HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 30 April 1993

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 March. Page 2270.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I know the position is not covered in the Standing Orders but, bearing in mind the problem we had last week with the gas escaping, the temperature seems to be rising considerably in this Chamber. Can you advise us about the problem?

The SPEAKER: I suggest to the member for Napier that that matter could have been covered much more simply and easily without a disruption to the service of the House by approaching the Chair or the Clerk and having an inquiry made. Disruptions to the proceedings of the House will not be tolerated.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Opposition supports this legislation. It is interesting to recognise that all of the original signatories of the report are now absent, other than the Prime Minister. The original signatories were the then Premier of Victoria (Mrs Kirner), the then Premier of New South Wales (Mr Greiner) and the then Premier of South Australia (Mr Bannon). The only signature that remains is that of the Prime Minister. This Bill is for the purpose of consolidating and finetuning the 1982 River Murray Waters Agreement which was negotiated by the Tonkin Government with the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth. With the enactment of the Murray-Darling Basin Act in 1983, the River Murray Waters Agreement became the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement.

The Bill tends to modify the current agreement in the following areas. It broadens the role of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council and Commission, and it provides the opportunity for Queensland to become a party to the agreement, and that is something I am sure all members of the House would welcome. It also provides for the implementation of strategies such as the national resource management strategy and the salinity drainage strategy to become schedules to the new agreement. The management of the financial resources of the commission, including flexibility for the ministerial council to determine alternative cost sharing formulae, are also provided for. Water distribution clauses are overhauled so that water used by New South Wales and Victoria is accounted for on a continual basis. Finally, it provides for the appointment of an independent President of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission in lieu of the current arrangements whereby a Commonwealth Commissioner automatically becomes President.

There are a few matters of concern in the Bill that will be raised at the appropriate time, but at this stage I would like a response from the Minister on the following matters. In the Murray Darling Basin Act 1983, the Crown was bound by the provisions of section 4. This clause is not included in the current legislation, although I believe that the Crown continues to be bound. I would like that clarified. I will refer later to the River Murray Boating Management Report. Although this is not specifically related to this legislation, there has been some concern with respect to that report, and the Minister has made a ministerial statement.

Clause 23 of this Bill provides for tolls on locks. Whilst this provision exists in section 16 of the Act, the release of the River Murray Boating Management discussion paper has engendered a considerable amount of fear in the community that this section is about to be invoked. I ask the Minister to respond to that. Clause 61 of the schedule provides for the river to remain as navigable. However, it would appear that the provisions of section 44(3) of the Act regarding the channels at the Murray mouth have been omitted and could result in additional maintenance costs to the South Australian Government. I ask the Minister to respond to that as well.

Fortunately, for all Australians, and particularly for those in the eastern States and South Australia, we are now experiencing a considerable upsurge in interest in the issues affecting and relating to the Murray River. Generally, I believe the Murray-Darling Commission has the respect of the overall community, and that is why there was some concern with the release of the report to which I have referred, because it was felt that previously the commission had been very irresponsible in its attitude to the management of the river and, with the release of that draft report which came out in something of a glossy form rather than giving the impression of its being a draft report, it was felt that the Murray-Darling Commission was tending to get involved in areas that were not necessarily its responsibility but rather more the responsibility of the States.

The Murray-Darling Commission continues to do an excellent job in providing educational publications for all people who have an interest, particularly for the younger members of our community. We all recognise the importance of education in this area, and in that regard there is no doubt that the commission has been very successful. Recently I was provided with a series of cassettes, which spell out clearly the responsibility of the commission very well. They would be invaluable to schools and students. Also, environmental groups have become involved with a number of the publications that are now available, as has local government. It is very encouraging to see the important and increasing role that local government continues to play in these areas.

Also, some excellent organisations are involved with the Murray-Darling Association in its responsibility of managing the Murray River. I would refer to only two in particular: the Murray-Darling Association (previously the River Murray League) and Greening Australia. I was pleased to be able to attend a meeting recently where the Murray Corridor of Green program was launched. This

program will receive $3.1 million seed funding from the Federal Government over the next four years. It will be managed by Greening Australia and delivered on the ground by the local people from farms and towns in the Murray catchment.

The Murray-Darling Basin is Australia's most important river system. The catchment forms about one-seventh of the surface area of Australia, or an area equivalent to France and Spain combined. It has a stream length of some 2 500 kilometres. The basin, we recognise, produces more than one-third of Australia's total output from rural industries, 25 per cent of the nation's beef and dairy produce, 50 per cent of its sheep, lambs and crops, and has an annual production of $12 billion or 40 per cent of Australia's exports. However, this bounty has been achieved only at the price of massive clearing of vegetation for urban settlement and agriculture. In a number of areas, this clearing has caused unsustainable stress to the fabric of the land, manifesting as salinity, toxic algal blooms, river silting, tree decline, loss of wildlife habitat, and so we could go on. In some irrigated areas, groundwater levels are rising at more than 20 centimetres a year. The rising watertable level, which has already reached the surface in many areas, brings about 3 000 tonnes of dissolved salts per hectare to the surface.

CSIRO research using a computer model to predict dry land salinity estimated that some 15 million hectares will need to be reforested with 12 billion trees to keep the Murray-Darling Basin salinity at a sustainable level. Neither the agricultural community along the Murray nor the nation that depends on its production can afford to allow this land to cease production because of land degradation, but neither can we afford to reforest the lot. A major part of the solution lies in webs of trees that form corridors, strategically linked by land-holders, to restore their land and water and simultaneously to ensure maximum benefit to their agricultural productivity, and that is what this program—the Corridor of Green—along the Murray is all about. I wish that program well, because it is very worthwhile indeed.

As I said earlier, it was November 1985 when the four Governments party to the River Murray Waters Agreement agreed to establish a ministerial council. The council comprises Ministers with responsibility for the land, water and environmental resources of the basin from the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. With the passage of this legislation the involvement of Queensland will be very welcome. The council's charter is to promote and coordinate effective planning and management for the equitable, efficient and sustainable use of the land, water and environmental resources of the Murray-Darling Basin.

Council has general oversight and control of the major natural resource policy issues, requiring common action by member Governments in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin. One of the first tasks initiated by council was a major environmental resource study, and the results of that study provided the base document for developing the natural resources management strategy. That strategy was released in draft form in 1989.

To further take into account the community views generated by the release of this document, the council referred the draft strategy to its community advisory committee. The committee's report was interesting, because it confirmed 'that the fundamental principle underlying the natural resource management strategy of the community's participation and leadership to develop local and regional plans of resource management schemes is strongly supported by the basin community'. The natural resource management strategy provides the framework for cooperative and coordinated community and Government action to address the basin's natural resource management problems on a long-term integrated basis. The strategy addresses issues that need to be dealt with at basin-wide level and others that need to be addressed at the regional or local level. The strategy also identifies issues which require priority attention.

There is a considerable amount of information regarding the work and the involvement of a large number of people in that strategy. I recently had the opportunity to attend a very worthwhile national conference that was held in Adelaide regarding water quality management and ecologically sustainable development. It was one of a number of seminars and conferences that have been held recently, all of which have been very worthwhile and very well attended by people throughout Australia. On that particular occasion the Hon. Simon Crean, M.P. (the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy) made what I thought was a significant contribution to that seminar. He made the point that, just as land degradation became a major environmental issue in the 1980s, the management of our water resources would become one of the major environmental issues of the 1990s. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

He went on to say that community awareness of water issues is growing rapidly and is increasingly reflected in media interest and coverage. We only need to look at both the national and State papers to realise that that is the case. He referred to the complexity of water management, which reflects its fundamental importance to all of us—the extent to which we depend on it for so many aspects of our lives. It is not just an environmental issue, and it is not just an economic or industrial issue or a social issue—it is all of these things wrapped up into one. He told the conference that water was not just a State responsibility or a local government responsibility, or the responsibility of communities, business enterprises or individuals, or even a Commonwealth responsibility; it is a responsibility that we all share. That is well recognised.

Mr Crean went on to say that we have given ourselves some enormous problems to manage: for example, diversion of water for development, such as irrigation schemes, has dramatically reduced average annual flow rates in much of the Murray-Darling Basin. Two thirds of the water that would have originally reached the sea is used; total diversion of water from rivers in the basin, excluding Queensland, now account for nearly 90 per cent of the average national flow. He went on to say:

> Above all the management of our precious water resources requires sound policy, policy that takes into account all the competing issues of the resource, their impacts and the many levels of management responsibility.

Government, of course, by itself cannot address all these issues. It really is a matter of landowners and managers in rural and urban areas playing a significant part, and

those people need to be empowered to deal with their own resource management problems. I do not think any of us would disagree with that.

He referred particularly to the problems relating to the input of nutrients into our river systems from diffuse sources. He indicated that these diffuse sources can be reduced by increasing the efficiency of fertiliser use, improving land management practices and through greater awareness of the impacts of human activity on water quality, and the community based Land Care movement has a significant part to play in that regard as well. He made the point, and we would all agree, that significant point sources of nutrients, particularly sewage treatment works, must also be tackled.

The Land Care initiatives that we have seen in recent times have taught us that collective action is a powerful tool. We only have to recognise the burgeoning growth in group numbers to appreciate the role that these groups play. We have to do more to bring Land Care into the cities. That is starting to happen, but there is still a long way to go. I think that is something that the Land Care organisation and those associated with it would want to see in the near future.

I guess there are a number of issues that one could refer to in this debate. It is probably not appropriate to go into too much detail and the opportunity will be provided during the Committee stage to do just that, but I would like briefly to refer to the problems that have been recognised in other parts of Australia and in this State regarding algal blooms, particularly the problems associated with blue green algae.

Both the Minister and I have attended, in recent times, a number of seminars that have dealt successfully and in much detail with many of these issues. We have recognised the importance of nutrient control; we have appreciated and recognised the need for appropriate education and awareness on the part of the community generally; and we have recognised the need for on-going monitoring—and that is an area that has given me some concern in the past, particularly in this State. I have been somewhat anxious about the resources that have been put into monitoring in this area. I am assured that the resources are adequate, but I continue to have some concerns about that.

