have got it this far, as it is a step in the right direction. I do not believe that it will necessarily be the answer; indeed, I am cautious about it. I advise anyone to tread cautiously and not be too optimistic about its outcome.

I do not know whether the Government knows what will be the cost of the scheme annually or on a 10-year rotation basis. I hope that the Minister can give us an explanation, as this is the crux of the matter. If the costing is fair and reasonable and the farmer can get adequate and fair compensation, it will go down the track and be readily accepted. If a few people benefit to a minor degree, they will query the worth of it. However, the worth is better than anything we have had in the past, so I am pleased to see it thus far.

I would like the Minister to comment on one aspect of the Bill. I refer to the payment to land owners and to what is actually meant by 'agricultural land'. I refer to clause 26 of the Bill, which provides:

'Agricultural land' means land declared by the Authority to be suitable after clearing for agriculture on a permanent basis:

My understanding of that clause would indicate that it is suitable for now and for ever more. So, if a patch of scrub could be cleared in the future, it would be covered under this legislation. Some people have tried to tell me that it is as it has happened or as it presently stands. How does one determine what is agricultural land? All land is agricultural with today's technology. Twenty years ago a limestone ridge would be considered non-arable land, whereas today it is arable land because machinery is available to make it such.

We could virtually say that, with the machinery that is now available, 95 per cent of the area within Goyder's line in this State is arable land. It worries me as to who will make the determination of what is or is not agricultural land. That point will probably come out in the experience to follow.

I would be grateful if the Minister would comment in summing up on land purchased between 12 May 1983 and today. A family in my electorate drew that point to my attention over the weekend, as one of their sons has acquired land in the past 12 months. Some land on the property is potentially clearable, while still complying with the 12.5 per cent figure and all other requirements. Where do they stand in terms of compensation? It could be argued that people knew that clearance regulations applied and that they should have taken that into account when they bought their properties. Also, it has been said that people acquired properties at a figure lower than that which applied before 1983.

On the other hand, at that time the regulations were, to a degree, placed in question by the court. It could equally be said that those people abided by the law until then and that, therefore, they should be eligible for compensation, even though they purchased their properties between May 1983 and now. At law at that time they had every right to acquire it, so they still believe that they are eligible for compensation.

It is a fine point of law, which is debatable. Will the Government indicate where it stands on the issue? Obviously, the enforcement proceedings are subject to debate, but hefty penalties should apply. We also have to determine what is meant by 'clearance'. Will the Minister comment on normal requirements for fencing tracks, which has been a grey area under the present regulations? I know of one court challenge concerning a man who cleared an area for his fence line and claimed that it should have been wide enough so that, if a big tree caught fire, it would not fall on the fence. This gave him an 80 foot span on each side, and this person was able to crop that, thereby getting around the regulations.

I also know of an instance involving a track through the middle of a paddock. A farmer said that he wanted to take his 60 foot harrows through the middle and pass another one coming down. However, he was bending the rules and certainly not complying with the intention of the regulations.

I support the Bill with reservations, because it may not be the panacea that the Government or members of the committee hope it will be. However, it is a step in the right direction, because it is a genuine attempt to try to assist those who will be obliged by law to provide for the retention of native vegetation for and on behalf of the State of South Australia. Those people will get some recompense although they may not have envisaged that when the properties involved were acquired before 1983. I support the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to speak briefly on this subject. As the Minister is aware, I know of three families who were concerned about land near Murray Bridge, and whether the provisions of the Bill will give them a fair and reasonable deal remains to be seen. At least it is a step in the right direction. One hears idealistic comments in relation to land that may be considered for clearing, either now or in the future. More particularly, one hears criticism of those who have cleared land in the past. However, people need to look at the circumstances that applied when those actions were taken.

I well remember after the Second World War all forms of government right throughout Australia encouraging farmers to help feed the starving millions of the world. Also, I remember the argument that we needed to populate or perish. Now we are told that if we do populate we will perish.

So, that was the environment that people in that era had to face. If we go back to the time of the major economic slump in the thirties, governments then were trying to find

ways of encouraging people who owned or even leased land to clear it and build up the economy by exporting mainly agricultural goods. During those times, other countries, such as Australia, did not have forms of cold storage for perishable crops, for example, apples and pears or vegetables, so we were able to export to Europe by sea, goods that European countries could not produce or retain in storage for their winter months. So, we were able to capitalise successfully on those markets because our cost of production was low, land tax did not exist, council rates were low, wages were low, and people in rural areas could live very cheaply.

During those years Parliaments encouraged people to clear the land because of the types of houses that were constructed. The brick kilns throughout Australia in the 1930s, except for a couple in New South Wales, were mainly wood fired kilns. In the main, the bakeries were wood fired, so in the near vicinity of cities or country townships, people were hacking down trees and clearing the land to grow crops. If it was within a reasonable distance to cart the wood, and if it was suitable for kiln baking, whether for building materials or edible goods, it was sold. People were cutting it with axes, and not chain-saws, so there were a lot of jobs created. It was the way of life. For us to say today—50 years later—they were half-bred criminals because they denuded areas of land that should never have been denuded, I think it is unfair in the circumstances.

So, I come back to the legislation before us. I do not think it has all the answers, as the member for Flinders has said. I think we will have some difficulties with it but I suppose that is part of the legislative process: we will wait and see what difficulties we have. But what difficulties do we have where people are saying, 'We do not want to clear this land for firewood'. People are carting firewood these days from areas near the Victorian border. I know that the regeneration process for some of that country is so slow that our grandsons will benefit if we start to plant it now. But there is not much left near the city. In fact, the cost of firewood for the amount of heat created is about identical to the cost of those expensive resources we call electricity and gas. In fact, there is very little difference between firewood, gas or electricity when we pay $150 a tonne for firewood.

So, it is no longer a cheap alternative and, no matter what happens with the Minister's legislation, it will never come back to being a cheap alternative because the cartage distance is so great. If trees are planted now to be harvested later, the growth rate is rather slow, except in some of the wetter areas in the hills. Even then it may not be an economic proposition; it is borderline. I do not think that there is a great fear, as far as fuel is concerned, that wood will be used in the future to any greater degree than it has been in the past. In fact, I think it will be to a lesser degree.

There will need to be a massive change in some areas of the cost benefit of clearing land for primary production for many people to move into clearing land for agriculture, particularly if the grain industry takes the financial belting that many of us believe it will take within the next two years. There is a concern also in that area that we may not need to worry very much about the increase in use of land for agricultural purposes.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have mentioned the cost of firewood and the difficulty in being able to grow it as a commercial product because of the slow growth rate of many of our native trees in the more arid and low rainfall areas of the State. I know that the Minister has studied the background of the State and will acknowledge that there are now more trees on the Adelaide Plains than there ever were in the history of white man. Some people will say that that is amazing. However, I invite honourable members to look at the early paintings in the Art Gallery and they will find that, in the main, the Adelaide Plains was not studded with large numbers of trees, except along the streams and the areas with reasonably shallow aquifers.

Even the Salisbury/Virginia area, where the aquifer for the gravel bed is only at 80 feet, did not have a lot of growth. Therefore, on the plains the white man has created more bigger-type tree growth than existed before we arrived. In the hills area where I and my family, going back to 1855, have spent most of our lives, it is fair to say that there are now more native trees, as well as exotic trees and shrubs—Upper Sturt to Clarendon through to Norton Summit and Cherryville—than previously in my lifetime and probably most of my father's lifetime.

The member for Flinders made the point about the economics of agriculture. Many small property owners could not earn a living from the land, but only off it—that is, right off it. This meant that the land reverted to native bushland or, in some cases, people bought properties for residential purposes and, as a form of hobby, looked after ornamental trees or shrubs. Much of the land that people think is native bushland—and we are now talking about native vegetation—is not native vegetation. Much of this land has been inundated with noxious or exotic weeds, plants and trees.

In the hills face zone and further in, the olive tree is the biggest offender. In the wetter areas—not quite so much in the hills face zone but further in—African daisy, blackberries, St Johns wart, boxthorn and broom have really become a menace. It will be a difficult task for anyone to attempt to clean them out. In the middle reaches of the Sturt Creek there is a jungle of blackberry bushes up to 30 feet high. There are infestations, I am told by people living near the area, of European wasp and those who say they can get rid of them would need a bushfire to get near them.

People driving through those areas see leaves and start talking about native bush. I know that the Minister will not do this, because he has studied it and knows that many are really pest plants that people cannot afford or, if they can afford it, do not wish to eradicate. Seeds and the distribution of plants for possible regeneration cause concern to neighbours if the neighbour wishes to clean up their property.

People should not be misled into thinking that all that they see growing in the hills are native plants or trees; in many cases they are pest plants, for which there are laws requiring owners to attempt to control them. However, very few of them have to be eradicated because most people know that that is impossible.

I support the Bill, although I do not believe that it will solve all problems for the Minister or for those unfortunate people who have bought properties thinking that they could do something with them. These people have found suddenly that they cannot work their land and must now apply to some organisation for compensation. Unfortunately, the compensation is unlikely to be enough to be a fair deal.

A minority, as I have said many other times, will have to carry the can for the majority. I still say to the Minister that, if the majority want something protected and kept, they should be prepared to pay the tax to keep it and not expect the minority to pay the penalty that may be incurred. I hope that when compensation is considered we do not put the minority at a disadvantage because the majority say that they want to look at it. That is totally unfair, and I have repeated that every year that I have been in this Parliament. I repeat: I have never supported that theory, but at least the Minister has gone some way down the track with this provision. I support the proposition.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I thank honourable members for the attention that they have given this legislation and for the indication of support, at least through the second reading. Certain matters have been raised during the debate to which I will respond. I will put together some of the claims made by the member for Goyder with certain things said by the member for Murray, because they link up fairly effectively.

First, if it is part of the Opposition's perception that we have before us essentially legislation that was introduced in another place last session by the Honourable Mr Martin Cameron, and if that assists it to support the Bill through the Assembly, who am I to complain? Obviously, it is the object of any Minister to get his legislation through. Therefore, if sometimes there are perceptions which do not square with reality but which nonetheless are apparently honestly held and lead to that desirable result, one would be churlish in the extreme to take too long to try to demolish some of those dreams and illusions.

One matter that should commend this legislation to honourable members was certainly not contemplated in the earlier legislation: the provision for ongoing management. The only way that the Government could countenance paying land-holders for the retention of native vegetation was as part of an ongoing management scheme whereby the land-holder would undertake to manage that vegetation on behalf of all of us. The ongoing management of vegetation is well understood because it is a feature of heritage legislation, but under that legislation it has always been something into which a person voluntarily entered.

In a sense, that voluntary element is preserved in this legislation. However, it has been agreed by the organisation which purports to speak for the primary producers that, in effect, a person cannot have it both ways. If a person seeks payment because permission for clearance has been withheld, that person must enter into a heritage agreement in order to continue to manage the land, and the State will assist that person as part of the agreement in a way that is well understood by all honourable members.

Of course, that is a very important departure from not only the scheme that I introduced but also the scheme which was hawked around in another place by the Hon. Mr Cameron. It is important to spell that out. Other important aspects were missing from the earlier scheme introduced in the Legislative Council. However, I will not detain the House further on that matter.

I refer to an important point raised by the member for Goyder. With due respect to the honourable member, he seems to have something of a blind spot in relation to this whole concept of native vegetation retention. I may be wrong, and, of course, the honourable member will have an opportunity to refute what I have to say, if refutation is his aim or indeed his due. The honourable member claimed that it is suggested that (to perhaps put this in the way in which environmentalists tend to talk these days) the sum total of the biomass on the Adelaide Plains is greater these days than it was at the time of European settlement—that there are lots more trees now than there were then.

That may well be so: there was a Black Forest, which I understand was a feature of what is now our near southern and south-western suburbs; and we know that the Aldinga scrub was far more extensive than the remnant piece of vegetation that exists now. Therefore, I would want that claim checked out fairly thoroughly. Even if it is true, I am not quite sure what the assertion proves.

In suburbs such as Morphett Vale, where I live, these days we consider that people have done a magnificent job planting trees on their properties—it has become something to which everyone aspires. The question I ask is whether one has created a habitat; has one replicated by this means the web of life which existed prior to settlement?

Of course, it is conceded that a good deal of clearance had to occur before our present urban and rural lifestyles could become what we have come to know and expect. However, environmentalists say (and I subscribe to this viewpoint) that clearance has gone as far as it should go, and perhaps beyond its natural limits, and that we really do need to look at retaining as much native vegetation as possible.

People talk about revegetation, and of course that must be done. So far, in the reasonably short-term, no-one has successfully replicated by a scheme of revegetation that which was destroyed by clearance. People look to revegetation for various things, because vegetation is valued for a number of reasons. We can consider this matter at various levels. There are those people who say that trees are nice, and I agree with them—trees are planted for aesthetic purposes. I guess that that is about as much as one would expect on, say, Anzac Highway where, being an urban situation, I do not particularly mind if exotics are planted. In a totally artificial environment, such as exists in relation to Anzac Highway or any other major arterial road, native vegetation is not necessarily more aesthetically pleasing.

I guess that one of the things I value as a result of my having been to that splendid seaside resort many times are the Norfolk Island pines at The Point at Victor Harbor. That is an introduced species and is a magnificent visual element of the landscape and the seascape. Some people would say, 'That is why we have to keep trees' but there are others who say, 'In the farm situation we want shelter belts'. I have heard people talking about how very wise farm managers were able to retain shelter belts on their property to reduce wind erosion to stop salinisation of the soil and so on, and that is important, too, requiring a greater sum total of biomass per unit area than if one simply wants to make an area look pretty.

However, it still does not retain the web of life; it is still not ensuring that the various native species, which I assume we are all united in wanting to preserve from extinction before their natural time, will be preserved. The only way in which that can be achieved is by preserving the native vegetation in its original form. Of course, native vegetation in its original form has certain defences. Nature is conservative: it has certain defences against the invasion of pest plants, for example, and we tend to find that pest plants are a problem where there has already been extensive disturbance of the original environment. We know that native vegetation has certain defences against the regime of fire, how quickly an area regenerates compared with the growth of introduced species. But we also know that the over intense application of fire to a particular area can cause problems in relation to pest plants and things like that, and that usually also relates to human activity and development.

I make that point, because some of the things honourable members have been saying, laudable though they are, simply do not go far enough. Of course, we should be doing these things; we want the greening of Australia; and we are interested in retaining native vegetation for farm management, but, if we are interested in the natural environment and in preserving as much of it as is consistent with the form of lifestyle that we have come to know and value, we must go much further. We must have a scheme of legislation similar to this, or the Act that is to be repealed or something very much like it.

Something very important has happened as a result of the earlier regulations and the attendant amendments to the development plan that were brought down, despite all the criticism raised in certain quarters, and that is that the nature of the debate has changed irreparably. I can find no

evidence that the Liberal Party in government seriously contemplated a scheme of control of the clearance of native vegetation. I can find no evidence that three or four years ago, if a scheme like this had been mooted, there would not have been extensive criticism by many people, particularly those associated with rural industries.

That debate has changed. Now the question is not whether there should be legislation to protect native vegetation but how that should occur. South Australia is still the only State that has been prepared to consider any sort of scheme like that. As I said, with all the criticism that has been raised about certain aspects of the way in which the regulations were introduced and administered, the value to the concept of environment in this State has been in the fact that the Government has changed the debate and, in effect, ensured that in the future, whatever people might say, so far as I can see no longer will the major political Parties in this State or any of the recognised organisations associated with the environment or primary production advocate a free wheeling situation in the country whereby people can simply do what they like. All of us have conceded that education is not sufficient and that incentives on their own are not sufficient—and that some scheme of legislation is important.

It is important that we place on record that that has been one of the lasting games for the environment for the scheme of legislation which this will now replace. I point out that people have talked about compromise. We are all involved in compromise: we have been involved in compromise from the very beginning. From a purely environmental point of view, I suppose it is true to say that any scheme of control short of outright prohibition is a compromise.

In those earlier regulations we did not provide for rights of third party appeal which are a normal feature of any planning scheme. That, in turn, was a compromise in the interests of the people out on the land, so everybody has been involved in compromise right from the very beginning. The original scheme, which has been criticised by honourable gentlemen opposite and which scheme this is now replacing, was a compromise on my part to my personal environmental principles. I did it as a practical politician and as a person who knows that one can only go so far in trying to achieve one's objectives, however desirable one may think they are.

The member for Flinders raised certain matters, to which I want to refer very briefly. He talked about the definition of 'agricultural land' and was concerned as to what is agricultural land as opposed to non-agricultural land. Obviously, advice will be provided to the authority by the Department of Agriculture. It will have to include things like soil conservation reserves and areas which, if cleared, would be subject to significant soil salinity, and that is something that has long been understood.

We expect that at this point we will be confronting the farming community with nothing more than what in the past they have come to expect under the normal soil conservation legislation, except that (dare I say it) I believe that, from time to time in the past, aspects of that legislation have been honoured in the breach, and obviously we will expect a closer and tighter regime of administration in relation to that legislation as it will impinge on the new legislation that we are bringing forth.

The honourable member in part answered his question in relation to land bought between May 1983 and the present time. Where people acquired land with the full knowledge that restrictions were already in place, or might be placed, on the land, they went into it with their eyes open. However, I point out to the honourable member that, despite the prohibition in the legislation, under clause 33 there is the ability for the Minister to consider a payment. In addition, as the honourable member has foreshadowed, and I again repeat, there will be a review at the end of the 12 month period, and that can also take up this matter, if that seems to be necessary.

The third point that the honourable member raised related to exemptions. We want to ensure that exemptions are very clearly defined so that people cannot drive bulldozers, as it were, through the legislation. We will be looking at that as carefully as we possibly can.

There is the reference to reasonable clearance, which I think is understood by all parties, and one of the examples that the honourable member gave would clearly not be an example of reasonable clearance. So, I do not believe that there are too many problems here. We understand that, where it is a new regime of legislation, the exemptions were not, so far as I can see from the select committee's report, a great problem either to the people in my department administering the Act or to the people out in the field.

I want to say something further about the select committee's report. I regret that the committee did not look a little more closely at some of the aspects of the administration of the legislation. The select committee seems to have accepted uncritically all it was told about the way in which my officers went about their business. It is not for me at this stage to enter into a point by point refutation of all the matters that were placed before the committee in this respect. I had in mind seeking to table a report I have in front of me which was addressed to the Legislative Council select committee inquiry into native vegetation clearance controls in July 1985 and which is, in effect, takes up point by point the various matters raised by way of individual complaint.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to do that, because this report is included in the Select Committee documents and is therefore available to members or to anybody else in the community who wants access to it. I stand by what I have said all along, that I believe that the officers involved in this matter have done a splendid job under very difficult conditions. Some of the criticisms raised against them are quite unfair. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr MEIER: A variety of definitions appears in clause 3, the definition of 'native vegetation' meaning 'a plant or plants of a species indigenous to South Australia'. The Minister referred to what he thought was a misunderstanding on my part when I said in my second reading speech that the Adelaide Plains biomass was greater now than it had been at any time since European settlement. I am quite aware of the difference between native vegetation as defined here and the planting of trees. I was endeavouring previously to make the point that much emphasis has been given to retaining native vegetation and insufficient emphasis given to reafforestation. I am aware that native vegetation has a habitat of its own involving a complete ecosystem. I think that everyone who reads this definition will recognise that, as well.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Membership of the Authority.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 3, line 13—After 'experience in,' insert 'reafforestation and'.

The definition would then state:

one shall be a person with extensive knowledge of, and experience in, reafforestation and the conservation of native vegetation nominated by the Minister;

That additional qualification should be included, because we are concerned not just with retaining what we already

have but with understanding how to ensure its continued survival in perpetuity to the best effect and, furthermore, how to rehabilitate and re-establish stands of vegetation for all those very good reasons to which the Minister, other members and I alluded in the second reading debate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I support the amendment. As the Minister indicated, a number of members have referred to the need to consider reafforestation more closely. Certainly, I recognise the need to protect existing vegetation, and I hope that as a result of this legislation both the present and future Governments will give more consideration to the need for future plantings as well. Reafforestation has been considered by many organisations, new techniques for new plantings have been adopted, and this development is of vital importance to the overall vegetation protection in this State. I hope the Government supports the amendment.

Mr MEIER: I, too, support the amendment moved by the member for Mallee. It perhaps highlights the concern that I was trying to express in my second reading contribution—namely, that we have to be realistic. We would love to go back in time and have natural vegetation in most places, but it is a fact of life that we do not. I will not go into the argument of how much we have to keep, but let us ensure that, as we are now debating the Bill and have the opportunity to put as much into legislation as possible for the future (even though it will be reviewed in 12 months time), reafforestation is a key aspect of the legislation. We should realise that a lot of vegetation has gone and that it is time to come to terms with the situation.

The amendment moved by the member for Mallee goes one step in that direction. It will be a more unified approach than the approach we had with the greening of Australia or with voluntary bodies or individuals planting trees. We had farmers wondering what to do in some cases and being well on the way to knowing what to do in other cases. This legislation is an excellent way to incorporate that principle. I fully support the amendment.

Mr BLACKER: I support what the member for Mallee had to say. We are looking for some discretion in the future. Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of clause 7 (1) *(b)* are broad enough that enable the Minister to handpick the committee. I am not saying that it is wrong that the Minister has that responsibility, but the second reading explanation does not match what is in the Bill. We can interpret it both ways. In the second reading explanation it states that the board will comprise a nominee from the UF&S, one from the Nature Conservation Society and two ministerial nominees, which would appear to have some balance in it. However, in the Bill we find:

> one shall be a person nominated by the Minister from a panel of four persons nominated by the UF&S.

That means that the Minister has a pick of four. The UF & S can put up its team, and the Minister can handpick his personnel for the committee. I am not suggesting that we should interfere, but it needs to be drawn to the attention of the Committee that it is there and that it is not quite as explicit as the second reading explanation would have us believe.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am in an extremely good mood this evening. I have jogged twice today and come through on both occasions with flying colours. I want to be as nice as I possibly can. I apologise to the member for Murray because I did nod acquiescence in relation to the specific proposition earlier. I have had time to think about it more and would like to put a couple of matters to him. Before doing so, I make a point in relation to what the member for Flinders has said.

The honourable member will be aware that a good deal has emerged as a result of negotiations between my officers and outside groups, specifically the UF&S and the Nature Conservation Society. Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) emerged as a result of that negotiation and I understand that both organisations are happy with the verbiage. I do not know why it has to be a panel of four. It is more usual in legislation for it to be a panel of three rather than four. I do not know who proposed a panel of four. The idea did not come from me.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It was in our legislation, and this Bill mirrors our legislation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am glad that there are some aspects on which I can satisfy the member for Murray. I am quite happy to be accused of plagiarism as to the details, so long as I can maintain my integrity in relation to the basic principles. It does not really worry me too much, but these two sub-paragraphs are in there because that is how it emerged from the negotiations. It may have come from that earlier scheme of legislation to which the member for Murray referred.

However, getting back to the specific amendment of the member for Mallee, there are some problems. First, I am not too sure who at this stage in South Australia we would appoint to such a committee. If we are to adhere strongly to the verbiage, one would be a person with extensive knowledge of reafforestation of native vegetation.

I do not think that there are any such people. I have a small unit in my department which has been doing experiments in broad acre seeding in the member for Murray's electorate. We have people in the community who from time to time have planted trees with a view to providing shelter belts and so on on their properties. The CSIRO has in some way looked at it. The plain fact of the matter is that reafforestation of native vegetation on a large scale in this State, and indeed around the country, is really only in its infancy.

I want to be as reasonable as I possibly can. I know that the honourable member is extremely well motivated in bringing forward the amendment, but I am not sure whether—as the person who will have responsibility for the initial appointment—I will be able to find someone who will fit the bill.

Of course, having found such a person, what opportunities will there be within this scheme of legislation for that person to be able to exercise that knowledge? I remind the Committee that we are dealing with a piece of legislation which, in many respects, is similar to that which it purports to replace.

People come forward with suggestions for the clearance of native vegetation. They are assessed by the authority (as opposed to the South Australian Planning Commission which does it under the present scheme of legislation) and are either approved or not approved. If they are not approved, then the other provisions of this legislation come into play —payment in return for a management agreement and all those sorts of things. At no stage is there any reference to revegetation in all that.

The fact is that no-one has to get permission from anyone else to undertake a scheme of revegetation on their property. If this were a piece of legislation which set out a scheme of incentives for revegetation—something on which I am very keen, by the way, and, indeed, we have put certain proposals before the Commonwealth Government in respect of that matter—then I can understand why such expertise is required.

I hope that the Committee takes my points, because I am trying to be as reasonable as I can. First, who specifically fits those qualifications? Secondly, having found that person, what role has that person to play within the scheme of the legislation? If the member for Mallee can satisfy me in respect to those two matters, I am prepared to reconsider the matter further.

Mr BLACKER: I am not at cross purposes with what the Minister and the member for Mallee have been saying, but I am glad that I raised the point about the four nominees. However, I would not have been so generous as to give the Minister quite so much latitude in his selection, particularly when this Committee is making the decision. Clause 7 (1) *(b)* (iv) provides:

> one shall be a person with extensive knowledge of agricultural land management nominated by the Minister.

First, is there any reason why it does not say that it should be a person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture who, I would have thought, would be the person best able to make a sound recommendation in that respect?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not too sure about that. There is no reason why, in terms of the Constitution, this whole piece of legislation could not be committed to the Minister of Agriculture. One of the recommendations that was put forward by the Nature Conservation Society in its submissions to us was that the 'Minister' was not spelt out. My advice is that it is not accepted drafting procedure to nominate a Minister in legislation as a normal course of events; that is a matter for the Government of the day. That is probably why it appears in its present form.

Mr LEWIS: Notwithstanding the remarks that the member for Flinders has made about the fourth person to become part of this committee, I want to focus the Committee's attention on the third person, about whom the Minister spoke in his penultimate expression of opinion. The Minister said that he could not see why it was desirable to have a knowledge of reafforestation as well as conservation embodied in the third person to be appointed by the Government within the terms of subclause *(b)*. I want the Minister to understand that I am not perpetrating a mischief here. Clause 6 (2) provides that the authority shall have the powers, functions and duties conferred, assigned or imposed by this Bill, and there is nothing to say that this legislation could not be amended at some future time to cover what the Minister has referred to.