I attended a recent meeting at Milang where the formulation of strategy was referred to. I found that interesting, particularly in regard to nutrient control and the emphasis on phosphorous, and the impacts of the blooms. Monitoring was also referred to. The increase of frequency and intensity was an issue that I was interested in; it was difficult to determine exactly what was happening in that area. It was pointed out to us on that occasion that scientists were not in a position to say whether the frequency or intensity was increasing.

Mention was made of the impact of Albury on the river system, particularly recognising the importance of nutrient control, and we in this House have recognised the substantial part that the Albury City Council has played in its most recent attempts to overcome this problem. As we said earlier, the council is certainly to be commended.

As a result of the consultation that has taken place about the legislation, I have had contact from a number of people and organisations. One of those organisations is the Local Government Association, and it has raised a point with me, which I bring to the Minister's attention, because I am sure that it has probably made the same representations to him. I have not sought to amend the legislation, but I would certainly appreciate the Minister's comments on a number of these matters.

The association has suggested that there is a need for a separate definition of 'local government' to ensure that local government is clear about its responsibilities and that other Governments also are clear as to the role of local government in regard to this agreement. It is the view of local government that consideration should be given to local government becoming a party to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement.

As I indicated earlier, I have not taken specific action about that matter, but I would be interested in the Minister's comments. Regarding this matter, it was pointed out to me that local government is a party to the Inter-Governmental Agreement on the Environment, with the Australian Local Government Association acting as a signatory on behalf of local government, and it has a representative on the commission as well. I hope that the Minister will address those matters.

Finally, I again refer briefly to the Draft Boating Management Discussion Paper. I recognise that it is not directly related to this Bill but it is of particular interest to people with a concern about the management and future management of the River Murray. As I said earlier, there was great disappointment about the way the draft paper was released without appropriate consultation. So far as I can gather, there was very little consultation and it came out in a rather glossy form, which suggested it was a final document rather than a draft document.

The draft was released at the end of the year, with Christmas and holidays coming up, and it was suggested that a response was required during the holiday period. There was considerable disapproval in the community about that process. There was much confusion, and it was pointed out to me that one of the senior officers who had a responsibility in this area was commenting at public meetings that in South Australia the gazettal had been uplifted and the Murray River designated as a water supply area about four months ago. That continued to be referred to me. I have since found that that is not correct, but that certainly was something being indicated at the time.

There has been concern expressed about any move to change the gazettal of the River Murray, and a number of organisations and individuals have suggested that the river is a multi-user resource and that that is the way it should continue. Indeed, a number of those organisations have urged the Government to ensure that any gazettal reflects the view that it should continue to be a multi-user resource, while having regard to the concern of water quality, which is a matter about which we should all be concerned.

It has also been said that the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement should include a preamble reflecting the multi-use nature of the river. I do not necessarily see that as being practical, because what might happen in New South Wales and Victoria as far as the river is concerned might not necessarily happen in South Australia, and what might happen in Albury-Wodonga might not

necessarily be the case in Mannum or Murray Bridge in South Australia. So, there are some concerns regarding the practicality of such a preamble being placed in the agreement. The Opposition recognises the importance of this legislation; it is certainly a step in the right direction. I reiterate the Opposition's support for the work of the Murray-Darling Commission, and I am sure that that support is felt throughout the State. The Opposition supports this Bill.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I commend the Bill to the House. When the previous member first spoke I thought he would suggest that politically nothing too much had happened since 1982, but he went on to talk about the 1985 agreement as well.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. I think we would want to say that both the 1982 and the 1985 agreements are very important milestones in getting to our present position. I recognise the work of the member for Chaffey during his time as Minister. We are well aware of the litigation with New South Wales and all those sorts of things that went on. It is important to realise that a good deal of quite crude political work still had to occur between 1982 and 1985. I recall attending a meeting of the Australian Institute of Political Science at which Mr John Mant, who is no stranger to South Australia in view of the fact that he was a departmental head in this State in the late 1970s, invited the Ministers present to try and solve the political problems 'while the planets are in alignment', meaning that at that time the Commonwealth and the three river States were ruled by Labor Governments. A meeting was held in South Australia in 1985 and a further meeting was held at Albury, and these things were eventually ironed out—but it was not easy—

I recall the role played by Senator Gareth Evans, the relevant Commonwealth Minister at the time, particularly in hosing down the concerns of the New South Wales people in relation to this matter. As I think various speakers have explained to the House from time to time, irrespective of the Party-political complexion of the State Governments, New South Wales has always been more of a problem to us than Victoria because New South Wales does not have the problems that Victoria has in relation to salinity. No-one other than a mad man would suggest that in Victoria any more land should be placed under irrigation, because of the salinisation problems that exist in that State. The Victorians have always needed our assistance just as we have always needed theirs. The temptation in New South Wales has always been to bring an extra thousand hectares under irrigation because that State does not have the same sort of salinisation problems, the land is there and so to a degree is the water.

I recall the concerns of Janice Crosio, the then New South Wales Minister, in relation to the ongoing use of the water from the Menindee Lakes and a number of other matters. I place on record, even though it is a long time since the event, the work of Gareth Evans, our Chairperson at that time, in getting this agreement between the States. Even at that stage, there was comment about Queensland and about whether that State should have been involved. I think that the feeling at that time was that Queensland would be picked up as we went along, and that wisdom has been shown to be well based. It was hard enough with four Governments without introducing a fifth. Queensland was different: first, because it was not part of the original River Murray Agreement and never had been; and, secondly, because its contribution of water to the system is marginal.

Although the area of Queensland that is part of the Murray-Darling Basin is larger than the area in Victoria that is part of the Murray-Darling Basin, on average Queensland's contribution to the total water in the basin is about 6 per cent whereas Victoria's contribution below the Hume Dam is in excess of 30 per cent, if I recall the matter correctly. So, Queensland was seen as being a fairly minor part of the system, and one that was not a signatory to that agreement at the time. We went ahead and the matter was negotiated and signed. Of course, subsequently, it has been possible to bring Queensland into what we might call the Murray-Darling family so far as agreements and legislation are concerned, and I certainly place on record my appreciation of what has happened there.

I do not want to go into a whole lot of statistics and information about the Murray-Darling system, partly because I have done that on a number of occasions in the past six months in this place, and I may well be running a very grave risk of boring the Chamber silly in relation to the matter in general and statistics about it in particular. If I can just perhaps take a little time to talk about what we might call the hydrological regime in the system which illustrates the problem that we have.

When we think that the Amazon discharges to the sea every six hours on average the amount of water the Murray-Darling system discharges to the sea every year, we begin to get some sort of concept of what we are talking about. The area of Australia which is drained by the Murray-Darling Basin is not significantly smaller than the area of South America which is drained by the Amazon, yet there is that enormous difference in the amount of water which is collected. We can say, if you like, that the extreme sensitivity of the Murray-Darling Basin is very much a matter of too little water spread over too large an area. Nature does not mind that: it adapts itself to it, but when, of course, we start fiddling with nature the degree of sensitivity of the particular system is something that we have to take into account. For the most part, our forebears did not; we are now paying; fortunately we are also doing something about it.

What I have done since October, just as a bit of an interest which has taken up my time for about 11h minutes each day, has been to graph from the figures which are in the *Advertiser* the flow to South Australia across the New South Wales border (not taken exactly on a daily basis; I notice there are no figures on a Monday, so I assume they do not work over the weekend—although the river certainly does) and also the salinity levels at a number of stations down the river, namely, at locks 9, 7 and 5, Berri, Waikerie, Morgan, Mannum, Murray Bridge and Goolwa (although that only becomes an occasional player when the figures are published).

First, if I can talk briefly about the volumetric behaviour of the water in the river since that time which illustrates another point about the hydrological regime of the river—and I would like to incorporate these details in

the record but I know I cannot, nor can I display them, so I will simply pick out the highlights of the graph. On 8 October, when I began this interesting little exercise, the discharge of the Murray to South Australia across the New South Wales border at that time was marginally under 38,000 megalitres a day. It climbed quite sharply in what we might refer to as a mini-flood to a peak on 14 December—or I guess it was the day before, since the figures would be one day out of date—of just under 96,000 megalitres a day. It then declined through January. There was a slight rise at the end of January, and then an enormous dive down to 20,000 megalitres a day in very early February. There was another slight blip and then down to the minimum flow which occurred very early in March when we were just marginally above 5,000 megalitres a day, and we have struggled back to 20,000, which would be almost exactly, I imagine, the figure that is in this morning's paper, although I have not yet perused it, but these things tend to be somewhat predictable.

So, we can see that not only have we a system which has very little water by world standards but we have a system which is extremely variable in the seasonal flow. Any numbers of commentators have mentioned from time to time—indeed, in this place—that the natural environment of the river evolved over millions of years in response to that ebb and flow—that flood and drought regime. The effect of the locking of the Murray has been to even out the levels in the river, even though the flow is still subject to that same force from nature.

Turning very briefly to the salinity levels, and this is an extremely complex graph and I will certainly not spend very much time on it, it is interesting to see that, since October last year and between lock 7 on the one hand and Murray Bridge on the other hand, we have had readings as low as 170 ec units at lock 7 on 15 December in mid flood and as high as 950 ec at Murray Bridge about midway through this month. Generally speaking, there was a slight decline in salinity through October, November and December, and there was not a great deal of variation at the time between lock 7 at the one extreme and Murray Bridge at the other. On one occasion lock 7 was reading about 230 ec and Murray Bridge was only about 355 ec—a very narrow band of salinity.

But when the flood was over and the level dropped and the waters started to flow back from the billabongs, the backwaters, we saw a considerable rise in salinity and a considerable difference between that which was experienced upstream and that which was experienced downstream. For example, on 30 March this year, lock 7 was reading 350 ec and Morgan was reading 900 ec, just on its way down from its peak at about 950 ec one week before. Since about that time, all the readings have shown a quite considerable and gratifying decline, indicating that there was in effect a huge salt slug that moved downstream. One could almost measure its flow from the graph, because the lock 5 (Renmark) peak hits marginally before Berri, and you can see it at Waikerie and then Morgan, and you can picture in your mind's eye the way in which it moves along. As the member for Chaffey reminded me on one occasion, they are the sorts of circumstances where the irrigators might be told to go easy on the irrigating for a few days until the worst has moved through.

Those figures are by no means disastrous. In fact, we are fortunate in that the benchmark which was adopted by the ministerial council for Morgan back in 1985 is one that we have kept fairly well under for most of the time since then because we have had good flows. That does not mean it will always be the case. The work that is proceeding and the work that preceded the passage of this legislation (but the continuation for which is important, so far as this legislation is concerned) must continue and must be accelerated. Some of it is short-term work. The playing with water levels in the Menindee Lakes and Lake Victoria, for instance, has brought some immediate short-term benefits in terms of salinity. The salt interception will bring mid-term benefits, but the really hard yakka, the changes of land use, will bring benefits only in the long term. That is why they must be instituted as soon as possible, and that is why in various ways they are already beginning. I commend the legislation to the House.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I certainly support the remarks of the member for Heysen and those of the member for Baudin. This is an issue that is not a Party political argument. It is one that both sides of Parliament have been endeavouring to grapple with in the overall interests not only of South Australia but Australia as a whole. I have had a natural interest in the Murray system, having lived there all my life. I am the third generation in my family to live on the river.

My family's involvement goes back prior to the turn of the century, when my grandfather became involved in riverboat traffic and established a river shipping company, Arnold's Line of River Steamers Ltd, which was involved in shipping wheat and wool out of the Murray-Darling Basin, long before railroads existed. That traffic continued until the mid-1920s, when the railways took over from the river boats but, up to that point, the river had been used principally as a navigable highway for shipping, to transport the primary products produced in the Murray-Darling Basin down the river system to Goolwa, where the products were distributed through to sailing ships. A bit later most of the shipping concluded at Morgan, where it was then railed through to Port Adelaide.

In the early days, the locks were built principally for navigation purposes and, to that point, they did exactly what was expected of them. There has always been a long-standing argument among riverboat people that the locks were built slightly too far apart and that the gradient from the water being held back by each lock meant that for five or 10 miles below each lock there was always a problem in low flow periods, because the locks were just that little bit too far apart. However, the river served a tremendous purpose for carrying freight into and out of the Murray-Darling Basin during those early, formative years.

The river has a totally different role today and, by the 1970s and 1980s, the original River Murray Waters Act and River Murray Waters Agreement between the three States and the Commonwealth were certainly well and truly out of date. We only have to look back at the history of the negotiations that went on in endeavouring

to reach a new agreement between the three States and the Commonwealth. On coming into Government in 1979, I was well aware of the fact that negotiations had been going on for some six or eight years throughout the then Dunstan Government, with the States of Victoria and New South Wales and the Commonwealth, to try to reach a new agreement but, unfortunately, nothing had been achieved to that point.

The member for Baudin referred to the legal action that the Tonkin Government took against the State of New South Wales. I believe it was one of those very rare occasions—I do not know whether it had ever occurred before—where one State in Australia took another State to court through its own court system. That occurred because the Government of New South Wales was continuing to make large allocations of water for further irrigation, particularly on the Darling, which would have had grave consequences for down-river users, not only for us in South Australia but also for the down-river users on the Darling in New South Wales itself. We had a great deal of support from the irrigators in the lower reaches of the Darling. We were successful in appearances before the Western Land Board hearings in opposing some of the allocations, and one in particular, and this then led the New South Wales Government to appeal against that decision through the Supreme Court.

Before any finality was reached in that appeal in Sydney, Premier Tonkin and I went to Sydney and had a meeting with the then Premier, Mr Wran, and eventually we reached agreement that we would withdraw from any further legal action against New South Wales if the Premier of New South Wales was prepared to sign the new River Murray Waters Agreement, which had been in the formative stages for about eight years.

The Premier was keen to get out of the legal action in New South Wales because officers of the New South Wales department were convinced that South Australia's position would be upheld. So, the New South Wales Premier agreed to sign the new agreement, and in 1982 all four signatures were on that new agreement. Since that time there has been a steady upgrade and improvement of that agreement. The member for Heysen referred to that 1982 agreement basically becoming the first of the Murray-Darling Basin agreements, and it was upgraded again in 1985.

In the past 10 years significant changes have been made to what was the old River Murray Waters Agreement, which principally provided an agreement for the allocation of water to South Australia and the management of the remaining water between Victoria and New South Wales and for navigation purposes. However, by 1980 it was becoming evident that there were real problems developing in relation to degradation, salinity and loss of production. When it is considered that the Murray-Darling Basin contributes somewhere between $10 000 million and $15 000 million annually to the economy of this nation and when we look at the very small amount that has been put back into that basin by the Governments concerned, we recognise that the deterioration had to continue. I have never believed that the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin were insoluble: it was a matter of having the will to want to do something about it and being prepared to put the financial resources into that great resource.

It is recognised as one of the great river systems of the world—perhaps not as far as volume of flow is concerned, but it does cover a vast area and generate a great deal of productivity for this nation. I have always believed that it is one of the great neglects of Governments in this country that they have expected so much from this resource yet have been prepared to put so little back into it. Most of the problems to which the member for Baudin referred can be resolved if the resources are put back into it. Much of it is as a result of abuse and over-clearing; and, in hindsight, a lot of that knowledge was not available at that time—that problems would be created as a result of the action that was taken.

Much of the flood plain areas of the Murray-Darling Basin were cleared for dairy production, pastures and so forth. We removed deep-rooted native trees such as box and red gum which held the water table down and we replaced those forests with shallow rooted pasture grasses, which immediately let the water table rise dramatically. Because of the history of the Murray-Darling Basin, where much of it X millions of years ago was under the sea, there is this enormous residual salt load that will be there forever and a day. We cannot get rid of it: it is there. By removing much of the natural vegetation, we allowed the salt load that has been under the flood plains for millions of years to rise, to come to the surface and virtually to wipe out everything in its path. That can be reversed.

Through the Natural Resources Management Strategy, the commission is making available significant sums of money to interest groups up and down the length of the river system to reafforest much of the area and recreate what was there prior to white settlement. While that is being done, a great deal more needs to be done on the properties. Where there is virtually no native vegetation, if 20 per cent or 30 per cent of each property was planted back to native trees, such as river red gums—a high salt tolerant species, which is now available through clonal selection work carried out in various places, particularly at the University of Western Australia—that would assist resolution of the problem. We now have a number of clones of our native species which are highly salt tolerant and which can be re-established on these flood plains; they will have the effect of drawing down the watertable.

We have had personal experience on our own properties in the Riverland, where there was no comprehensive drainage system in the Cobdogla division. On one of our own properties the watertable had reached the point where it was less than half a metre from the surface. The vineyards were dying out and there was no answer because there was no comprehensive drainage system.

Some eight years ago, one of my brothers planted a large wood lot right across the bottom of his property and today the watertable is down to about two metres, the vineyard is healthy, the salt level is now back where it was before white man interfered with the situation, and we do not have a saline drainage problem to dispose of. So what has happened is that he now has this very valuable wood resource. Of course, the native species can be harvested up to five and six times and they regrow again, so he has a valuable adjunct to his property; if and when he needs any additional income, he

can harvest those trees but not lose them, because they will stay there. In fact, it enhances their ability to hold down the watertable, because the regrowth takes up that much more moisture than the old established trees.

This is now being done in Shepparton. We have also heard the recent announcement regarding Albury City Council, which is in the process of removing its domestic effluent from the river system. But if we go a bit further down river, to the Shepparton area on the Goulburn River, we see a massive undertaking is well on the way towards completion. In that area, there will be massive wood lot plantations of native trees, which will eventually remove all the effluent from the river system. Of course, the effluent load of a place like Shepparton is far greater than that of Albury, even though Shepparton is much smaller. If we consider the domestic sewage load, the industrial effluent load plus the irrigation effluent, we come up with an effluent load of that of a city equivalent to 650 000 people—more than half the size of Adelaide.

All the effluent will be completely removed from the river system in the Shepparton area; it will have created a totally new industry for that area, which will be worth millions of dollars annually, and the problem of disposal will have gone. Of course, that is the ultimate answer, in my view, to many of the pollution problems. We are reafforesting the areas outside primary producing land and, I venture to say, if 30 per cent of most irrigation properties in Victoria and New South Wales were put back into forest, particularly in the flood irrigation areas of dairy pastures and rice production, the production from those properties would not drop. The increased productivity from the remaining 70 per cent would off-set the loss relating to that 30 per cent.

We have to look only at the massive salinity drainage schemes that are operating north of the river, in the area of Barham, where, as a result of flood rice production, there is a massive saline effluent disposal problem. Of course, there is nowhere to dispose of it. It is moved from one point to another, but the problem remains. But through strategically reafforesting the basin, we can effectively maintain a very high level of agricultural and horticultural production; at the same time, we finish up with that salt load being back two metres below the surface, where it has been for millions of years—and at no real on-going cost. Of course, there is that other valuable resource available to the primary producer and it is one which can be harvested and which will regenerate.

I congratulate the Murray-Darling Commission and the ministerial council for the progress that has been made in the past 10 years. I hope that Governments will not sit on their laurels given the achievements of those 10 years and I believe that, within the next 20 or 30 years, we can see a significant reduction in the average salinity level of the water here in South Australia. If we can achieve that and, in 20 years time, be able to present a river system that is significantly better than it is today, we will have done a great service to South Australia and to this nation.

I have never held the view that the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin were insoluble. It is an unfortunate political fact that more than half our Federal members of Parliament live in Melbourne and Sydney, and that has been one of the major factors prohibiting our coming to grips with this vital resource. It is tunnel vision on the part of people living in major cities such as Melbourne and Sydney that has allowed this to occur. The answers are there, it can be achieved, and I hope it will not be long before we can proudly stand up and say that we have largely rehabilitated much of the damage we have caused in the last 150 years.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I want to say a few words in support of the Murray-Darling Basin Bill, which gives effect to the new Murray-Darling Basin Agreement between the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The Murray-Darling Basin Agreement is a very important milestone in the history of the management of the basin and, of course, the whole question of River Murray management has been central to the constitutional development of this nation. Indeed, the pre-Federation debates, almost exactly 100 years ago, were dominated by the questions of the River Murray and the railways. Arguably, Federation was held up for some years until those issues were resolved.

The resolution that did come out in 1901 with Federation did not really solve the problems of the River Murray. Indeed, it was some 14 years later before the first River Murray Waters Agreement came into effect in 1914. That agreement was limited, as the member for Chaffey pointed out. It referred solely to water quantity. It really was just a solution to the problems between South Australia, which wished to protect the river boat trade, and New South Wales and Victoria, which had irrigation interests.