What is more, someone who has knowledge of reafforestation also has knowledge of forestry and, although we have heard a great number of people complain about the adverse consequences of the legislation and its effects on them, when this was embodied in the regulations, which have been found to be *ultra vires*, and notwithstanding the fact that the majority of these people are farmers, this legislation will still have a substantial economic impact on the State's forestry industry. The foresters, be it those in the Woods and Forests Department or more particularly those in the private sector, cannot plant monoculture stands where there presently exists native stands of vegetation, without getting planning approval to do so.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: They have no desire to. The Woods and Forests Department has not cleared native vegetation for exotics for 15 years.

Mr LEWIS: Sure, but that does not mean that it would not be economically feasible, sensible or desirable to do so—and not just for exotics but for other natives. I put it to you, Mr Chairman, for the benefit of the members of the Committee, that a number of native species take on commercial importance and significance, given the value which now attaches to those timbers, following their 'discovery' by local cabinet-makers.

Another species to which I referred during the course of my second reading remarks was the melaleuca which is used not for timber production in the mill sense of the word but for brush production and decorative purposes—shade houses, borders, and so on—in the domestic and commercial field. What is wrong with having somebody there who knows not only about conserving existing stands of vegetation but also about establishing forests—that is, other species of timber, be they exotic or native, for the purpose of milling timber, or simply for making some other use of it?

I ask the Committee's indulgence and draw to the Minister's attention the necessity to enhance the density of the stands of banksia in the heath country of the upper South-East for the purposes of apiarists. I hope that the Minister understands the importance of this. This heath country represents a very valuable and vital part of the apiarists capacity to over winter their bees near home. The South-East beekeeping industry is vital to the multimillion dollar small seeds industry, not just for lucerne production—what the Americans call alfalfa and the botanical name for which is Medicago sativa—but also for a number of other clovers (the trifolium species) and gramineae (grasses—cocksfoot, phalaris, fescues, and so on).

These fine seed industries in the South-East depend on the beekeepers, who depend on having a fairly substantial range of banksias in flower available to them in the winter season so that they can feed their bees. Existing stands of native vegetation do not have high densities of banksias for one reason or another, and those stands are outside the Ngarkat National Park. There is a very good case for enabling those stands of native vegetation to be enhanced in the percentage of banksias that they have in them by planting more in mid-winter when there is wet weather, as we have now, and allowing the people who own them, presumably the apiarists, to use them as over-wintering sites without their needing to be so utterly dependent, as they are now on stands of banksias in the Ngarkat National Park.

That is one example of where understanding forestry and reafforestation *per se* is an advantage. I have previously mentioned commercial timbers. It does not follow, as the Minister said, that the only producer in the business is the Woods and Forests Department and the only species is pinus, whether radiata, canariensis, or whatever: there are other species, even if they are not exotics. Indeed, there are a number of native species of timber which have commercial value for cabinet-making and which are outstanding in their capacity to replace mahogony, for instance, as part of the range of timbers that can be used for cabinet-making. Australian natives are very good hardwoods.

Cabinetmakers in this State who have recently 'looked in the scrub' have found these valuable species and now know how to use them. It is not good enough simply to ignore the needs of that small and in some instances as yet, not even established economic need or industry, as part of a total economy, in the composition of this committee. Some people who have studied science and botany at Adelaide University and then gone on to the Australian Forestry School have majored not in commercial timber milling production and marketing but in silviculture and horticulture—not of exotics but natives. During the course of the second degree and its honours, they have had a profound insight into and understanding of how to manage native stands of vegetation in any ecosystem. They are the kinds of people who are presently at least part of the lecturing staff in natural resource courses in this State and in other States.

They are the vanguard of knowledge about how to use herbaceous plants for economic purposes and how to derive those plants in their raw form ready for product preparation from those native stands. Some of the species cannot be grown in monoculture; some of them have to be grown as part of a total ecosystem; others can be grown in monoculture.

The authority in its present form needs to have someone who has an understanding of that so that, when an application is made to overplant an existing area of scrub with a greater proportion of banksias for the beekeepers, when an application is made to the authority by someone who

wants to plant more brush or melaleuca in an existing stand, or when an application is made to do anything at all other than grazing and grain cropping, at least someone will be on that authority who has some insight into where the information about that application (and its economic consequences) can be obtained if the members do not have it themselves.

At present, none of those four people would necessarily have that insight unless we include someone who has some knowledge of and experience in reafforestation or forestry management, that is, herbaceous vegetation management, which is all that forestry really is, although it embodies also a study of silviculture and horticulture. That is the reason for moving my amendment to Part III, and I commend it to the Committee in the form in which I have defined it.

There is no point-scoring involved at all; no mischief aforethought is involved. It is merely my concern to take a wider purview than the confrontation that emerged between the aggro political lobby of the UF and S and those people on the other side of the argument who want to ensure the maximum possible survival of remnant native vegetation stands that already exist. They are well catered for in the first and second Parts: I beg the Minister to consider the third and fourth Part amendments that I bring to the attention of the Committee.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has now made it clear what he is on about. It was not necessary for him to reassure the Committee about his motives: I made it perfectly clear that I understood that the honourable member was well motivated in this matter. I hope that his reference to aggro between groups outside is historical because we have a reasonable level of agreement between these various groups on this scheme of legislation.

Mr Lewis: Aggro politicians are people who are agrarian in their sectarian interest as well as those who are angry or militant.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair reminds the Minister and the member for Mallee that this is a Committee and not a panel of two.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will not proceed in that direction. The example that the honourable member has given relates to a species of application that would not loom large in the total volume of applications coming before this authority and, in any event, would be undesirable. Whether one is talking about exotic species or native vegetation, if one wants a cash crop one should look at utilising areas of the State that have already been cleared for other cash crops, whether agriculture or improved pasture for cattle or sheep, rather than eat further into native vegetation. I adhere to what I said previously. I do not think that this qualification, if we can find such a person, will be put to that much use in this part of the Act, but I am prepared to make an offer, although I cannot go too far here. If the honourable member likes to look at Division II of the legislation he will find in clause 16 reference to the Native Vegetation Advisory Committee. I am prepared to favourably consider an amendment to those categories to include experience in reafforestation of native species as part of the Native Vegetation Advisory Committee.

It seems to me that that is where this qualification is more likely to be of use to a person than it is in purely assessing propositions and saying yea or nay as they come forward. Therefore, I must reluctantly ask the Committee to reject the honourable member's amendment. At the same time, I assure the Committee that I am prepared to consider favourably such an amendment, and indeed during the time that the honourable member was on his feet an amendment has been put to me to be considered as part of the scheme of amendments that the member for Elizabeth has in relation to that portion of the Bill.

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister clarify the last point that he made? I assume that the authority tends to sit in the boardroom and make decisions from a central office, whereas the Native Vegetation Advisory Committee will probably get out into the field.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: They have quite different roles. The Native Vegetation Advisory Committee will advise the Minister on policy, which in turn will determine the context in which the authority makes its decisions. I remind the honourable member that this is special legislation which will surplant the role which to date the Planning Act has undertaken. In the Planning Act there was the same division between the decision making body on the one hand, which is the South Australian Planning Commission, and the Advisory committee on planning, which is the Minister's adviser in relation to policy. The amendments to the development plan, which had to be processed through the normal procedure, and which were necessary before the legislation could take full effect, had to be processed through the advisory committee on planning.

With the new legislation it is now appropriate that we utilise new committees which will be specific to this legislation. The Native Vegetation Advisory Committee will take the place of the advisory committee on planning which has operated until now. However, it will not be a decision making body, but in some respects maybe it will be more important, because it will determine the policy context in which the authority will be making its decisions. The extent to which the authority moves around will depend on the nature of the delegations that occur, which is another feature of the Bill, as the honourable member knows.

In relation to the delegations, it may be that, as we move along and get more confident about doing that, we could have what is, in effect, an extremely mobile decision making body. However, clearly, for the time being it will simply be an authority without delegations in making the decisions, and fairly obviously it will be making its decisions in a central location. The advisory committee may well be a reasonably mobile body, moving around the State as part of discharging its obligations under the Act to the Minister.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am sorry that the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment at this stage. In relation to the amendments to be moved by the member for Mallee, there is a proposed amendment in regard to the advisory committee, and I support that. I recognise the role of that committee and the need to have someone on it with a knowledge of reafforestation. We are probably getting hung up on the 'extensive knowledge' question. The Minister has indicated that there are not very many people in the State with extensive knowledge of reafforestation. I do not know about that but, if that is so, that is something of a pity. I know that many people have a very real interest in reafforestation, and there are many people studying that subject. I know of people and organisations which are very much involved in reafforestation studies and could fit the bill very well indeed.

It would be a pity if the Government was prepared to toss aside this amendment just because of the 'extensive knowledge' argument. Obviously, it is important that a person with extensive knowledge of and experience in conservation of native vegetation be involved—that is to be expected. But surely it would be easy enough to find someone who also has extensive knowledge of reafforestation. I hope that the Minister will reconsider this matter.

The Native Vegetation Authority, without any doubt at all, is surely recognised as the major body. I recognise its responsibility to consider policy, to advise the Minister and to answer the Minister's queries but, in addition, it is the major decision making body. As the member for Goyder has said, it is the organisation that will be out in the

community, and it will be recognised as the body with responsibility. With that in mind, we must ensure that one member of the authority can pass on the appropriate knowledge and understanding of reafforestation and its importance. I urge the Committee to support the amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I am disappointed that the Minister has not understood what I was talking about and has expressed reservations, putting it in the too-hard basket. I assure the Minister that I, as convener of the Liberal Party's Forestry Committee, know that there are plenty of people who can make a sensitive appraisal of the value and importance of native vegetation. I refer to science honours graduates, majoring in botany with a second undergraduate degree with honours in forestry—people majoring in studies relating to forestry management as well as having a general grounding in the business of forestry *per se.*

There are people of ability about the place. However, if the Minister considers that there is not a sufficient number of such people at the moment from whom he can make a recommendation to the Governor, at least in the very near future he should discover that such people can be found when the time comes to make appointments and reappointments. Even if someone with extensive knowledge of and experience in reafforestation and conservation of native vegetation could not be found, at least the attention of those four gentlemen would be focussed on the fact that one of them was appointed because of his awareness and understanding of the relationships between conservation of native vegetation and the management of those natural stands of native vegetation and the ecological factors involved. It would be someone who has had training in the science of genetics and biometry so that he understands how the ecosystem is dynamic and whether or not the rate of change in an ecosystem is acceptable as part of that which would emerge spontaneously from its interaction with the climatic and soil factors (constantly dynamic themselves) impacting upon the system.

If we do not ensure that someone with that breadth of perception, concerned insight and understanding is appointed (not just someone from the farming community or the UF & S, a second from the Nature Conservation Society, a third with professional experience and knowledge of conservation of native vegetation, and the fourth a farmer), we will ignore our total responsibilities to the society that we seek to represent in this place, because this measure has a wider impact.

We ought to ensure that the four people understand that the purview of our deliberations went wider than the narrow publicly focused argument that we have had up to the present time. I am very disappointed that the Minister cannot accept that additional qualification, for two main reasons: first, it is a good thing to look at the effect of the legislation on areas other than farming and, second, it is a good thing to ensure that the people comprising the Native Vegetation Authority know that we want them to consider it.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I have carefully considered the arguments put forward by the member for Mallee and the response of the Minister. I must say that, taking into account the overall scheme of the Bill as presented, I believe that the Minister's acceptance of an amendment to the Native Vegetation Advisory Committee to include members with a knowledge of forestry and reafforestation is probably more to the point of the Bill.

If one looks at the functions to be undertaken by the authority and those to be undertaken by the committee, it is quite clear that that experience would be better utilised in the committee structure, because clause 17 provides:

(1) The Committee—

(a) may, of its own motion, and shall at the request of the Minister advise the Minister on . . . the planting of native vegetation in cleared areas.

It seems quite clear to me that reafforestation would be better dealth with in the committee structure.

I commend the Minister for his foreshadowed amendment to the structure of the committee in order to take that into account. However, if one looks at the function of the authority, it is quite clear that under the scheme of the Bill as it now stands—and that is what we have to consider—it is the authority which will be making decisions as to whether or not land should be cleared. It is not part of the purview of the authority to be advising the Minister on matters of reafforestation or the planting of bush in cleared land. That clearly falls for the committee to undertake. I believe that the authority is best structured with a view towards those with experience in native vegetation and the conservation thereof, whereas the committee might well benefit at a subsequent stage in the consideration of this Bill from someone who has experience in forestry matters.

For those reasons, I support the Minister in rejecting the amendment at this stage. I support the Minister's foreshadowed amendment to take into account the very important matters raised by the member for Mallee. Those matters can be more properly considered by the committee when advising the Minister on its functions, as defined by clause 17.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Olsen and Oswald. Noes—Messrs Payne and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 3, lines 15 and 16—Leave out subparagraph (iv) and insert:

(iv) one shall be a member of the Advisory Board of Agriculture nominated by the Minister for the time being responsible for agriculture matters.