It was rather ironic that by the time that agreement was finally settled it had become a non-issue, anyway, because the railways had long overtaken the river boat trade in importance. The River Murray Waters Agreement of 1914 remained largely untouched until 1970 when there was some review involving the Dartmouth Dam. There was considerable debate in this State and changes were made to the water allocation for South Australia, but the agreement remained essentially an agreement to distribute water on the main tributary of the Murray and it did not look at any of the other problems of the river. Of course, those problems were beginning to grow rapidly, particularly the salinity problem. It is interesting to note in the aftermath of the Dartmouth Dam dispute that Professor Sandford Clark, one of the most notable commentators on the legal questions of the river, noted:

> The present wrangle stands as a wry testament to the fact that, for all the acknowledged water management expertise accumulated by Australia in the last 80 years, there has been no notable genetic revolution in our political stock.

Fortunately, things have improved since Professor Clark wrote that in the early 1970s. At the time of Professor Clark's writing, it is interesting to note that he presented a paper to the River Murray Working Party, which was established by the Whitlam Government in the early 1970s. Professor Clark made a number of recommendations at that time to reform the River Murray Commission and increase its scope and independence.

Looking back at those recommendations one is struck by how modest they were, even though at the time they

seemed radical indeed. It is interesting that one of Professor Clark's recommendations was that we should have an independent Chairperson of the commission. I note that at last that is to be one of the advances to come in the agreement before us today. In 1983 the real improvements were made to the management of the Murray-Darling Basin. It was at that time that we began to look at integrated basin management and, although the 1983 agreement was not a true river compact, in the sense of river compacts which exist in other parts of the world and which are generally upheld as models of good river management, it was still a great advance on what we had had previously.

Whereas the main problem that seemed to dominate the debate during the 1970s was salinity, increasingly other problems of water quality were coming to importance. It was also being increasingly understood that we had to look at the problems of land management associated with the use of the waters of the Murray, the Darling and its tributaries if we were to really solve some of the problems.

Of course, in the 1985 agreement and in this new agreement we have seen further progress towards a greater integrated management of the Murray-Darling Basin. It would be fair to say that prior to that agreement the River Murray was basically managed from an engineering perspective; it was, in a sense, seen as a freely provided pipeline. However, increasingly, the importance of the river as an environmental resource and increasingly the impact of irrigation and other land uses on the quality of the water have been recognised, and the member for Chaffey spoke at length about those matters.

One of the most significant advances that will come with this new agreement is the provision that will enable Queensland to become a member of the basin management. Although the contribution of average water volumes from the Queensland section of the basin to South Australia is not particularly large relative to the contribution from the other tributaries of the river, nevertheless the Darling has been an important source of water to South Australia, particularly in drought years.

In 1974 it was the Darling flood that flushed out the Murray system in this State, and that illustrates the point that one of the great advantages that such a large basin as the Murray-Darling Basin is for this State is that it gives us some diversity if there is a drought in south-eastern Australia, and it has often been fortunate that there have been heavy rains in the northern part of the basin which have been so vital to this State.

Why Queensland is important to South Australia is that the catchment of the Darling in Queensland is largely not developed, and there is potential for great development within that region. Also, that part of the Darling is a source of considerable turbidity in the water that flows into South Australia. It is most important concerning any development that should take place in that large part of the basin in Queensland that consideration should be given to its impact on downstream users. Queensland's becoming part of the basin management will only be to good of this State as well as to the better management of the basin as a whole. I certainly welcome that.

In conclusion, if members look back through the history of the management of the Murray-Darling basin, I believe they will see that an interventionist role from the Commonwealth Government has been central to resolving many of the problems of the River Murray. The changes that have come through the agreement, particularly in the 1970s and 1980s, would not have come about if the Commonwealth had not played a key role and had not backed that with some financial support. We need to accept that fact.

I think we must also accept that this agreement should not be the final form of the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement. There are still some deficiencies in the agreement: it is still not the sort of water compact that exists in many parts of the world. One could argue that, even with rivers such as the Rhine which pass through many countries in Europe, those countries have a mechanism for resolving problems that are more efficient than some we have in this country.

Nevertheless, what we have seen in the past 10 years is that changes have been steadily evolving. It is necessary that they continue to evolve but, given the progress of the past 10 years, we can all be optimistic that we are moving in the right direction and that we will in the reasonably near future end up with a system of management that will be a model for the rest of the world. I am pleased to support the changes we are considering here: they are an important step and are vital to this State, and every member should welcome them.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This a very wide ranging piece of legislation in its implications for the people living in the four States involved, the Australian Capital Territory and, indeed, the whole nation. It is part of complementary legislation, as we all know, being dealt with in other jurisdictions. I guess it has been adequately described by earlier speakers as representing yet a further milestone along the way in developing a comprehensive understanding of the need for sensible management practices on this chunk of dry land, this continent called Australia, where the rainfall runs off into some streams defined as existing within the Murray-Darling Basin.

It has always been there; the water that fell on that dry land would have always gravitated towards the sea or towards a lake if it was landlocked. It is not necessary for us to stand back and marvel at the wondrous works of nature in this respect—it was always going to happen. Our responsibility is to ourselves and to future generations who will occupy this continent, especially this part of it. If we seek to live here we must ensure that we do nothing that will detract from the ability of others in their own community to continue to live here in a civilised way without any loss of their ability to use the land and the water that falls on it for the enhancement of their standard of living and quality of life. That is what it is all about.

Over the past 180 years or so we have not done very well. Post-European occupation of this land has had a detrimental impact on the capacity of future generations to enjoy it and what can come from it in comparison with what we ourselves have enjoyed. My remarks recognise some of the phenomena that have arisen out of civilised occupation of the land over the past 180 years. 'Civilised' is a European word that describes what most people, regardless of their cultural origin, consider to be

a more desirable lifestyle than that which existed previously, when life expectancy was very low and the nature of society and the way in which an individual related to that society was fairly proscriptive and restrictive, most of it being by ritual and not much by reason. That was the pre-history part of European occupation of this continent.

Let us look at what has happened since we have put European names on places and used those names to identify what I am going to talk about in the context of this debate. I have deliberately made those remarks in the first instance to acknowledge that there were people who lived here prior to the arrival of Europeans. We use the word 'Aborigine' to describe them, and their descendants, whether full blood or otherwise, are called 'Aboriginal'. Those people who were living in the Murray-Darling Basin at the time the Europeans arrived to begin their settlement of it were not the original inhabitants of the continent. There had been several other successful migrations to the continent over the period since humans first arrived here. That does not detract from what they had and what they were doing: it is not a value judgment but a statement of historical fact on my part for the sake of the record.

The first thing we must do is recognise that, whilst there are now provisions in this legislation that will enable us to incorporate Queensland, there is no requirement or conscious understanding of the need to include the ACT Government. That matter ought to be addressed immediately, because the Legislature in the ACT, as a unicameral Parliament, can make decisions about the ways in which it will do things in the ACT which can have, apparently in their opinion—and in ours—an innocent effect downstream, yet the effect is by no means innocent. All we need to do is look at the numbers of people who live in the ACT compared with those who live in Albury-Wodonga. Why is that important? It is important because in my judgment the people of Albury-Wodonga deserve congratulations for having taken the responsible and expensive option, with assistance of funds from other sources, to divert their effluent, after it has been fully treated, from discharge into the Murray to wood lots on dry land away from the river. They are to be congratulated and thanked by all of us, as by doing so they ensure that almost no nutrient arising from the centre and density of population in the Albury-Wodonga area—in particular, the Albury side—will find its way into the river system.

Only 61 000 people reside in that area, and that is about the same size as Bendigo. Bendigo has not taken that step yet, and it is situated on a major tributary that leads directly into the Murray. I am looking through my papers for a table which sets out the population comparisons with these major urban developments in the Murray-Darling system. There are 305 000 people living in the Canberra-Queanbeyan area. What they do with their stormwater and effluent water very much impacts on us. Toowoomba has a larger population than Albury-Wodonga, with 79 000 people. Although that town is further upstream, it is situated directly on a river which is in the watershed, so that the main trunk flow from that river comes down the Darling and into the Murray. That is why Queensland must be included in future. Moreover, the total population of the basin is 1.8 million.

There is an area of 9 million hectares within the basin which is being cropped and a further 90 million hectares—10 times that area—which is being used for grazing. Grazing was occurring on that 99 million hectares, and then some, by native animals before Europeans arrived. The rainwater used to run off—there is no doubt about that. The kangaroos, emus and other native species, as well as human beings, occupied that run-off, but the impact was not as noticeable because the river system had developed a response to that type of animal occupation of the land, and the way in which the vegetation lived and died and decomposed was also part of the natural ecosystem.

We have had an adverse impact on that by increasing the density of our human population and the greater numbers of animals that we carry on that land through our manipulation of plant nutrients in the soil to support crops and the pastures upon which our commercial animals graze. The consequence is that greater quantities of soft dung are left on the surface to be rapidly eroded in heavy downpours and carried away in the streams that form the tributaries of the Murray. They end up in the lower Murray, creating problems of the kind that have caused anxiety and concern recently. I refer particularly to the blue/green algae. In addition, we have the effects of increasing salinity levels referred to by the other speakers who have preceded me. I will not go over that ground, as it has been covered by the members for Baudin, Heysen and Chaffey in their useful and relevant contributions.

The basin supports about 60 million sheep, 6 million cattle and over 1 million pigs in varying degrees of density according to the intensity of production on the land occupied. In some instances they are not a problem; in other instances by virtue of their high density they create a considerable problem, greater even than human population in the towns and principal urban centres to which I have referred.

I commend the Government for having responded to my continued requests and taunts to take the Murray Bridge sewage and effluent away from the river and put it into an area where we believe and hope it will not cause a problem in the river. I want to take up a point made in part by the member for Chaffey in his remarks and stress that salinity and effluent disposal schemes of the type to which I have just referred at Murray Bridge need to be more carefully monitored in their impact on water tables adjacent to the surface. It is all very well for us to conduct studies that indicate that the sub-surface layer beneath the ponds in which we put the water are impervious, but there is no guarantee that they will remain so if we treat them differently from the way in which they have been treated by nature itself. For instance, we are treating them differently at Woolpunda.

I will not go into detail regarding the places that do not have a direct impact on the area I represent—they are to be found further upstream. At Murray Bridge, before the establishment of either of those off-river evaporation pans, we should have sunk inspection wells on a straight line grid pattern downstream from any surface aquifer or perched water table that might have been created should the impervious nature of the pan beneath the sites in

which we dispose of that water become pervious to some degree. We could monitor the movement of that water, and we have not done that.

I can tell the House that water is already flowing through the cliffs on the eastern side of the river downstream from Blanchetown which local residents sincerely believe is coming from the Woolpunda off-river evaporation pans. It has never come through those cliffs before, and it started coming through the cliffs not long after the establishment of the Woolpunda saline groundwater interception plan and that water being placed back off-river. Likewise, we should have done the same thing at Murray Bridge by drilling a couple of lines to create narrow diameter wells, and the depth to the free water surface could have been monitored as well as the salinity. Now what we must do—as a matter of urgency in my judgment—is drill those wells and begin collecting that data and do another upstream, as it were, batch of holes into which we put radioisotopes at higher than normal concentration sufficient to enable us to track whether there is a movement of water from the higher elevation, past those bores and back into the river—or toward the river in the case of Murray Bridge. By that means we will know whether we are being successful.

What we have to do, before we create yet another problem, is fix it. It is always cheaper and better to get it right the first time or to fix it before it becomes a problem than to wait until you have the problem. It is like treating diabetes: you do not need to have your leg amputated if you can keep your sugar levels straight. If you ignore that, you will end up needing one of your extremities amputated. I do not want to see that happen to any of our disposal systems at present. There is still an opportunity to save the situation. I would like to draw attention to the fact that as yet we still have not learned to use the water provided by that system—where we are using it at all—to best advantage. In other words, we are not getting as much from it as it we could. We should use it for aquaculture before we use it for irrigation. If we did that, we would get double the benefit from it—and certainly more than double the value.

There are world markets for the products of fish farming. We do not need to rely on local prices for our indicative yields because we have world prices to provide us with those yields of profit, procurable from that kind of production. It would also provide us with jobs and a decentralised development base in the localities in which we would put those fish ponds—in the regions of the Riverland and the lower Murray, for instance. We are crazy not to get on with that. Just because there are no fish farmers and no fish farmers association to put up a proposition to Government and to lobby the Government to do it, and that no votes are seen to be involved, nothing gets done, and we do not have the wit to do something about it. Well, we jolly well need to look a little wider than the lobbyists who pressure us as politicians and Governments into making decisions about things and see our responsibilities to the future as taking advantage of those opportunities presented by the circumstances in which we find them. We have not done very well at that for the past 30 or 40 years in this country in general and in this State in particular. It is time to do something more about it now, given our high levels of unemployment.

With regard to the motion that the river ought to be seen as a reservoir, for us in South Australia that is an anathema. The river must be seen as a resource to which multiple users must continue to have access, so long as their access is always subject to the rights of others who need access to the river. Of course, the highest priority must be given to the notion that it is potable water and must be retained as potable water. So, any other kind of access is contingent upon our capacity to be allowed to continue relying on it as potable water. If we cannot do that, we certainly must not allow development of anything in the basin that would put it in jeopardy.

I hold the view that some other things could be done. We should meter the supply of irrigation water to irrigators rather than simply allow them to irrigate a given area. There is no incentive for them to use that water efficiently; if it were metered it would be much better. Also it might be better to privatise all those irrigation schemes and allow the people who use them more effectively and efficiently to get their water and dispose of their drainage (they would not have any drainage to dispose of if they had to own and operate them at their personal expense, I am sure). That is something, too, for the future. However, it is important because of its benefits to the State budget and to the river itself—cost for the State budget and cleaner water in the river in consequence where the river itself is involved. I would like to have had the time to address a number of other matters, but I find myself unable to do so.

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I thank members for their support for this measure, and I note that it is support that comes from all members of the House. The member for Chaffey is quite right in his comment that this is not a political issue: it is an issue for the planned and strategic use of a resource that we have. Of course, any planned and strategic use is better than an unplanned one, and that is why this agreement, in various forms, has existed for a very long time. I will take this opportunity to respond to some of the issues that members have raised. The member for Heysen did raise some interesting points during his contribution, one of which dealt with clause 4 in the 1983 Act which he indicated bound the Crown. He said that a similar clause has not been included in the current legislation. I understand that the Acts Interpretation Act now clearly takes that into consideration and that, unless there is a specific reference to not binding the Crown, all legislation that is now passed by this Parliament does automatically bind the Crown.

The other thing I found interesting about the contribution of the member for Heysen was that he referred to a widening of the ambit of the Murray-Darling Agreement, particularly when I contrasted the 1983 Act with the 1993 agreement. In various parts there was very clear indication of how much the ambit has been widened. To illustrate that, section 25 of the 1983 Act dealt with surveys, works and measures as follows:

...the better conservation and regulation of the waters of the River Murray or for the protection or improvement of the quality thereof.

That very clearly deals with the water in the Murray River. If we look at the equivalent section in the 1993 agreement, section 39, it also refers to the studies, surveys and works as follows:

...the equitable, efficient and sustainable use of water, land and other environmental resources.

That gives a very clear indication of how far we have moved in just 10 years in accepting that there is a resource that needs to be treated with very considerable respect, and that it is a sustainable resource if—and only if—we treat it properly.

The member for Heysen then referred to the boating management draft discussion paper. In a sense, that has very little to do with this Bill but, in any case, the boating management draft discussion paper has not been placed before the ministerial council and therefore currently has no status. However, it is my belief that the draft guidelines will require extensive modification, particularly with regard to proposals for zoning the river, imposing speed limits and so on. To a large extent, these are State rather than commission matters, and they will be dealt with by the State. I also indicated earlier that the community ought to be involved in this review, and I understand that the commission has agreed with my request in this matter. Two South Australian community members will assist the review of comments received from the public to date and will advise on where we should be going from here.

The member for Heysen referred to clause 23 with respect to tolls. This issue was probably raised by well-meaning people who saw the situation for the first time and did not realise its history. I went back as far as the 1917 Act, and the power to invoke tolls has been in place since that time. I have not found any degree of enthusiasm by anyone else to invoke the power to impose tolls, and I certainly do not intend to do so. We are in a position to put that matter to rest because very clearly it is not a problem.

The member for Heysen also referred to clause 61 and the dredging requirements. I am informed that the dredging of the river will be purely for the purposes of the conveyance of water down the river and not for other purposes. I understand that the commission does so mainly between the Hume Dam and the Yarrawonga Weir because there are problems in that area. Apparently South Australia does it between lock 4 and Loxton. We do our own dredging to the tune of about $100 000 per year. However, if the commission works were to cause obstruction to navigation, the commission would be expected to do something about it for navigation purposes as distinct from merely providing for the free flow of water.

The honourable member made some comment concerning the fact that there may not be much in the way of algal management strategy. I make it very clear that an algal management strategy is now in draft form and will come before the next meeting of the ministerial council. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission, in its algal management strategy update, devoted some considerable space to indicating just how that would be done, including proposed timetables and so on. It might be of interest to members and the wider community to have some snippets of information from that document, because it is rather interesting to note that the first recorded bloom in the Murray-Darling Basin was in 1853, so they are not a new phenomena. The document also refers to the fact that the first scientifically documented case of toxicity due to an algal bloom was in 1878 when there were stock deaths at Milang on Lake Alexandrina. The next time I sail anywhere near Milang I will take due note of that situation.

The member for Heysen then dealt with the interests of the Local Government Association to become a party to the Murray-Darling Agreement. I guess I have to say that, in the first instance, this is an agreement between the States and the Commonwealth. It is therefore at that level of Government. All the States and the Commonwealth Government who are a party to that agreement come prepared with very large sums of money. Whilst the mere bringing forward of large sums of money would not by itself be a sufficient reason for coming into the agreement, it would certainly be a necessary prerequisite, so we have here one of those interesting situations where ‘necessary’ and ‘sufficient’ are totally separate. However, local government is very clearly consulted and involved in the provision of works and other things that are done by the Murray-Darling Commission, so it is not as if they are not consulted or involved in the processes.

Time prevents me from dealing with the other comments of the honourable member, but I will have them looked at to see whether it is possible for any of them to be included in further rounds, because clearly a document such as this is not a document which will stand the test of time for ever. It has not in the past; it will not in the future; and it will need to be looked at from time to time. I am very pleased that the Opposition has indicated that there should not be any alterations to the Murray-Darling Agreement, and I agree, because it has come this far only after a considerable amount of effort. If this Parliament were to make any changes to the agreement, we would have to start the entire process all over again, because New South Wales has already passed it, I understand it is currently before the Victorian Parliament, and the Commonwealth will enact it once the States have all done so.

I now move to the contribution of the member for Chaffey. He referred to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission expenditure. That expenditure is currently about $60 million per year. It has roughly doubled over the past five years, and South Australia’s contribution I am told is about $11 million.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It is still minute in the total scene.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member comments that it is still minute. A certain amount of work has been done. This is a yearly contribution, not an overall contribution. It has doubled over the past five years, so at the very least we are heading in the right direction. The commission is funding very large revegetation programs all over the basin through its natural resources management program, and I was aware while I was Minister that the South Australian Woods and Forests Department was successful in applying direct seeding technology throughout the basin.

As members would probably be aware, the Woods and Forests Department has been very active over the past few years in the direct seeding processes, has got it down to a fine art and has even done some inventing of machinery, which does the direct seeding. The third point that I wish to deal with from the member for Chaffey is that drainage in both New South Wales and Victoria, as it affects the River Murray, is controlled and managed within the Murray-Darling Basin salinity and drainage strategy, so I think that deals with the points he made regarding that.

The member for Murray-Mallee made a number of contributions, but I am afraid I will need to correct some of the points he made. For instance, the arguments that he put forward that the ACT cannot join the Murray-Darling Basin Commission is incorrect. Section 134 of the agreement allows any State to join, and included in the definition of 'State' is 'Territory', so that any State or Territory that wished to join could apply for membership. The Australian Capital Territory has an observer at the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, but I am not aware that it has made any attempt to join or that it wishes to join. Any State or Territory that wishes to join under section 134 of the agreement can make an application to do so. That is on pages 65 to 67 of the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, if the honourable member wishes to look at that.