Clause 7 *(b)* (iv) states that the fourth member appointed by the Governor to the Native Vegetation Authority shall be a person with extensive knowledge of agricultural land management nominated by the Minister. As the member for Flinders pointed out earlier, this paragraph ought to be more explicit. There is a very competent body whose officials are democratically elected by all farmers. This is regardless of whether they belong to that agrarian political organisation called the United Farmers and Stockowners. I have the greatest respect for the way this body operates.

In addition, we already have in existence and appointed by Statute the Advisory Board of Agriculture. This statutory board has its members elected from the various regions of South Australia and it meets many times each year. It advises the Minister of Agriculture on how Government policies are affecting farmers.

This responsible body is not subject to the constraints of pressure group exercises that might occasionally be experienced by the United Farmers and Stockowners or the Nature Conservation Society. This responsible organisation has existed for many years and its members are elected frequently: half its members retire annually and I believe one person should come from that board. My amendment leaves

it to the Government to decide which member of the advisory board will become a member.

I can say from my personal knowledge of past and present members, who have all been men—there are no women members at present but there is no sexist capacity in how the board is constituted to preclude women (it is just that no woman has ever stood for election as a regional representative)—that they are not only outstanding farmers in their communities but are well qualified and most are graduates of Roseworthy Agriculture College or Adelaide University in recent decades. Therefore, the people elected to represent the regions on the board are of such a quality that I am sure the Minister could find someone from their ranks willing to serve as a member of the authority. Such a person would act as a link between the Department of Agriculture and the advisory board, an organisation recommending policy and amendments to policy, and between the department and the authority. My amendment specifies the group of distinguished and pre-eminently suitable people from whom the fourth person should be selected.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not inclined to accept the amendment. I do not see why it is necessary to restrict the ambit of choice as suggested by the honourable member. All such appointments obviously involve consultation between the two Ministers. As Minister for Environment and Planning I know that there are from time to time people who need to be put on the Pest Plants Authority or appointed in regard to vertebrate pests and who represent an environmental background. The Minister of Agriculture consults with me and the same mechanism would apply with regard to this legislation.

I remind the Committee of the point I made to the member for Flinders earlier that, although it is unlikely and has been unlikely ever since we have had a Minister for Environment and Planning, there is nothing to prevent this sort of legislation being committed to the Minister of Agriculture or for the person who is Minister for Environment and Planning also being the Minister of Agriculture. In that respect the only prohibition in our Constitution Act is that the one person cannot be both Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Lands.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mallee, who has outlined the position very clearly. I have had the opportunity over a period of time to get to know a number of people on the Advisory Board of Agriculture. I reiterate what the member for Mallee said: they are a group who are given the responsibility of advising the Minister of Agriculture on a number of matters. They are very representative of agricultural industries in this State, and I am sure that members on that board could well serve in the capacity determined under this clause.

I regret that the Minister has, without very much debate at all, taken the line that he has. I do not see it as tying the Minister in any way whatsoever. I recognise the importance of that group, the responsibility that they currently have and the importance they could place in the position as a member of the authority. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the points that he has just made.

Mr BLACKER: I, too, support the amendment, although perhaps for a slightly different reason. As previously mentioned, as the Bill stands it would indicate that the Minister can handpick whom he likes. One of the criticisms that the Minister and the Government will have is that it is a one-man band or that members are selected by one individual. By nominating a person from the Advisory Board of Agriculture, we alleviate some of the all-embracing nature of the clause with one person being responsible for the nomination.

Although I have every confidence in members of the Advisory Board of Agriculture, as they would be an ideal group from whom to pick, I believe that, as the legislation stands, it would be a problem to the Minister in the field in a public relations exercise. If it is written into the Act that at least another person must come from a different body that is not necessarily handpicked by the Minister, it would exclude the Minister from some of that criticism.

Mr LEWIS: Before I see this clause disappear from the attention of this Committee, ignominiously ignored as it has been by the Minister with gratuitous indifference, I state that, as it is presently worded, I see something sinister in it. Members should note the clause refers to 'one person with knowledge of agricultural land management'; it does not say anything about insight into farming, commitment to farming, or agricultural industries. It just says 'agricultural land management'.

I worry that the person who may be appointed now or at any time in the future will not necessarily have any experience whatever with primary industry production at a personal level. This person need have had no experience in farming of any kind whatsoever at any time in his life—just extensive knowledge of agricultural land management. This relates to primary production, rural industry or anything to do with farming but rather only to a knowledge of land management in agricultural areas.

That is a pretty loose and shoddy way of defining it and, in agreeing to it, the UF&S allowed itself to be conned and owes an explanation not only to me and to other members but to people in the rural community. That organisation should explain why it agreed to such sloppy and loose wording in relation to the fourth member of the authority. It is clearly stacked very heavily against the interests of primary producers, if the Minister chooses to exercise the discretion he has at present provided in the clause.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis (teller), Mathwin, Meier, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Olsen and Oswald. Noes—Messrs Payne and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Personal interest of member.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 4, lines 21 to 23—Leave out 'is disqualified from participating in the Authority's consideration of the matter' and substitute 'shall not take part in any deliberations or decision of the Authority in relation to that matter'.

This is one of a number of amendments which I wish to move to the Bill that are related in their impact. This is the first part of that package. I propose to bring the wording of clause 10 into line with the wording of clause 17 which has a similar import. The ultimate intention is to enable the Bill to include a penalty provision against anyone who exercises a delegation or makes a decision on a matter in which they have a direct or indirect financial interest.

Already under the Bill as it stands, where the authority delegates a function to a local government council, any member of that council who participates in a matter in which he has a direct or indirect financial interest will, of course, incur the penalties under the Local Government Act, which are indeed very substantial, and quite properly

so. However, under the Bill as it stands, any person who exercises a delegation in relation to a matter in which he has a direct or indirect financial interest does not commit an offence for which there is any penalty under the Bill. It is my contention that, given the sweeping powers of delegation that this Bill provides, the extensive economic impact of decisions under this Act and the fact that it is very difficult to repair the damage once done, it is only fair and appropriate that not only should local government members be subject to a penalty if they breach this particular provision of the Act, but so should any other person, including a member of the authority or any other person to whom a power or function of the Act is delegated.

I believe that where this Parliament sets up significant powers or functions and permits the delegation of those powers or functions widely, the community would expect us to provide the proper safeguards to ensure that people do not engage in the decision-making process in their own interests or favour. I commend this as a general principle to the Committee in relation to all legislation of this type. In particular, I commend it this evening in relation to this Bill which has significant consequences for those who are involved in it, where the economic impact of a decision can be very substantial and where, I believe, it is appropriate that not only local government people, but any other person to whom the function is delegated, should be subject to this sanction. I might say that this sanction is less than that which is applicable to a local government authority, but I believe that is consistent with the limited nature of the delegation as distinct from the sweeping powers of the local government authority. I give notice that, if this amendment is carried, I will subsequently move an amendment in relation to the insertion of a monetary penalty for a breach of that condition.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, prior to its meeting the Committee was given a two page list of amendments by the member for Elizabeth. We have now been given a one page amendment which in some parts is identical and in others is slightly different. The Chair takes it that we are replacing the front page of the two page list of amendments with the one page list subsequently circulated. Is that correct?

Mr M.J. EVANS: Perhaps I can explain. The new front page, if you like, replaces the old front page. It is identical in all respects, except with respect to the amendment to clause 16 where, in consultation with the Minister, we seek to incorporate a comment about reafforestation. Otherwise it is identical.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Having considered the amendment, I think it in no way derogates from the power of the legislation and, in many respects, improves it. Therefore, I urge the Committee to support the amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I think that both propositions are stupid. Here we have an authority, appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Cabinet, being formed in the first two instances of four persons nominated as a panel from which the Governor selects one, the Minister having the absolute and utter discretion—indeed, the responsibility—of handpicking the other two. If the Minister and Cabinet assembled with the Governor in Executive Council cannot be relied on to make good judgments about the men or women they put on the authority and trust with the responsibility of making objective decisions regardless, then why the hell do we have to sanction them and remove them from the authority with a clause like clause 10, or the other one to which the member for Elizabeth referred, and punish them with a fine of $2 500? There is no parallel in any sense with the local government situation where any citizen can nominate, offer themselves for election and carry on a rhetorical campaign with a whole lot of claptrap and, if they are shrewd, cool, calm, collected and clever, con the populace and get themselves elected to local government.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Is the honourable member speaking out of personal remiss?

Mr LEWIS: Not at all. I have never been a member of local government and I do not reflect on those people who are. I am just saying that maybe there needs to be, in the Local Government Act, a provision to which the member for Elizabeth referred and from which the legislation in this form takes its example. I cannot see the necessity for it. We must be nuts if, as a Parliament, we cannot accept and expect our Ministers in Executive Council to advise the Governor to get four honourable people on the authority without putting them under the threat of being penalised if they happen to make what some fool, knave (or other individual citizen not in those two categories) considers to be an indiscretion.

Therefore, I want to give some definition to my understanding of the meaning of 'direct or indirect pecuniary interests'. First, a 'pecuniary interest', as I understand it, means some financial benefit or gain for the particular person. If one is a communist, one's intention would be to destroy anybody's chance of obtaining any gain out of any decision, given the continuation of a democratic Government in this country, if one was committed to its overthrow. So such a person would have an indirect pecuniary interest in every decision. No-one in this Chamber in their reasonable and right minds can refute that.

Showing it in that most extreme way illustrates the stupidity of the proposition. Not one man or woman in this State could claim to be absolutely, utterly and dispassionately divorced from any pecuniary interest of an indirect kind as it applies to this legislation. That is why I think the clause is utterly unnecessary. If we get four honourable people on the authority, there is no necessity for us to consider whether they should be fined for any indiscretion of one kind or another and then attempt to define the kind of indiscretion according to the narrow mores of financial interests. There is a lot more than personal financial benefit and interest at stake in this legislation—a hell of a lot more. For us to imagine that that is the only consideration of a pecuniary nature involved is utterly ridiculous.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I know that I am a fool for even responding, but I cannot contain myself: I must make a couple of points in relation to this matter. The honourable member should know well the concept of pecuniary interest and the way in which it has been incorporated in legislation 'ere now. To sustain his argument and to be consistent, the honourable member needs to go back and remove from various Acts of Parliament this concept of pecuniary interest and look at the way in which he has voted in this House on certain occasions.

The second thing that he needs to do is go through the satutes of the State and consider the number of occasions where the conditions on which a person can be removed from a Statutory committee by the Governor as a result of dishonourable conduct or something like that are specifically spelt out. If we are to leave it to the Executive of the State to make appointments, what is the point of legislation on this matter?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not as fussed about this as other members have indicated. I make the point, though, that it is heavy handed. I looked at this earlier, and I agree with the member for Mallee that the responsibility must rest with the Minister. To be talking about penalties and everything else is very heavy handed. The responsibility that these people have to the Minister who appoints them is understood.

The Minister has indicated that the Government will support this. The Government has the numbers, so that is

what will happen, but I share some of the concerns expressed by my colleague the member for Mallee, and I recognise it as being heavy handed.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I take up the same points that the member for Mallee and the member for Murray have made. I draw their attention to the fact that this is part of a scheme which I am suggesting this evening and which is not restricted just to the authority. If the authority was the only body concerned, I would not be so concerned, although I would still wish to make some amendment to the Bill. I am also seeking to impose that penalty, as part of the overall package, on the wide range of delegatees who can be also involved.

Whilst I accept that the Minister may be in a position of choosing men of honour and the like for the authority—and I am sure that that would be the case under any circumstances, penalty or not withstanding—there is also a wide range of people to whom powers and functions under this Act can be delegated. We must have regard to that and to the wide economic impact of the power that they are exercising when they do it. I draw the Committee's attention to both the diversity of delegation and the economic power and consequences that flow from decisions under this Act.

Amendment carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 4, after line 23—Insert 'Penalty: $2 500'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Delegation of powers and functions.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 4, line 39—Leave out 'The Authority' and insert 'Subject to this Act, the Authority'.

Because of the wide range of delegations that are available and because of the prohibition that the Bill also contains on any right of appeal, I propose subsequently to move an amendment to clause 21 to create a limited right of review. In order to do that, it is necessary to qualify the power of the authority for unlimited delegations. Accordingly, in foreshadowing the subsequent right of review that I intend to move as an amendment, it is necessary to first amend this clause to make sure that the delegation power of the authority is subject to the Act.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I support the amendment. In my second reading speech I referred to the wide powers of delegation under this clause. A number of people to whom I have spoken and who did not have the opportunity to look at the legislation were rather puzzled about why it is necessary for the powers of delegation to be so broad. The Minister may have a reason for this. I do not know whether it was the Minister who felt that this should be the case or whether it was an outside body, such as the United Farmers and Stockowners. The Minister might be able to tell me that.

In my second reading speech I referred to matters raised by the Native Conservation Society, and the member for Elizabeth referred to a number of matters that it has raised in correspondence with the Minister. The society has indicated that it is perturbed by the extremely broad powers to be given to the authority. It has asked questions such as:

1. To which branch of government is it intended to delegate?

2. What specific power or function would it receive?

3. Under what circumstances would any other person be delegated the authority's powers?

I am particularly interested in that. It seems to be very wide. In the second reading explanation, the Minister stated:

The authority will have exclusive authority to make decisions on all applications, but with the power to delegate.

However, we learn that the delegations are to go as far as 'to any other persons'. I am not necessarily saying that there is a problem with that, but I want to know how it came about. I will be interested to hear the Minister's reply to some of those matters.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The matter arose as a result of negotiations between my office and the United Farmers and Stockowners. The attempt here was to get some flexibility into the administration of the Act, which would endeavour to ensure that applications were considered as expeditiously as possible. My feeling is that initially the delegation should not flow to any great extent; that the authority would want to look at the operation and the powers that had been conferred to it, and that that would probably mean limited or no delegation at all.

However, one can image examples where delegations could be properly undertaken. For example, recently, details of the following instance were put to me: there is a local government authority in South Australia which has successfully sought an amendment to the supplementary development plan to bring native vegetation within the actual township, covered by the authority under the regulation that we have at present.

In those circumstances it would seem to be perfectly proper for that authority to have the development control conferred on it, given that it took the initiative in the first place to have the policy amended so that certain areas would be under the control of the regulation. One can imagine similar sorts of situations like that occurring.

A safeguard exists in that, wherever the delegation goes, any decision must still be within the context of the overall policies which are determined by the advisory committee. Any attempt on the part of any decision making authority to play fast and loose with that policy would simply mean that the delegation would be withdrawn.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I accept what the Minister says. I simply make the point (the member for Flinders referred to this today, as I did in this House last Thursday in my second reading speech) that, although it is not provided in the Bill itself, we are aware that the Minister intends to have a review undertaken, certainly within 12 months. I shall be particularly interested to find out how that will actually work. I have some concerns about it, as I think it is a pretty clumsy way of going about the matter. I hope that the Minister can assure the Committee that the matter of delegation will be given considerable attention when the review takes place.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can give an assurance that I will ensure that these matters are addressed properly as part of the review.

Mr LEWIS: What does the Minister really mean by 'the authority delegates powers or functions to a council'? The Bill does not specify what kind of council. Is it a local government council or a conservation council? The Bill provides that the authority may delegate any of its powers including the functions delegated to it by the Minister to a council, which may subdelegate all of the authority's powers to an officer of that council—to one person.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is explained under the definitions.

Mr LEWIS: In that case, I am concerned that far too much power will be delegated to one person or to fewer people than the already small number of four. In my judgment, given the nature of the Bill I am concerned about how that power will be exercised. It is unwise to leave so much power in the hands of one person so that decisions are made behind the aprons of the authority and not in the purview of public accountability.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I indicated by interjection that what was meant by 'council' was explained under the

definitions. I would imagine that the circumstances to which the honourable member is addressing himself are unlikely to occur. However, if they did occur, it would be because there were assurances that this mechanism is faithfully carrying out the intentions of the Act. There is a good deal of streamlining and efficiency in the handling of applications by having one person administer the provisions. I would imagine that in the short term, prior to the 12 month review, it is unlikely that that will occur.

Amendment carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 5, line 12—After 'may' insert 'with the approval of the authority'.

In keeping with the comments made by the member for Mallee and other members about the scope of the delegation and the potential power of subdelegation, I believe it is appropriate that we take note of two factors. First, the authority can delegate its powers only with the approval of the Minister, and that offers a degree of protection. Secondly, this amendment affects the power of subdelegation by a council. The member for Mallee correctly drew attention to the fact that the council could subdelegate to a single officer its powers, which in effect are all the powers of the authority if they are the powers delegated to the council. Under this amendment the council can subdelegate those powers to an officer only with the approval of the authority. The amendment addresses some of the problems raised by the member for Mallee, ensures a greater degree of caution on the part of the authority and councils, and in some ways limits what I agree are very sweeping powers of delegation.

Amendment carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 5, after line 17—Insert 'Penalty: $2 500'.

This amendment is essential. The main purpose of my moving amendments along these lines is to ensure that those acting with delegated authority obey the pecuniary interest provisions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not believe it is necessary. It is a pity that it is referred to. I would be quite happy to trust the people who are given responsibility under this legislation. This amendment is very heavy-handed.

Mr LEWIS: I presume that, given the reasons put forward by the Minister and the member for Elizabeth in opposing the amendments that I proposed previously, in this instance the UF&S happily accepts this amendment. If not, be it on its head, because the Opposition will not call for a division. I do not believe that the UF&S would be very happy about this.

Amendment carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 5, after line 23—Insert 'Penalty: $2 500'.

I move this amendment for the same reasons as the previous amendment. I think we have really canvassed it. I do not think it would be productive to debate it further at this stage.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Native Vegetation Advisory Committee.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 6, line 6—Leave out 'native vegetation' and insert 'flora and fauna or in reafforestation'.

Originally, as honourable members will see from the first sheet that was handed out, I had proposed in clause 16, page 6, lines 5 and 6, to leave out 'native vegetation', which is a very limiting phrase, and insert 'the natural environment', which although it does not address it in the precise terms of the Nature Conservation Society, does address the same sort of interests that it had in mind when it sought the expansion of that phrase.

However, in view of the representations made by the member for Mallee and other members opposite concerning the necessity for reafforestation to be considered in this Bill (and I think it does fit quite properly in relation to the powers, functions and duties of the committee to advise on amongst other things the planting of native vegetation in cleared areas) I believe it would be more appropriate to incorporate experience in the area of reafforestation in the membership of the committee. I am suggesting to the Committee that we should adopt the revised wording of that amendment, which leaves out 'native vegetation' and inserts 'flora and fauna or in reafforestation'.

I point out that the clause permits the appointment of two people, so it might well be that the Minister can find a person experienced in both areas, or alternatively, he may choose to appoint one from each area. I believe that that would satisfactorily address the need for a member of the committee to have experience in the area of reafforestation and will also address the question raised by others relating to the necessity for the committee to have available to it the benefit of the expertise of a person who is knowledgeable not only in relation to native vegetation but also in relation to native fauna.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This touches on the matter about which I gave certain assurances to the Committee earlier. It seemed to me that there was an opportunity here to address two concerns: the one that had originally been expressed by the member for Mallee in relation to the authority and, also, the matter which has been raised by the Nature Conservation Society in its well quoted correspondence to honourable members. Its concern was that fauna is as important as flora in this matter, because in considering whether to preserve the stand of native vegetation, our concern is not only for the intrinsic merit of that vegetation *per se* but also its role as a habitat for fauna, and therefore the advisory committee should reflect expertise in relation to the management of native fauna.

I could have moved my own amendment, but the member for Elizabeth had this scheme of amendments available. I consulted with him and suggested that both these matters could be taken up by a simple amendment to the original amendment of which he had given notice. The member for Elizabeth agreed and I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I certainly support the inclusion of 'reafforestation' as foreshadowed by my colleague the member for Mallee. In relation to 'native vegetation' and 'flora and fauna', or as the Nature Conservation Society would have it, 'nature conservation', I do not think that that means a great deal, but I point out to the Committee that this is an advisory committee on native vegetation.

I would have thought that that was the only reference for appointments to the committtee. One could hardly be interested in native vegetation if one was not interested in flora or fauna. I think that the clause was fine in its original form. I certainly support the inclusion of reafforestation, as mentioned by the member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I do not support the member for Elizabeth's proposition as to the advisability of amending clause 16 (2) *(c)*. This clause is not just about reafforestation; it is also about the effect that that will have on forest production. It is not just about the Woods and Forests Department, or pine trees; it is also about using native and/or exotic species for commercial production of timber and other things.

I talked earlier about the composition of the authority, but now I am talking about the composition of the committee. I think that it would be wise if the persons mentioned under clause 16 (2)*(d)* were required to have forestry qualifications. The sciences of botany and ecology are the fundamental bases upon which forestry graduates depend,

so it is only logical that the knowledge base should include provision for a forestry qualification. I do not think that we should be amending clause 16 (2) *(c)*; instead, we should be amending (2) *(d)*.

To make this amendment to clause 16 (2) *(c)* begs the question and introduces role conflict, in the opinion of most conservationists. It may not do this in their opinion, or in the opinion of the Minister or the member for Elizabeth, if it is narrowly interpreted as reafforestation re-establishing native vegetation. I am concerned about that, but my concern is even wider and embodies my worry about the necessity for the committee to include a member who knows about, and has an interest in, using herbaceous plants for economic purposes.

The clause already requires a member of the committee to presumably have an awareness of how to use herbaceous plants for economic purposes where fruit and/or parts of a plant are to be consumed by human beings. I place that under the broad category of 'agriculture'. What is wrong with including somebody on the committee who knows something about using cellulose and lignin structures of plants—the stems and/or the leaves? As the committee will have an impact on the industry now and in the future, why cannot one member be required to have that type of training? It could be easily and sensibly incorporated as a requirement under clause 16 (2) *(d)* that a person has studied botany, ecology and forestry at the post secondary level, or at university.

There is no person in the professional arena in this country, or any other country, better qualified academically to make comments about the conservation of vegetation than those people known as foresters—they know this field back to front. All one has to do is find a forester who has done an honours degree in Australian native species and their use for straight logging purposes and for a wide range of other purposes.

He should be aware also of the other aesthetic reasons why we must retain native vegetation. My foreshadowed amendment is superior to the proposition of the member for Elizabeth, whose proposal is much narrower in its purview.

Amendment carried.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 6, line 7—After 'knowledge' insert 'of forestry and'

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17—'Functions and powers of the committee.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 6, after line 40—Insert 'Penalty: $2 500'.

This amendment is the final path about which I set earlier. It is necessary and desirable to do this, despite the objections of members opposite.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 passed.

Clause 21—'Provisions relating to consent.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 8, after line 4—Insert new subsection as follows:

(3a) The authority shall not delegate the consideration or determination of an application for consent to clear native vegetation where—

(a) a delegate, or sub-delegate, of the authority has previously refused consent, or attached conditions to consent, to clear that vegetation; and

(b) the application was made within 3 months after the applicant received a written statement of the reasons for the decision of the delegate or sub delegate.

As members have pointed out previously, wide powers of delegation are contained in the Bill and we have now narrowed some of them. However, there is no right of appeal from a decision under this Bill and, because of the significant economic impact that a decision against the clearing of native vegetation could have on a farmer, it is appropriate to incorporate in the Bill not so much an appeal provision but what I call a review provision where the authority is denied the right to delegate the consideration or termination of an application for consent to clear native vegetation. It is limited in that respect where it has previously been refused or where unacceptable conditions have been attached by a delegate or subdelegate.

The amendment also requires that an application should be made within three months of an applicant receiving a written statement of the reasons of the delegate or subdelegate. Although the amendment does not insert an appeal mechanism in the Bill, given the wide powers of delegation it at least provides for a review by the authority of the decision by a delegate or subdelegate to refuse consent to clear native vegetation. This will provide some measure of protection where a delegate chooses to exercise his powers inappropriately and an aggrieved owner of native vegetation wishes to have the decision reviewed.

I point out to the Committee that the amendment is limited in its application to two areas: refusal to consent to clear native vegetation, and the attachment of conditions to that consent. The application must be made within three months. The amendment provides a little additional protection for those who are subject to this legislation, given that there is no appeal against the refusal of consent, and given the wide powers of delegation contained in the Bill. I believe that this is an appropriate mechanism to permit a review of decisions.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Briefly, the Government supports the amendment. I refer to the whole question of rights of appeal. In negotiation this matter was raised, and it was agreed by the parties that it was no longer appropriate to have rights of appeal as in one sense there are no longer any losers. People either get approval to their application to clear, or they receive a payment representing the reduction in value of the property as a consequence of the refusal to allow clearance.

In those circumstances the only right of appeal that seemed to be appropriate was the traditional right that everyone has to appeal against the valuation itself. However, in relation to the delegations to which the honourable member refers, it is reasonable, given the course that we have decided to undertake here, that there should be such a provision which will also act as a brake on the Minister's easy acquisition in delegations. So, I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 22 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Interpretation.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 11, lines 1 and 2—leave out these lines.

This is basically a drafting amendment. Having discussed the matter with Parliamentary Counsel, I consider that this definition of 'miscellaneous lease' is not required and is inconsistent with earlier provisions of the Bill. I therefore commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr LEWIS: I ask the Minister what is the meaning of the word 'agriculture'. As the Act currently stands, it refers to agricultural land only. I do not know whether that means that land could be used for horticulture or silviculture, which are excluded from the text of the Act, or whether it is included. Later on a subsequent clause makes it impossible for consideration to be given to other industries which use land and which may find themselves needing to get the authority to address a request for permission to clear native vegetation for an industry that they propose to establish.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I give the honourable member an assurance that that would be interpreted by the authority in the broadest sense of the word. Horticulture

and silviculture would be included, just as to date obviously there have been applications entertained by the South Australian Planning Commission in respect not of agriculture in the narrow sense but for the planting of a pine plantation, or something along such lines. The intention would be that the authority interpreting the clause and would do so in the broadest sense.

Mr LEWIS: The only other concern I have about the definition is that it would have to be a loose interpretation if we were to accept the Acts Interpretation Act definition of the meaning of the word 'lands'. The land may be below the normal water level of a stream, river estuary or coastal bay. Let us take the example of a Murray swamp, where the owner wishes to establish fish ponds. It may mean that the owner cannot do that without approval of the authority to do so because, in the process, there may be a temporary dislocation of the macrophytes growing six inches below the surface of the water, or any number of other species that I could name. It is a bit narrower than I would like it to have been since 'land' itself as a definition is broader than simply 'agricultural'. I would have been happier if the definition had been 'land other than for urban and industrial development.'