The member for Murray-Mallee also indicated a great need for a monitoring program to see whether or not saline water is getting back into the river. My understanding is that such a monitoring program exists and that there is no evidence (at the moment at least) of a return of saline water into the river. It may be appropriate if I make somebody available to brief the member for Murray-Mallee as to what is going on there so he can satisfy himself that appropriate measures are being taken, and indeed we can work out what is the area of disagreement between him and the commission.

During the contributions made by members of this House I was struck by the high degree of knowledge and interest that was brought to these contributions, both by members opposite and by members on my own side. I think that is a very clear indication that people in this State and members of Parliament in this State have a clear recognition of the importance of the Murray-Darling system to this State and this country in general and, indeed, the importance of such agreements as this to the economic and general well-being of this State. I therefore thank all members for their contributions to this debate.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That Standing Order 364 be so far suspended as to enable me to speak three times on each proposed clause and the schedule without the question being put.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Construction of works.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am interested to know where the E&WS fits into the situation in this State. Does this clause authorise the commission to do the work, or does it authorise the construction of work required by the commission? Where is the responsibility as far as any construction work on the part of the E&WS is concerned?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The clause indicates that, since it is subject to this Act and the agreement, any construction, maintenance, operation and control in the State of any works would be done by the commission but, of course, the commission may wish to have that work done by another party, and in those cases the E&WS would logically be one of the parties that could well do that work because of its expertise.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—'Acquisition of land.'

Mr LEWIS: Do I hear from the Minister an assurance that such work as is necessary will be undertaken to secure the use and operation of the channel as a navigable waterway, as has been the case until now?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The situation is that it is not the commission's job to maintain the channel as a navigable waterway within South Australian borders. It would be the responsibility of the State to do that, except, as I indicated in my second reading reply, where the commission by its works might obstruct the channel, in which case I presume the commission would then feel duty bound to make sure that the channel became navigable again, through its own efforts.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Does the Minister believe that it is his responsibility rather than the responsibility of the commission? The commission is having greater and greater involvement in the total river system. Does the Minister believe that the responsibility to maintain as near as practicable the total river system as a navigable water resource clearly rests with the State and the E&WS Department?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I guess the honourable member is referring to clause 61, which deals with dredging and snagging. As I understand the situation, it is the State's responsibility. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission deals mainly with the section I read earlier. The response I gave during the second reading was that it would normally be the State's requirement to maintain the navigability of the river except where the commission by its own works caused some problem, and one could expect it to do the job of clearing the channel in those circumstances.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Does the Government believe that the river should remain a navigable waterway?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member is referring to the 'reservoir' tag that has come up in the draft guidelines. That is causing some problem, so let me see whether I can clear it up. I think that it was also raised by the member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I raised it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am sorry; the member for Heysen raised it. The word 'reservoir' apparently has a different meaning interstate than it does here. Here it is a much more restrictive situation in that it refers to water for public drinking over which there are certain controls. I am told that that is not the case in other States. We will be working towards removing the word 'reservoir' from those draft guidelines so that the confusion which has arisen will no longer be there.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would have thought that this matter came under clause 61, but seeing we are dealing with it now I will continue on this point. In my

second reading contribution I referred to a statement that I believe was made on a number of occasions by a Dr Seaton, who was representing the Murray-Darling Commission; and I understand that it has been made on at least two or three different occasions at public meetings. I have been given his direct quote, as follows:

In South Australia the gazettal has been uplifted and the Murray designated a water supply area.

On at least two occasions I have sought clarification on this point. He was very specific that that happened four months ago. I have been able to find no evidence of that whatsoever, but I think that this opportunity should be taken to clarify the situation because it has caused a considerable amount of concern on the part of those who are worried about the draft boating management document, to which I referred earlier. I think it is important that that be clarified. I understand what the Minister is saying about the different understanding of the word 'reservoir' between the States. However, this is a direct quote and I believe it is essential that the Minister provide some explanation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding is that the uplifting of the gazettal that took place was to stop the Murray-Darling from being regarded as a harbor. Consequently, a lot more has been read into it than was the situation. There is no intention to turn the river into a reservoir as it is understood in South Australia. As I indicated, under the draft guidelines being prepared and reviewed, we will attempt to remove the word 'reservoir' altogether because there is no intention to stop the normal use of the Murray as it presently is.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister reaffirm that the current situation will prevail, that the Murray River will continue to remain a multi-user resource and that it will continue to remain navigable?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am happy to give both of those undertakings.

Mr LEWIS: I am grateful to the Minister for the frankness and simplicity with which he gave us that assurance. I want to add an esoteric point, since I am sure the commission will take note of this debate. It would be very curious and quaint, under the transfer of powers that are occurring, many of which will be farmed back to the various State instrumentalities that have been exercising them—and that is acknowledged—if the commission, on assuming those powers, handed them back to the States or left with the States the responsibility for retaining a navigable waterway subject to commission consent; in other words, the States could not do it without the commission's approving of it. That is the way it would be under these provisions.

The quaint aspect arises in regard to New South Wales and Victoria. The New South Wales Government has its southern State boundary along the southernmost edge of the river against, if you like, the shore line or water's edge; it owns the free surface of the main channel and whatever there is beneath it as part of the State of New South Wales. The Victorian Government will not be real happy about the impact that may have on its tourist industry if the New South Wales Government decides not to continue maintaining the navigability of that waterway. I put that on the record for the commission to chew over later.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not entirely sure whether the member for Murray-Mallee and I are talking about the same thing. My understanding is that maintaining the river in South Australia as a navigable channel has always been the responsibility of the State Government. As I have said several times now, the only exception to that is where the commission in its works or around its weirs or dams creates problems, and one would expect the commission to also clean up after itself.

Mr LEWIS: I raise the following matter here because of the necessity to consider what the commission would own or not own in the way of dry land. Is the Murray mouth seen as the point at which the commission's title and responsibility ceases or commences? That is a point of great concern and contention in the wider community in South Australia, particularly in the Lower Murray. Malcolm Fraser expressed concern about this when the mouth became blocked a few years ago in the drought of 1982 and we had to open it. But this legislation, and in particular this clause, definitely affects the way in which that will impact, because it may be ultimately decided to shift the position of the mouth, or some other thing, which would require a rearrangement of national park boundaries, for instance, and/or private land held back on the north side, near Goolwa.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member asked this question about land and then talked about the Murray Mouth in the same sentence. Certainly the mouth of the Murray River shifts and, when one sees photographs taken of it some years ago and photographs taken of it today, one realises that it has shifted by a very considerable margin. However, the point in response to the honourable member is that the Murray-Darling Basin Commission's writ, if one likes, runs as far as the Murray mouth.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Tolls on locks.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand—and I must admit I was not concentrating at the time—that the Minister did give a commitment regarding this clause, in that a toll will not be applied to passage through the locks. If he did give that commitment would he be prepared to repeat it as this is the appropriate clause that deals with that matter?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I did give that commitment and I am happy to repeat it. There is no intention of imposing any tolls on the locks and weirs. Of course, I can only give that assurance in relation to South Australia because my responsibilities extend only to this State, but certainly I am happy to give that undertaking.

Mr LEWIS: For a minute and a half I simply sought to put on record that one of the ways in which we might in future ensure even better access and movement than we have through the lock at the present time is to install the kind of modern technology which is available to operate those locks using, as it were, key transponders—the same as we use to get into and out of this building.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Heaven forbid. Often we cannot get in.

Mr LEWIS: That is because you rush up to the thing a little bit too quickly and cause it to be over-excited.

We obviously need a lesson in using it but that is not this clause. Under this clause we could enable use of those locks to be secured by anyone who wanted to take a temporary lease on a transponder key linked to, say, their credit card so that when their houseboat or other vessel approached the lock it could be opened automatically and the fee charged to their account and collected by the Government without people having to be present.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: But we are not going to have a fee.

Mr LEWIS: If there is to be no fee at this point, then we still need to operate those locks without the need for someone to be standing by at all times. It is very expensive to keep someone on a payroll on the off chance that another human being might want to take a vessel through that lock at a time spontaneously arising but unknown to the person on duty. I am not trying to do someone out of a job, as it were; we can rearrange their location within the service so that it is in the public interest. I am trying to be more efficient in the way we use our resources. That is the suggestion I am making as to how we could serve everybody's best interest.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Certainly there is no intention to impose tolls, and that makes rather irrelevant the question of how we are going to impose tolls. I guess the second part of the honourable member's question was whether it is in fact cheaper to put some kind of automatic system in, rather than to pay the salaries. That is clearly one of the things that the commission would, from time to time, wish to look at. I doubt if the honourable member will be very welcome in certain parts of the river after having made that suggestion, but certainly I would imagine that the commission, from time to time, does those sorts of studies.

I think what I have to indicate is that if it were to be considered as part of the normal upgrading of equipment that belongs to the commission, without some kind of toll, I would be very much opposed to it on the basis that the cost of maintaining and refurbishing the structures that the commission has now had for some 70 years will rise over the next few years, particularly with some refurbishment and maintenance of some of the major dams, and consequently money will be very short.

While the honourable member's question is hypothetical, in the sense that we will not be doing it because we will not be raising tolls, it would certainly not be done unless there were tolls for that purpose. Having said that, I want to repeat that there is no intention of putting tolls in and therefore it is unlikely that the equipment will be upgraded out of the current budget of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

Mr LEWIS: On the point of whether or not I might find myself welcome in certain parts of the Riverland, let me explain. We are fairly sensible and realistic folk who recognise that, whereas a couple of hundred years ago it might have needed 2 000 people on a rope to raise and lower the gates on the lock, we have now gone through the phase of steam engines and other fossil fuel powered engines to electric motors, and this is merely one of the steps along the way of progress. They accept and understand that you do not need someone standing by to press a button if you can press it electronically and keep the whole thing functioning without doing so, especially since everyone in this place is willing to guarantee that any introduction of that sort of technology will not result in people losing their jobs and becoming redundant. There are ways of reallocating them to other work.

Clause passed.

Clause 24 passed.

Clause 25—'Appropriation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This clause provides that money to be contributed by the State under the agreement must be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament for that purpose. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that prior to July 1991 the department received capital grants from the Consolidated Account to off-set the expenditures relating to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission call-up on capacity works. Prior to that they were treated as non-business undertakings. There is some uncertainty about this. Does this clause really mean that the contributions for this purpose are met just from general revenue at this stage? For example, does the money coming from metropolitan water and sewerage rates contribute to the money that is paid for this purpose under clause 25?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The money for the Murray-Darling Basin Commission comes out of the E&WS Department revenue. The question as to the degree to which that totally meets with clause 25 of the Bill I cannot answer because I do not have those sorts of skills, but I will make sure that the honourable member gets a response to that in time for it to be debated in another place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 26 and 27 passed.

Clause 28—'Certain documents to be laid before Parliament.'

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

Page 7, lines 32 to 36—Leave out this clause and insert new clause as follows:

28. (1) The Minister must cause a copy of each report and statement submitted by the commission to the ministerial council under clause 84 of the agreement to be laid before each House of Parliament within 15 sitting days after submission to the ministerial council.

(2) The Minister must cause a copy of each schedule approved under clause 50 of the agreement to be laid before each House of Parliament within 15 sitting days after approval by the ministerial council.

The current clause requires that a schedule approved under clause 50 and a statement and report submitted by the Commissioner under clause 84 should both be laid before each House of Parliament without delay. That is an uncertain and inexact term. Since it is the Minister who must do so and it may be possible that the Minister may be interstate or elsewhere on Government business at that time, I would prefer to see a fixed number of days so that we all know where we stand and we do not have the situation where 'without delay' becomes a subject of debate and contention.

I picked 15 sitting days because clause 29 in dealing with another matter uses 15 sitting days. I am not fussed whether it is six, nine, 12, 15, 18, 21—or whatever—sitting days, but it seems reasonable to have a fixed number of sitting days within which the Minister should make the information available to each House of Parliament.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (29 to 32) passed.

The Schedule.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Proceedings of the ministerial council.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Subclause (3) provides:

A resolution before the ministerial council will be carried only by a unanimous vote of all Ministers present who constitute a quorum.

Has that been the case previously? It has been put to me that this subclause weakens the agreement. Frankly, I am not sure of the rationale behind it, but that concern was expressed to me. Has that provision been in the legislation previously? If it is a new provision, does the Minister believe for any reason that it might weaken the agreement?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is exactly the same wording as in the 1983 Act. I am sure the honourable member is as familiar with the reasons for it as I am. As he did not ask why it is there, I will not comment on that.

Clause passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Appointment of committees.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the Community Advisory Committee. There has been conflicting representation about the committee and the role that it plays. It has been put to me by some people that there is no role for it: I cannot believe that, because I would have thought that it was quite appropriate in the role set under the legislation. Others have said that it is a bit of a toothless tiger. I realise it is only an advisory committee and that the representations it makes to the council, its advice, is not always acted upon. The Minister would be much closer to the situation than I am. Can he indicate to the Committee how he sees the role and work that is currently being carried out by the committee and say whether there has been any discussion at ministerial council level about any changes that should be made to the committee's role?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member knows as well as I do that there is a rule of thumb in politics where, if you are being yelled at for not doing enough or for doing too much, then probably things are not too bad. I do not think that that rule applies on this occasion. I understand that this is the third advisory committee in about five years, that this third committee has met only a few times and that its report to the ministerial council will be its first. I understand that it is reporting on the basis of how well the commission has involved the community. Clearly, there have been some problems in the past.

The previous two committees had difficulty in clearly defining their role. One assumes that the third committee, if it is not able to do so, will need to get some assistance to clearly define its role. As part of its role, it is looking at that territory. While I agree with the honourable member that such a community advisory committee has an important and useful role to play, it needs to be made clear that it is an advisory committee, that it has the capacity to advise the States and the Commonwealth on the discharge of their obligations and duties under this Bill when it becomes an Act, but that it cannot tell the States and the Commonwealth what they should do.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Appointment of president, deputy president, commissioners and deputy commissioner.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: At the moment, the president is nominated by the Federal Minister or by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Federal Minister. Subclause (1) provides:

The ministerial council shall, after seeking and considering the advice of the commission, appoint a president by a unanimous vote of members of the ministerial council.

Does that mean that any one of the commissioners nominated by the three States and the Commonwealth could become the president not necessarily just the nominee of the Federal Government, which is the case at present?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding is that the president will not be a ministerial appointee, that it will not be one of the Ministers from either the Commonwealth or the States but someone from outside the body. The Bill refers to the president and the ministerial council—they are separate.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: At the moment, the president is not a Minister but a person nominated by the Federal Minister. Will the president be nominated in addition to the two commissioners from each State and the Commonwealth plus the two deputies? Will the position of president be an additional nomination or appointment over and above or will the president be drawn from one of the commissioners nominated by the four Governments?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not entirely sure what the honourable member is saying, but my understanding is that the president will have a casting vote. He will be additional to the eight appointed by the four Governments.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: So, there will actually be a commission of nine. Is that right?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes. Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 43 passed.

Clause 44—'Water quality objectives.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Clause 44 provides that 'the commission must formulate water quality objectives'. Clause 45 provides that 'the commission may make recommendations' concerning any matter. Will the Minister clarify why it is compulsory in clause 44 and not in clause 45?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Clause 44 used to contain the word 'may', but my predecessor amended the word 'may' to 'must', which I think is an advantage, certainly at this stage.

Clause passed.

Clause 45 passed.

Clause 46—'Commission to be informed of new proposals.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I mentioned during my second reading contribution, the Local Government Association feels that the words 'responsible to a contracting Government' are not technically correct in relation to local government and that they should be

deleted, recognising that the deletion of those words would not change the intent of the agreement.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This point has been discussed, but I am opposed to making any change because any change to this document would need to be considered by other Parliaments.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (47 to 138) passed.

Schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 1.1 to 2 p.m.]

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTION TIME

ECONOMY

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why has this Labor Government failed to have any clearly enunciated economic development strategy for South Australia, as reported yesterday by the independent Centre for Economic Studies?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier personally accept responsibility, as he has been the senior economic Minister since 1985? Will he apologise to the 84 000 unemployed in South Australia at present and the hundreds of bankrupted businesses that are now paying that very high price of a wasted decade, as the report said, in South Australia's economic development? It is the Premier, as the senior economic Minister, who must now ultimately accept responsibility for those 10 wasted years.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am happy to answer this question—very happy indeed—because the points raised by the honourable member in terms of the report of the Independent Centre for Economic Studies does bear consideration. In fact, it bears consideration alongside the other reports of the very self-same centre over the years. Yesterday, of course, was the release of its report, which was its tenth anniversary celebration report, as it called it. It is worthwhile looking back at what it has said at other times over the years in some respects about what has happened in South Australia. I draw to the attention of the Leader, who referred to my time as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology in this State, in the second half the 1980s—I take it that that was what was implicit in the member's debating question on this matter since 1985—the October briefing in 1989 of this self-same centre for economic studies, and the one in which the Leader said nothing has happened over the past 10 years. Well, in fact, let us look at—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader says that we now have the benefit of hindsight. The fact is that jobs created in manufacturing employment in the second half of the 1980s were real jobs created. The increase in exports of this State were real exports. These were real goods actually sold to other parts of the world. There is no hindsight to it. If you have the payment for the exports that have been sold, you do not need hindsight to know what the figures were. Let us look at what the Centre for Economic Studies said in 1989 about these matters:

> We seem to be in that unusual position where the State economy is in much better shape than that of the nation.

That is what was said in October 1989. It continues:

> South Australia has been enjoying its best sustained period of growth since 1976 and of late has clearly been outperforming the nation.

You cannot simply quote what you want to quote from organisations such as the Centre for Economic Studies. You actually have to quote what it says in the context of things that it has said over the past. Let us look at manufacturing, because that was an area on which we had key emphasis and, in its most recent report, the Centre for Economic Studies seems to be implying that there were no strategic policy objectives of this State Government in the 1980s. Yet I recall my predecessor as Premier and myself as Minister actively pursuing the reinvigoration and revitalisation of the manufacturing industry in this State. That was a key strategic policy objective of this Government to which resources were committed and achievements made.

What was the outcome of this strategic policy direction that Cliff Walsh now seems to ignore ever took place? What this same October 1989 briefing stated about manufacturing in South Australia, and it was referring to the most recent figures available, was as follows:

> There is no doubt that 1987-88 was by far and away the best year for South Australian manufacturing in many years.

Now, that was after this Government had put in place its strategic policies for growing manufacturing in this State. Let us look at some of the other global figures again, the figures that the Leader does not seem to want to know about, the figures he glibly tries to ride over. In the five year period up to 1991-92, under the previous Premier and me in my capacity as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology—and it is interesting to note what happened with trade in that five year period—our overseas exports rose by 76 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I know what some members opposite will want to say. They will say that that must be raw materials exported overseas. In fact, that is not so. Manufactured goods finally overtook all other sections of exports in that period, and by 1991-92 had become 57 per cent of our exports. It is to be noted that, during that period, because of the tough terms of trade that agriculture has faced in the past five years—and that cannot be blamed on the State Government; it was an international factor—the actual

return by agricultural to export income declined by 23 per cent over that period. Notwithstanding that enormous decline in one sector, our exports increased 76 per cent in that five year period. I do not know how the Leader, against these facts, has the gall to stand up in this place and make the sorts of comments he has been making. We can look at a number of other points made by this centre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is trying to lay all the economic woes on the Government: it is trying to say that the world recession, the recession of many nations, the recession all over Australia—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will very quickly, Sir, with one final set of references. I want to draw attention to a book written by the very author of the review, the report on the economy mentioned yesterday, entitled *Budgetary Stress. The South Australian Experience* by Richard Blandy and Cliff Walsh. In one part they say:

> In brief, the South Australian Government runs a tight financial ship compared with most State Governments, taxing less severely and borrowing on a more prudent scale.

This is the very selfsame Cliff Walsh. Finally (and I apologise for the length of this answer), he makes the point:

> The State Government has shown a good housekeeping frugality for a decade, which has seen real net State indebtedness fall to levels half that of Victoria. The State public sector is now amongst the least debt-ridden in the land. In the 1990s South Australians are going to have good reason to rejoice at the persistence of our State in being boring during the 1980s.