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is absolutely right. In fact, it is the intention that this legislation should come into play where there is a proposition for, say, the extensive draining of the wetland area.

Mr Lewis: Not draining—for fish production.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Whatever is undertaken which extensively changes the nature of this piece of the environment. So, the definition, as the honourable member indicates, is kept in that form so that we have those powers to exercise if the authority wants to do so.

Mr LEWIS: In effect, the Minister is saying that it would not only be possible for the authority but that it is his intention for it, under the terms of this Act, to have responsibility, but indeed it is outside its capacity, to look at a proposal to develop fish ponds on what might become uneconomic dairy swamps or fish ponds on wetland which is already along the Lower Murray and which has not been drained as dairy swamps already and which, up to this point, never came under the control of the native vegetation clearance control regulations in their original form.

It also seems that mariculture developments in shallow coastal waters will be made unlawful without the approval of the authority and that the authority does not even have the legal—as the Bill sees it—prerogative of considering applications about mariculture or aquiculture. That worries me a bit, too, because another industry I thought we might be able to establish here is water chestnut production, and so on, of one kind or another. If it is not possible to develop the land simply because it does not come under the definition of 'agricultural land' and because it is precluded from the definition unless the authority has the power to make a decision about it, one is caught in a catch 22 situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Maybe I unintentionally misinformed the honourable member and the Committee. It is not the intention that these powers should be used except where there is a drastic modification of the local environment. It seems to me that for the most part mariculture would not be included in that, because there would not be a drastic modification of the environment. However, I wanted to make the point that certainly, where there was an extensive draining of a wetland envisaged, the honourable member is absolutely right that the authority would have powers under this legislation to consider that.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 27 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—'Power to inspect land and premises.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page, 13, lines 17 to 21—Leave out subsection (1) and insert the following subsection:

(1) A member of the Authority or a person authorised in writing by the Minister may—

(a) at any reasonable time, enter upon and inspect land for any reasonable purpose connected with the administration of this Act, but no building shall be entered pursuant to this sub-section unless the occupier has been given reasonable notice of the proposed entry;

(b) require any person who the member or authorised person believes has committed, or is about to commit, an offence under this Act to state that person's full name and usual place of residence.

This is basically an enforcement provision which enables the authority or person authorised by the Minister to enter upon land. I see that as perfectly reasonable, but I also commend to the Committee the proposal in paragraph *(b)* of my amendment which also empowers a member of the authority or authorised person to obtain the name and address of a person whom they perceive to be committing or is about to commit an offence under the Act. Without that power in the legislation it will be very difficult for those required to enforce its provisions to do so. I commend the proposal to the Committee as a way of enhancing the enforcement provisions of the Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 32, schedules and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I am pleased that this legislation has finally passed through this House. I make one point—I made it during the second reading speech—and that relates to my disappointment that the Opposition did not have the opportunity to look at the draft regulations. At the time I thought that the Minister had indicated that that would be rectified, but I still do not have them. If the Minister would see to that matter, I would be even happier in supporting the third reading of this Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During previous years in this House I have referred constantly to the problems that have arisen from time to time concerning travel industry agents. My attention has been drawn to this issue in the past six months or so because of questions raised in the Federal Parliament and because of statements made by several federal Ministers that these problems would soon disappear—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They let you down again.

Mr FERGUSON: —following the introduction of complementary State and federal legislation. I agree with the interjection, the Federal Parliament has let us down. I was alarmed to read in the recent press release from the Minister of Sport, Recreation and Tourism, Mr John Brown, that the Federal Government had revised its position and decided to leave the remaining work on the legislation to the States. I find this press release both disappointing and alarming. Anyone who has followed the history of the local travel agent crashes would know that the holiday dreams of an unknown number, but certainly a large number, of Adelaide travellers, have crumbled with the failure of certain local travel agents. I know that the State Attorney-General has now directed his officers to look at alternative means of regulation that will not involve the Commonwealth.

I am sorry to see the failure of the discussions on common legislation for the Commonwealth and State Governments. Travel agencies are involved in work that traverses interstate and national boundaries and the need for regulation, with complementary legislation between the Commonwealth and the States, would be obvious to everybody in this House. I know that regulation is distasteful to some people, but from time to time there has been a call from all sides of the political spectrum to protect the South Australian public.

Our local newspapers over the years, and particularly in recent years, have been sprinkled with stories of the collapse of travel agencies. The latest episode relates to the Norwood Travel Centre, which apparently was abandoned, leaving behind passports, accounts, receipts, pamphlets and other paperwork. Police and Consumer Affairs investigators have estimated that the loss to the travelling public would be at least $18 000. The *News* on 10 July 1985 reported that a man had been arrested on fraud charges following the collapse of this agency, and the rule of *sub judice* will not allow me to discuss further this case.

In the wake of the tour firm's collapse there has been a call for the provision of a trust account being established for travel agencies. This is not a new proposition, and there has been a call for many years for either insurance or the establishment of a trust account for all travel agencies. Another case was referred to in the *News* of 29 January 1984 as follows:

> A Director and a former employee of an Adelaide travel firm, which collapsed last week with debts of at least $100 000, have been charged in relation to financial dealings of the company. Police laid a charge against the two men on Friday, and they appeared in court on Saturday. Burnside CIB said yesterday the charges related to alleged false pretences and a $17 000 loan to the Living Travel Company of Rundle Street, Kent Town. Meanwhile a provisional liquidator says, 'Records relating to the clients' trust fund operating by the company are missing'. He says airlines and travel companies in South Australia are unlikely to recoup losses, $10 000 in one case, that customers have paid Living Travel in advance for tickets.

Unfortunately, we have had headlines of this nature in South Australia year after year, and the only way that we can protect the travelling public from such unsavoury practices is by way of regulation. I am sure that many members of the House are aware that overseas holiday travel is often the result of years of saving and includes money accumulated through long service leave, accumulative annual leave and by just plain hard saving by South Australians who are seeking the holiday dream of a lifetime. There is no doubt in my mind that South Australians' hard won savings should be protected from being plundered by unscrupulous agents.

The Australian travel industry has been littered with company crashes, and the travelling consumer is still basically unprotected. I pay tribute to the Australian Federation of Travel Agents who for many years have been trying to produce a solution that would overcome the problems of travel companies going into sudden liquidation and leaving behind extremely large debts which have proved to be an embarrassment to the travel industry as a whole.

In South Australia, as in all States except New South Wales, the criticism has been made that it is very easy for somebody to hang up a travel agent's sign and go into business. There are no requirements at all; no training is necessary, there is no financial investigation into a new travel firm, no bonds are to be deposited, and it is not even necessary for an agency to set up a trust fund.

The crashes in the travel industry have made it obvious to all that some form of consumer protection is necessary in the industry. Protection has been a long time in coming to fruition. Legislation was first introduced in 1975 by the then Whitlam Government, but after that Government lost office the incoming Fraser Government adopted the idea that self-regulation was the way to consumer protection.

One only has to refer to the collapse of the large travel agency, Tour World International. Airlines have lost hundreds and thousands of dollars, and the reported debts were stated to be nearly $2 million. The collapse caused panic within the tourist industry after receivers had been called in by the Australia and New Zealand Bank. An airline official described the whole episode as a mess. Generally speaking, in a situation like this, airlines agree to honour tickets that have been paid for and issued even if they have not received payment from the agent. In recent times, passengers already travelling or holding tickets for future travel have not faced any interruption to their plans, but there has been nothing to protect people who pay deposits or full fares for tickets that have not been issued. My own attention to this matter (and I am sure this also relates to my other parliamentary colleagues) has been diverted by the fact that very firm statements on it were made in the Federal Parliament.

The question was raised by Senator Bolkus on 15 December 1983, in the Senate, and the very hopeful reply that came from Mr Brown, the federal Minister for Tourism, certainly led me to believe that there was no need to continue to pursue this problem, but this is not the case. I hope that there is a speedy resolution to this particular problem. At the moment we are facing an upturn in the economy. All graphs supplied by State and federal Treasuries indicate an upward movement in the economy. Therefore, problems are unlikely to occur immediately, but we know from the history of this industry that any recession, no matter how slight, will mean that we will go back to the bad old days of seeing company crashes, leaving many South Australians in the position of losing their very hard won money.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I take the opportunity, first, to refer to problems relating to water on the Adelaide Plains. It has been a long-time decision of Governments of both political persuasions that the water for agricultural purposes —more particularly, vegetable growing, lucerne and other products of that nature—be kept under control. There is a very good hydrological reason for that.

There is an indication from expert investigation that the cone of water available in that situation has deteriorated, and there is always the possibility of an ingress of saline water from the gulf. That being the case, there has been a bipartisan approach to this matter and there has been an agreement—not always totally acceptable—that there has to be a management program that adequately takes heed of those facts.

As a result of that management program, which has developed over a period, market gardeners or agriculturalists who used water at a certain date were given an allocation. Subsequently, there have been adjustments to that allocation. In the early stages it was always possible for a person who procured a block of land in that area, whether as a result of new subdivision, or a parcel of land that had been separated from an existing parcel but had its clear title previously, or if it happened to have been a piece of land that was relinquished by local government or otherwise or had been made available after being used for extractive industries—which were very common in those areas, for both sand and loam—would be able to acquire a licence to sink a well or pump to low level that would guarantee him a supply of water for his house, personal garden and what few stock he may have.

Without access to water of that nature, that land was virtually useless. It is in a rainfall area of somewhere between 13 and 15 inches, not always assured. It is not in an area that has direct access to reticulated water, but because of its proximity to agricultural areas, to the rural town of Angle Vale and to Adelaide it has maintained a fairly high value. More recently, the E & W S Department has completely

clamped down on the availability of a household license for a person who is in possession of such a parcel of land to build a home and be able to obtain that small quantity of water that is required for personal use and for the home garden.

It has been suggested that such people who want to build a home on their land should seek to acquire an indirect service from the E & WS Department, notwithstanding that the E & WS main might be as far as five kilometres away and that there might be some resistance from the local governing body, and indeed from the E & WS Department to make such indirect services available.

A person wanting, say, a five kilometre E & WS service pipeline not only has the expense of having it laid and buried in common or council ground but may have the inconvenience of having a very poor reticulation service, being at the far end of a line, getting only a dribble of water out, if he is lucky. In those circumstances, with such a suspect water supply, one must then install a very large tank so that water which might come through in the evening can be retained in the tank and used for domestic purposes throughout the day.

A number of people have been invited to appeal against the rejection of their applications for water for household use. Such appeals involve further expense. I have all the details of one case that was heard before a tribunal earlier this year. These documents are available for any honourable member who would like to read through them. This appeal cost the appellant an amount of money, as he had to be represented, the department having indicated that it would be represented.

The tribunal made the following statement to the appellant on the day that the appeal was heard:

> The tribunal has considered a number of possibilities that will be open to you. Obviously, there is the opportunity of purchasing water from somebody else. That apparently is not as easy as it sounds but it is by no means impossible either. Any expense incurred in your doing that would be well and truly offset compared with holding out any hopes for indirect service. I guess, what I am saying is, if you can buy some water off some of the others, if you can buy some water off the other licensees, then that would be a lot less expensive than waiting for an indirect service and having to purchase it.
>
> You certainly have the sympathy of the tribunal, but unfortunately we cannot find a way around the problem and we simply cannot find a way to justify giving you any water because no water has been used there for over 15 years.

There was a well on this property. Although it had collapsed, it was capable of being repiped and having water drawn from it. The owner sought to do the right thing—to obtain a licence in order to put down that pipe—but, because the well had not been used for 15 years, he was not allowed to do that, and therefore was put in this rather invidious position. The summary of the tribunal continued as follows:

> It really is tantamount to a new use when you look at the date of commencement of restrictions and the whole policy consideration attached to the Northern Adelaide Proclaimed Region. The appeal is dismissed, but a written judgement will be forwarded to you in due course.

The written judgment was forwarded in due course. It indicated that, because he was a person of some means (with a house in Adelaide, a block of land on Yorke Peninsula, and a block of land on which he wished to build his retirement home), he was adjudged to be not in need. What this person's other assets had to do with his needs in relation to the property in question, I will never be able to work out. However, he was deemed to be not in need, refused permission to have water provided, and told to go and seek to buy water.

He did just that, because some of this water is now being offered for sale by people who do not want to use it. That is another case of a privilege providing a financial benefit for those who would sell it. That person wanted only 500 000 gallons for a full year, and that amount was expected to be greater than his requirement, so he sought to make this contact and he was told, 'Yes, you can have 1 million gallons' and that it would cost him between $3 000 and $3 500. On the information available it seems that automatically he would lose 10 per cent of that amount under Government policy, and perhaps no-one would argue about the loss of 10 per cent.

However, he was then advised that, according to a new direction of the Minister on 22 July 1985, because the land was not to be used for agricultural purposes or as was originally intended, the department would subtract another 70 per cent, so that he would get 20 per cent of the 1 million gallons that he had purchased for $3 500. What chance has that person to make use of a home that he is building for his retirement? Who is ripping off whom in these circumstances?

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to an issue that concerns me and the public of South Australia, that is, the public utterances of the member for Davenport. As we have heard so often in the past, the member for Davenport shoots from the hip, he has a mouth like the Grand Canyon, and he is prepared to bucket anyone to get cheap political mileage in the media. I refer to the incident that the Minister cited today—a collision between two train movements on the Noarlunga Centre line.

While I do not condone what happened, I am concerned that the member for Davenport makes utterances in the press and then has the gall and the temerity to telephone the Secretary of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen and ask about the circumstances pertaining to the accident. Needless to say, the AFULE and many of its members were incensed at the utterances of the member for Davenport.

I am informed by railcar drivers that members of the public, not being aware of the safe working regulations that apply to the railway industry and the fact that a railcar driver can stop at a permissive 'stop' signal for one minute and then proceed with caution into the next block, are questioning drivers. Railcar drivers can also go past what is called an absolute signal, under certain conditions. The utterances of the member for Davenport (and I am glad to see he is present) have resulted in members of the public speaking to railcar drivers during transit, and this is very disconcerting.

Obviously, the member for Davenport, given his stupid remarks, is not aware that railcar drivers under certain conditions can go past those signals. His remarks are an affront to railway workers—and I was a railway worker for many years. The member for Davenport is prepared to brand all railway men in South Australia collectively. I do not condone what happened, but nevertheless why should he brand not only railcar drivers but every railway man. Indeed, the honourable member failed to mention that the guard is in charge of the train: he was unaware of that fact. However, the member for Davenport was prepared to tip the bucket, literally, on the railcar drivers.

It is shameful that the honourable member was prepared, without first obtaining the facts, to shoot off his mouth to the press. He should be condemned, because not only has his action incensed railway workers both in the traffic grades and indeed the railcar drivers but also it has caused unnecessary concern to the public. I am informed that people are saying to drivers, 'You have gone past a signal. You are creating a danger for the passengers.' The member for Davenport should apologise to the AFULE for what he has done. As a man involved in the railway industry for more than 24½ years, I do not condone any breach of safe working

rules, but the honourable member should not come out in the press and say that drivers are going past these signals. Of course, as I have said, under certain conditions they can go past the signals, but he is obviously unaware of that fact.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It is not the first time that the member for Davenport has wanted to shout people down. He does not know what he is talking about and he ought to get his facts straight.

I want to commend the present Minister of Transport (Hon. Gavin Keneally) and the previous Minister (Hon. Roy Abbott) for their actions in installing boom gates at the Woodville railway crossing at GMH on Port Road. Those signals were sorely needed. This Government was prepared to put its money where its mouth was in order to protect not only the pedestrians and motorists using the up and down tracks of Port Road, but also the pedestrians who use that roadway.

As a result of my involvement over some four years in requesting a new bus service to Delfin Island, West Lakes, the Minister of Transport made a recent announcement and, whilst applauding that, as I have expressed to the Minister, I am disappointed with the route of the bus service. Whilst it goes down Corcoran Drive, it comes to a dead end and then goes back on the same route along the West Lakes Boulevard. Unfortunately, it seems to me that someone has been remiss in that area, because Corcoran Drive extends onto Delfin Drive, which as I said is an extension of Corcoran Drive, and loops back on to Corcoran Drive some 300 or 400 yards to the south. I would have thought that it would be logical for that bus service to be extended along that route, and looped back onto Corcoran Drive.

This service will provide a facility for three retirement villages in the West Lakes area: Woodbridge South and Woodbridge North, although unfortunately at this stage it does not really couple up with Woodbridge East. I have spoken to the Minister privately, but I want to put it on record that I appeal to him. I know that, as he is a very competent Minister, he will give this proper consideration. I hope that in the very near future the Minister will be able to provide me with the appropriate information so that I can convey it to my constituents in relation to the extension of that service. I hope that a revised service will cater for not only those residents who currently reside in the Delfin Island area but also for those people who will take up residence in the future, because the Delfin Island development is not yet fully completed. I imagine that another 200 homes are yet to be built in that area.

The bus service will also provide the opportunity for schoolchildren to go to the various schools in and around my area: in this respect I refer to Seaton Primary School, Seaton High School and West Lakes High School. It will also provide a connecting service to the West Lakes Shore Primary School, an area that has been neglected in the past. As I said previously, it is interesting that we do not find very many new services introduced under a conservative Government, although they are certainly introduced under a Labor Government.

The other matter that I want to address is the need for a pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Semaphore Park Primary School. There has been much correspondence back and forth between the Woodville council, the Road Traffic Board and the Minister in relation to the need for a pedestrian crossing to safeguard the children who use this increasingly busy road along Fairford Terrace. I received today correspondence from the Secretary of the Semaphore Park Primary School Council expressing concern about this matter. This school is becoming busier with an increasing number of students attending it. I hope that the Minister will have looked closely at this matter.

The Woodville council, the Semaphore Park Primary School and I support this project. Unfortunately, when the appropriate authority counted the number of children who crossed this road it found that a crossing was not necessary. I strongly support the school and the Woodvile council in regard to this matter and hope that, if the pedestrian crossing is not installed this year, the Minister will be able to provide sufficient funds for its commencement before the start of the next school term.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 28 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 August 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

18. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: What property, goods, items, etc., were lost or stolen from Government hospitals and institutions and the South Australian Health Commission in each of the past three years?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member is referred to the reply given by letter to this question on 2 August 1985.

CLEAN AIR ADVISORY COMMITTEE

26. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Who are the members of the Clean Air Advisory Committee and what is the term of appointment and remuneration of each?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Members of the Clean Air Advisory Committee are as follows:

Mr G.R. Inglis (Chairman)
Mr A.J. Smith (Deputy of the Chairman)
*Dr B.K. O'Neill
*Professor R.W.F. Tait
*Professor P. Schwerdtfeger
*Mr P. Davos
*Mr J.M. Davey
*Mr D. Gray
*Dr D. Mathews
*Mr J.R. Tucker
Dr C.C. Baker

* Denotes members who are eligible for a fee of $85 per meeting

Each member has been appointed for a term expiring on 11 April 1990.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

32. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: What were the findings of the audit of Lyell McEwin Hospital for the years ended 30 June 1983 and 1984 and what remedial action has been taken?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member is referred to the reply given by letter to this question on 1 August 1985.

FLINDERS RANGES

48. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will the Minister adhere to the views and wishes of local government and residents before he proceeds to draw up or implement the Flinders Ranges Land Management Plan?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The views of local government and residents will be fully taken into account during the planning process, which will take several years starting from July 1985. To ensure this, representation from all the major interest groups in the area have been invited to join one of two groups to oversee the preparation of the plan. One group is to be based in Adelaide, the other in the Flinders. As well, consultation will be maintained with each individual group and council.

Councils having no planning staff have been offered the services of Department of Environment and Planning officers to help prepare their own detailed, local components of the plan. A brochure has been circulated in the area which will be followed up with regular newsletters. Public meetings will be held. Regular advertising of progress will be made through the radio and newspaper media. There will be two stages of public advertisement and comment, rather than the one required by the Planning Act. A study report is expected to be exhibited in July 1986, with a draft plan at a later date. In summary, the process is to be as open to input, comment and scrutiny as possible.

PORT AUGUSTA TAFE

49. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What was the cost to relocate the tennis courts so that the TAFE buildings can be enlarged at Port Augusta and was the Department of Technical and Further Education or any other Government department involved in the costs of the relocation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost to relocate the netball courts (not tennis courts as mentioned in the question) from their current location adjacent to the Port Augusta College of TAFE to a new site on land purchased from Australian National is estimated at $761 678—which includes $71 650 land costs.

2. The cost of the relocation was borne by the Department of Technical and Further Education from its State funded capital works and property line allocation. The relocation of the netball courts and subsequent acquisition of the old netball site has enabled Australian Government TAFEC funds to be made available for the College redevelopment. (Estimated at $7.6 million—May 1985).

POLICE AIRCRAFT

50. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many light aircraft are owned by the South Australian Police Department, when were they purchased, at what price and what are they used for?

2. How many light aircraft are leased by the Police Department and for what reasons?

3. What are the annual maintenance costs of the aircraft and where are the planes located?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Two light aircraft are owned by the Police Department. They are a Cessna 402C which was purchased in February 1985, for $624 000 (less a trade-in allowance of $250 000), and a Cessna 414 which was purchased in August 1982 for $240 000.

The aircraft are used for:

Transportation of police personnel throughout the State and to locations outside the State where circumstances dictate such mode of travel.
Movement of prisoners between prisons and courts.
Conveyance of civilian witnesses in Crown proceedings, as required.
Conveyance of non-police specialists to scenes of crimes in country areas.
Conveyance of dead bodies for post-mortem examinations.
Transporting of dependants of police members for reasons associated with their remote location in country areas.
Aerial surveillance and/or detection of drug cultivation, fires, missing persons, aircraft, vehicles or vessels at sea.
Transporting of State Emergency Service personnel, as required.
Training of police personnel in search and rescue operations.

2. One aircraft is leased. It is used to supplement the activities of the two owned aircraft. It is preferable to have a leased aircraft available at all times than to 'hire and fly' on an ad hoc basis for reasons of performance, seating capacity, and aircraft compliance with Department of Aviation requirements.

3. Maintenance costs total approximately $87 000 per annum. The aircraft are based at Adelaide Airport.

X-LOTTO

52. **Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: What were the X-Lotto unclaimed dividend totals for the past three financial years?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The totals were:

1982-83	$7 498.89
1983-84	$11 284.97
1984-85	$9 477.75

PAROLE BOARD

87. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Correctional Services: What were the costs of running the Parole Board for each of the past four financial years?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The costs of running the Parole Board for each of the past four financial years are as follows:

1981-82	$46 861
1982-83	$52 411
1983-84	$98 545
1984-85	$141 897

The figures for 1981-82 and 1982-83 do not include board contingency costs. These costs were included within Department of Correctional Services contingency lines and can not be readily determined.

McLAREN VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

88. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Minister reply to the letter from the member for Murray dated 21 May 1985 regarding the provision of facilities at the McLaren Vale Primary School? Is there any specific reason for the delay and, if so, what is it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A reply was sent on 6 August 1985.

STIRLING SEWER EXTENSIONS

94. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: When is it expected that plans for the next stage of the Stirling District Council sewer extensions will be placed before the Public Works Standing Committee for consideration?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Stage III of the Stirling-Aldgate-Bridgewater sewerage scheme has been placed on the current Engineering and Water Supply Department's five year capital works plan as a priority category 4 item. As such, it is unlikely to be placed before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in the near future.

IYY GRANTS

98. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Labour: Which people or groups have received IYY grants, for what purposes have these grants been used and what has been the amount of each grant made?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

Grants to Young People—IYY Grants First Call
Summary of Projects Funded

Djabbic Youth Theatre Ensemble, $750: A group of young people is establishing a drama group to bridge the gap between secondary school drama and professional drama. A performance for Come Out is being planned, in addition to three further performances during the year.

Findon Youth Centre, $750: A youth centre is to be established by a group of young people. The centre will be utilised by five different youth clubs in the area.

Young Women's Conference, $750: The conference is being organised by and for young women. The focus will be on the development of life skills and self-awareness. In addition, discussions will be held on issues of relevance to young women. The event is supported by SAYF.

Venturers 'Off the Road' Vehicle, $750: Renmark venturers intend to construct an 'off the road' vehicle using second-hand parts. The people involved will have an opportunity to learn skills in motor mechanics, welding, etc. The completed vehicle will be made available to other community groups.

Disco and DJ-ing Workshop, $650: A workshop will be held for young people involved in the Port Lincoln Kid's Kitchen to enable them to develop skills in disco lighting operation and DJ-ing. The aim is for the people involved to be able to run their own discos.

Murray Bridge Youth Club, $500: A group of young people in Murray Bridge plan to establish a venue of their own to be used for youth club activities.

Aborginal Youth Club, $750: An Aboriginal youth club will be formed in Oodnadata. The aim of those involved is to combat the boredom and isolation resulting from their location.

Interdenominational Sunday Gathering, $750: The project is designed to bring together young people at an interdenominational gathering to focus upon the Christian response to IYY and its themes. The event will be held in Adelaide and will involve predominantly South Australian young people.

Rehabilitation Gardening Project, $750: A group of young blind and visually impaired people are organising a horticulture cooperative. The project will be located at the Royal Society for the Blind and will be supervised by staff.

Sundays in the Park, $750: A range of activities are being organised by a group of young volunteers to inform young people of organisations and services in their local areas.

Stop 25—Street Theatre, $365: Eight young people plan to perform a series of five-minute plays which make statements about society. The scripts have been written by members of the group.

Sea Rescue Squad Boat Shed, $750: A boat shed is to be built to have a training craft to be purchased by the newly formed cadet division.

Young Gays Survey, $750: This project aims to increase awareness of gays' issues by conducting a survey of young gays (15-25 year olds) who frequent gay social venues in Adelaide.

Renovation of Glenelg Youth House, $600: A youth initiated project in the Glenelg area. A group of young people with the assistance of skilled adults have decided to renovate their local youth centre.

Port Augusta YCW Newsletter, $510: The Port Augusta YCW plan a newsletter with the view to improving the communication, support and understanding between youth groups in the Iron Triangle. It is proposed the newsletter will be published on an eight weekly basis. The newsletter will include information on various youth groups and will hopefully reflect the opinions on current youth issues.

Girl Guide Banner and Poster Project, $75: Banners and posters will be made by the 1st Barossa Valley Girl Guides at the Angaston Show. The banners and posters will illustrate IYY and 75 years of guiding. They will be included in the Girl Guide float during the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival and later hung in the Girl Guide Centre.

Regency Park Electric Car Project, $125: A group of students at Regency Park wish to form a group whose interest focuses on radio controlled cars. It is hoped to, in value, attract other muscular dystrophy boys in the project. Some research will need to be done to ascertain the best type of car to be used in the project. The young people propose to build their own track with assistance of two adults. It is expected there will be races organised with other groups already involved in the sport.

YWCA Young Females Club, $450: This club will be focused toward young women between 17-25 as an alternative to organised sporting groups. The club will introduce young women to the concepts, beliefs and ideas of the YWCA. It is proposed the positive atmosphere will foster, self-confidence, self-esteem and leadership skills.

Loreto College Youth Issues Radio Project, $500: Year 12 students at Loreto College plan to make a series of 30-second community announcements for radio. The announcements will alert the public to the problems and issues concerning youth in 1985.

Cottage Children/Refugee Horse Riding Project, $500: A group of young people (presently residing in Catholic Welfare Cottage Homes) with horse riding/management experience will teach refugee children to ride. The project will encourage young people to share their experience and create better racial understanding. A book 'Rattle-trap Rosie' will be presented to each of the children as a remembrance of the day.

Nunga Youth Club, $750: This project will provide a venue where young Aborigines can meet in the Port Lincoln area. The aim is to offer an alternative to the football club and offending subculture.

Resistance Film Survey, $655: The Resistance youth group proposes to show a series of films to offer young people dealing with current issues, that is, nuclear arms, world peace, unemployment. A survey sheet will be distributed at each film and the audience will be asked to write their opinion of the film. The project is designed to lift the awareness of the young people on issues that will affect their future.

York Town Come-Out For Peace, $350: A group of year 11 students will present for 'Come-Out' 'Drama for Production'. The drama group will perform a script created through group discussion, improvisation and research. The production will focus on youth issues that have been researched by the group. There is a possibility the group will tour with the production.

Single Parent Children Adventure Camp, $750: The Belair 'Boys Brigade' plans two adventure camps for childen of single parent families.

Promotion of SAYFOD, $750: The South Australian Youth Forum of the Disabled plans to design and distribute a poster. The aim is to publicise the existence of SAYFOD and the role it plays in the community. Furthermore, the project is designed to encourage more young people with disabilities to become involved with SAYFOD.

Come Out Cabaret, $735: The Offspring Theatre group will perform in the Come Out Club, presenting cabaret style entertainment. This project is initiated by youth and will be run by youth. It is proposed to run over a period of 10 weeks enabling youth to foster their theatrical skills.

Barossa Valley Youth Folk Dance, $630: Two young people in the Barossa Valley aim to hold a folk dance with expected attendance of 150 people. It is hoped to provide an alternative to existing entertainment offered in the area with the accent on participation.

Julia Farr Video Project, $750: A video is to be established and coordinated by a group of young disabled residents at the Julia Farr centre. The project is designed to provide entertainment in a situation where options are limited in addition to skills to those involved in organising.

Pt Augusta Drop-in Centre, 'The Place Upstairs', $750: The drop-in centre is aimed at 13-18 year olds, and will be staffed initially by volunteers. It is designed to provide a relaxed venue for young people where they can receive support.

SAINTY, $750: For the production of a video on Peace Education. SAINTY is an organisation of South Australian tertiary and secondary students.

IYY GRANTS SECOND CALL

Projects Funded

Peterborough IYY Meeting Place, $750: The Peterborough IYY Committee will establish a coffee shop/meeting place. This will provide a focal point for socialising and also create a centre for information services, seminars, film nights, etc.

Mount Gambier IYY Disco, $300: A group of young people in Mount Gambier will organise a disco to coincide with the visit of the DCW caravan to the town.

ASG Karate Club, $690: The ASG Karate Club will purchase uniforms for members. The club consists of over 30 young people, aged between 12 and 20. Their aim is to

promote pride in the club and its activities. The karate club is, in its words, the alternative to being on the streets.

Youth Entertainment to the Elderly, $160: Youth Entertainment to the Elderly aims to benefit people of all ages: the old through the mediums of song and melodrama and the young through contact and experience with the aged. The group intends visiting a number of homes for aged and disabled people, presenting a cabaret style of show.

Sunday School Camp, 1985, $200: A group of young people aged between 18-24 will take 34 children (7-12) on a three-day camp. The camp will be held at the Seeanee campsite, Stirling, during the September holidays. The camp organisers hope to develop a great sense of self-confidence and responsibility through this exercise.

Social Survival Youth Program, $500: A series of sports carnivals, excursions, camping trips, etc. will be held by young people in Coober Pedy to develop social, organisational and leadership skills.

Young People for No More Hiroshimas, $500: To commemorate the 40th anniversary of the destruction of Hiroshima, eight people wish to produce a poster. Not only does this project impart technical and practical skills, that is, silk screening techniques, but it also reflects the 'peace' theme of IYY and demonstrates that young people are concerned about the state of their world.

Mural Month—Port Pirie, $600: Throughout the month of July, selected walls and stobie poles in Port Pirie will be painted. This will improve the skills of young people and the aesthetics of the township, as well as lend visibility to IYY.

Video Production Aimed at Youth, $1 000: A combined project between the Service to Youth Council and MAPS.

Wildlife Park, $750: Since 1973, Bute Rural Youth has managed a wildlife park: the park is now in need of refencing. The project has been funded to enable the young people of Bute to continue the park, rather than allow its closure or takeover by a larger service club.

Operation Clubhouse, $750: Peterborough Motorcycle Club intends building a clubhouse. The junior members of the club are involved in the planning and execution of the project.

Project Genesis, $500: A group of young people from Ardrossan is arranging a talent quest involving the whole community. The group hopes to promote understanding and appreciation between generations through community entertainment.

Garden Project, $80: The students of East Murray Area School have established gardens. With an IYY grant, these people will be able to improve and extend the gardens, and in so doing gain skills relevant to a rural community.

Morris Commercial Truck Restoration, $250: The restoration of two Morris trucks will give the Karoonda community a highly visible project for IYY and a permanent asset. The restored vehicles will play a role in the local Jubilee celebrations.

Ngeringa, $650: The young disabled people of Ngeringa will undertake two projects. The first is the addition of a poultry run to existing farming and gardening activities. This will provide an opportunity to undertake care of animals. The second project consists of visits to centres like Ngeringa in Sydney and Melbourne. Those involved in this project will benefit greatly in terms of independence and self-confidence.

Port Lincoln IYY Mural, $750: Through an IYY poster competition, designs have been selected for printing in the main shopping area of Port Lincoln. A mural artist will hold workshops for young people before the painting is started.

Video Production, *The Blindness*, $370: The mentality and issues of racial discrimination and racist views will be explored in this videotape production. *The Blindness* will be entered in the Young Film Makers Award.

Not the Antipodes: Entertainment Promotions for Youth, $750: 'Not the Antipodes' activities will include the screening of non-commercial circuit films, new bands nights, mini-concerts etc. Venues for stage 'Not the Antipodes' will be around the Stirling/Aldgate area.

Youth—Sprint Chair, $750: The young members of the Paraplegic and Quadraplegic Sports Association will acquire a sprint wheelchair. The association has been active in sporting events for some time, and the new chair will allow the potentials of young people to be more fully developed.

Cummins Area School Entertainment Project, $750: A group of young people wish to purchase the preliminary equipment and gain the skills to enable them to hold a series of discos in the Cummins district. The project will, initially, benefit 300 people.

Yaninee Church Grounds Beautification, $500: This project will not only improve the environment of Yaninee, but will also provide a lasting contribution to the community by its young people.

Youth Housing Information Video: A combined project between the Service to Youth Council and MAPS.

BBQ Development in Quorn Community Recreation Park, $462: Students of the Quorn Area School will undertake the construction of a BBQ area in the recreation park. The park itself was reclaimed from swamp land by the students.

Double Exposure—Two Nights of Performance by Youth for Youth, $750: Double Exposure will be a cabaret style presentation, occurring over two Friday nights. It will include film and musical, as well as live performances. 'Double Exposure' will reflect the issues and circumstances confronting young people in the 1980s. In addition, a weekend workshop will be held to share skills amongst performers and interested members of the public. Contact: Rachel Boyce/Catherine Fargher—424 006

Tiger Judo Club Resource Centre, $300: The members of the club wish to establish a resource and information centre of relevant books, tape, etc.

Adventure Community/School Playground, $200: Two young people will design and construct a playground for under-10 year olds. A total of $250 has already been raised towards this project.

End of Course Exhibition, $500: A group of 28 fine arts students will hold an exhibition to mark the end of their course. They will, through various mediums, demonstrate their capabilities as young artists. The exhibition will be held in the Festival Theatre foyer.

SUBMARINE PROJECT

102. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Premier confirmed with the Federal Government that no announcement on the successful tenderer for the Navy's submarine project can be made before the end of 1986 and, if not, what advice has he sought and received from the Federal Government on this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Federal Government signed project definition study contracts with HDW/IKL/Ferrostaal, the Eglo Engineering team and the Australian Submarine Corporation, comprising: Kockums AB, CBI Constructors, Wormald International, and AIDC on 12 August 1985. The contracts will require the contractors to evaluate prospective contruction sites and make a recommendation to the Commonwealth on their suitability. The project definition study contract is expected to last 15 months.

PRISONERS

108. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Correctional Services: What were the numbers of prisoners held in each South Australian gaol as at 31 December 1983, 30 June 1984 and 30 June 1985, and what proportion of total capacity of each gaol did these figures represent?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Prison	31 December 1983		30 June 1984		30 June 1985	
	No.	Occupancy Per cent	No.	Occupancy Per cent	No.	Occupancy Per cent
Adelaide Gaol	246	110	238	106	313	140
Yatala Labour Prison	165	89	106	57	132	71
Northfield Security Hospital	19	63	17	57	23	77
*Northfield Prison Complex	18	46	31	39	70	89
Port Augusta Gaol	66	63	62	39	77	73
Port Lincoln Prison	28	61	33	72	37	80
Mount Gambier Gaol	14	52	23	85	29	107
Cadell Training Centre	70	46	49	32	97	64

Discussion

Note (1) *Additional accommodation for 40 men, 'The Cottages', was occupied in March 1984.

STATE HEALTH

114. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Commonwealth Government advised the States that it intends to deregulate its participation in the State health field?

2. Is the Government about to drop the present system of categorisation of hospitals and, if so, will it be replaced by the DRG (Diagnosis Related Group) system whereby patients will be admitted for a set period of time according to the surgical procedure and all hospitals will receive the same fee and, if so, how will the length of stay be determined in private hospitals for psychiatric patients?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth Government has advised the States that it intends to deregulate its participation with respect to private hospitals.

2. No specific proposals have been received from the Commonwealth with respect to categorisation of private hospitals.

FINE DEFAULT SCHEME

117. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. When is the 'fine default scheme' intended to commence?

2. Are the same screening safeguards which apply to offenders working under the Community Service Order program being applied under the fine default scheme and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Legislation to provide community work as an alternative to the default of a fine will be introduced into the current session of Parliament. Planning for the scheme is already underway. The Department of Correctional Services would seek a lead time of two months from the date which the legislation is assented to.

2. Provision of community work will become an alternative to default of a fine. The mechanism for placement in community work will be triggered by financial means only, for example, an inability to meet the fine, or an installment thereof. The final definition of a fine, the default rate and the tariff of hours to default rate will be significant factors for (a) the overall numbers, and (b) the range of hours to be worked.

As it is likely that some defaulters may have a short period on community work, and financial means is the only 'suitability' criterion, screening of offenders will be less rigorous than for the Community Service Order program. For safety and efficiency it is intended to place fine defaulters on supervised group projects, separated from community service offenders. It is not planned to place fine defaulters on individual work placements such as pensioner gardening.

LOTTERIES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the total revenue raised from State lotteries in each of the financial years 1983-84 and 1984-85?

2. How was this revenue disbursed in each year?

3. Has any of this revenue been set aside in each year for emergencies and, if so, in which year, how much and for what specific purposes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2.

	1983-84 ($ million)	1984-85 ($ million)
Prize money	46.251	52.970
Operating costs	5.453	7.422
Net surplus (for transfer to Hospitals Fund and Recreation and Sport Fund)	24.781	27.952
Total revenue	76.485	88.344

3. No.

POLICE COMPLAINTS AUTHORITY

132. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What resources have been provided to enable the Police Complaints Authority to carry out its responsibility of dealing with complaints when the legislation is proclaimed in September?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government has provided a total budget of $300 000 to the Police Complaints Authority in 1985-86. This amount incorporates funds for the salary of the authority and up to four full-time staff; contingencies, including a vehicle and office expenses; and the cost of commissioning the office site.