The point I want to make is that where the financial—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Such interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Fisher: he deliberately interjected when I stood up, and I was looking at him. He is warned, and anybody who speaks over the Chair will be warned every time. I cannot hear the answer and I am sure members cannot hear the answer. I ask the House to come to order, and I ask the Premier to draw his remarks to a close.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Those areas of financial management that were directly under the control of this Government, within arm's length, received that commentary from Cliff Walsh. We all live with the results and problems relating to the State Bank but, for those areas directly under Government control, that was Cliff Walsh's commentary on the performance of this Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Premier advise the House what have been the more general views of economic commentators about this State's finances and this State's economic strategy during the 1980s, and did the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies predict much of the advice of the A.D. Little report in its reports over the past decade?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A number of points could be made in answer to that, and one of the points that I find very interesting is that, while the Centre for Economic Studies yesterday made one finding on this matter, a couple of years ago the same Centre for Economic Studies made a slightly different finding on what Government should do. I will give members an idea as to how different it was. It made a comment a couple of years ago under the former Director—I acknowledge that it was under the former Director, and I suppose the present Director may want to take issue with the former Director but, nevertheless, both directors were appointed by the same organisation—about whether or not there should be Government cuts and Government restraint.

It is quite clear where Cliff Walsh wants us to go; he wants us to go down the very dry, hard, economic rationalist line of Jeff Kennett. He said we have simply not cut enough and that we should cut a lot more. Certainly, that is an option, but it is an option that this Government consciously rejected, because we knew the devastation that it would bring in terms of social justice issues and Government services in this State.

Fair enough: I accept the fact that Cliff Walsh does not feel himself to be in the position of giving a big tick to the policies of this Government, because he does not have a policy of supporting those sorts of issues but, a couple of years ago, when faced with the question of whether or not the Government should cut services, the previous Director of this selfsame centre said:

> I would have thought it would have been the socially responsible role of Government not to fire people in a recession.

Yet, now it is saying something totally different from that. It is saying that in that situation it would have been reasonable for the Government to run up debt and not fire people.

This Government is not firing people. We have voluntary arrangements, where the 3 000 positions we will reduce will be voluntary reductions. That is precisely the case and, while certain other members in this place may want to paint a different picture, they cannot get away from the truth of the issue that there will be a voluntary reduction in public sector employment. However, if we were to go for what the centre has recommended in its report yesterday, if we were to go for the sorts of figures it was talking about in its report yesterday—figures that the member for Victoria was talking about when he was Leader (so they certainly sit comfortably over there)—there could be no voluntary nature about it. There would then have to be firings. So, the very centre that is recommending this would be recommending firings, because that is the only way we could achieve that.

Mr D.S. Baker: What about attrition?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Victoria haplessly interjects and asks, 'What about attrition?' Apparently, we will be able to see 9 000 people retire and not replace them; regardless of where they are in the Public Service, we will not replace them. A lot of people retire from jobs that we have to fill. You cannot automatically transfer somebody else into another job. If there is a retirement in the Police Force, are we to say that we want to fill that position with somebody from the E&WS Department or with a nurse from the hospital? That is ridiculous, and the member for Victoria knows that it is ridiculous.

A couple of years ago this self-same centre said that that was not the answer; it rejected that. Indeed, in the mood it was in at the time, I am sure that it would have been critical of the statement we came down with and said that we should not have done what we had done, that we should not in fact have had this restraint. Now the centre has leapfrogged over us and is saying that we have not gone far enough, and now it is attacking us for that. We will get on with a policy of reasonable economic and social justice approach and that is why we chose the option we have chosen.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Following the Arthur D. Little report, the findings of the Royal Commissioner and the Auditor-General about the State Bank, and now the report of the Centre for Economic Studies, how many independent verdicts does this Government need before it will accept responsibility for leaving South Australia as a 'fiscal basket case'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That was a strange drawing together of different issues. I do not know that the Royal Commissioner at any stage found it within his purview to make a finding upon the state of the broad economy of South Australia. I know that the Deputy Leader has wanted to read many things into the Royal Commissioner's report—anything at all which he thinks can be damning to the Government—but it is a new one to say that the Royal Commissioner in his report (and I would be interested in the page reference to this) said that South Australia is a fiscal basket case. He did not in fact say that—and neither did the Auditor-General. For the Deputy Leader to draw together this comment by Cliff Walsh, which does not bear out his own words in his earlier publication or his own centre's words in its earlier report, and say that therefore they must link up with two other reports, is clearly an illogical approach.

The Deputy Leader obviously was so eager waiting to ask his question that he did not listen properly to the information that I gave before. So I will tell the Deputy Leader what this supposed basket case of an economy has done over the past 10 years, notwithstanding the very deep, hurtful recession that this State, along with the rest of Australia and many countries in the world, has been through. Where are we now compared to 10 years ago? We have 100 000—I have been saying nearly 100 000 but apparently it is over 100 000—more jobs in South Australia than 10 years ago.

I will repeat the export figures yet again. There has been a 76 per cent growth in exports. That is some basket case—a manufacturing industry which grew in employment at three times the national average in the second half of the 1980s resulted in an export growth that saw 76 per cent more exports than five years earlier. We are talking 1991-92, we are not talking old figures; we are talking as recent a set of figures as you can get. Then we have a number of other figures, which I have quoted on other occasions and to which I refer the honourable member, in terms of growth in this economy and what this Government is trying to do about stimulating that.

We know that we face serious challenges in the 1990s. Certainly Arthur D. Little tells us that. But, Arthur D. Little did not say that this State was automatically a basket case. The report said that if we do things this State can grow, and grow well. What this State Government has done is consider the recommendations of that report, and a number of things have already happened—the economic development package last year of $40 million; the economic development package repeated this year of another $40 million; the establishment of the Economic Development Board and authority; and various other things bringing business together to share in the opportunities that this State has to offer.

That is what is really the case. What the Deputy Leader would need to consider is how do we get this economy moving. Rather than wanting to wallow in phraseology like 'fiscal basket case', he should be saying, 'Let's get on with the job. Let's govern this State. Let's move this State's economy ahead so that all South Australians can benefit.' That is what the Deputy Leader should be saying, rather than wallowing in the gloom.

The SPEAKER: In the absence of the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, questions directed to that Minister will be handled by the Deputy Premier; and, in the absence of the Minister of Health, questions directed to that Minister will be handled by the Minister of Primary Industries.

INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise whether arrangements have now secured the future of the International College of Hotel Management conducted at Regency Park as a joint venture between DETAFE and the Swiss Hotels Association; and are there any plans to extend this operation?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in this area. As members would be aware, there was a recent visit by the President of the Swiss Hotels Association, Senator Amstutz, and a delegation which came from both the Swiss Hotels Association and, indeed, *Cordon Bleu* (the international cooking institution). I am delighted to inform the House that I can confirm not only the agreement between DETAFE and the Swiss Hotels Association but that the association has agreed to extend the contract between DETAFE and itself for a further 10 years.

This is extremely good news given the importance of the International College of Hotel Management and the recent opening of that college. I think it reflects great credit on the professionalism and dedication of the staff in the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education and Regency College. Again, I pay tribute to my predecessor for establishing this particular area.

The development also gives us the opportunity to consider an extension of the college into South-East Asia, which is a major growth region for tourism. Indeed, we have already identified where that growth should take

place as an extension of our own International College of Hotel Management, and we believe that that should take place into Thailand. That has been identified as perhaps an incredibly important and potential market for this particular facility. Such a move would provide commercial opportunities and, of course, income for South Australia. I am sure all members would welcome the announcement and indeed the suggestion that we should be looking at marketing this facility in a very positive and proactive way into South-East Asia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. What responsibility does the Government accept for consigning South Australia to a level of unemployment which will be much higher than the national average for the rest of this decade? And what hope does she offer to the 84 200 South Australians who are the tragic victims of what the Centre for Economic Studies describes as this Government's 'decade of policy inertia'?

Yesterday's report by the Centre for Economic Studies shows that the Government's economic strategy will make no immediate impression on unemployment. The centre also states that, 'unless unemployment growth can exceed 2 per cent per year there will be little impression on unemployment', compared to the statement made in the Government's Economic Statement of a prediction of 1.25 per cent economic growth. There has also been further grim news for South Australia's unemployed with a release today of a report on investor confidence by the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which shows that only Tasmania is faring worse than South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister, I would point out that there was comment on the question. Secondly, such a broad ranging question may elicit a broad ranging response and time will be taken up.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can only assume that the honourable member has not listened to one word that the Premier has said in what I thought were extremely detailed and comprehensive answers to the questions which were raised. Of course this Government—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I did not interrupt the honourable member in asking his question and I would assume that he has the manners to extend that courtesy to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister directs her remarks to the Chair the interchange will not occur.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank you for your protection. Let me just say, as we have said on this side of the House on a number of occasions, that we as the Government are concerned with what we believe are the unacceptably high levels of unemployment in this State, and those levels, of course, are similar to levels right across this country and indeed are reflected in countries right across the world.

Having said that, I would refer the honourable member to the Premier's statement Meeting the Challenge, which contains a number of important economic stimuli to ensure that we pick up the employment issue and move forward with it. The honourable member would be aware, because he refers to business confidence, that we do need to work with the public and private sectors hand in hand to improve business confidence.

Indeed, in my short period as Minister of Education, Employment and Training, in conjunction with the Premier I have initiated an employment strategy for South Australia. We have looked at establishing an employment committee of the private sector to boost the confidence of the private sector and ensure that it takes up some of the generous employment initiatives through a number of projects that the Commonwealth Government has offered to private employers and to Governments across the country.

As a Government, we have taken up that challenge. As I have indicated to the House on a number of occasions, we are committed to taking on 400 young people within the public sector to give them some training, a work record and to be able to give them an increase in their confidence. As well as that the private sector is now starting to look more positively, I believe, at the initiatives that we and the Commonwealth—the Federal Labor Government—have put in place.

The challenge is certainly a major one. We do not resile from that, and the Premier made that clear in his Meeting the Challenge statement. He was unequivocal in his commitment that we as a Government will ensure that we do everything possible to work more flexibly, to be able to provide for the private sector, to have a cutting of regulation in South Australia, to have a one-stop shop in the creation of business and, as my colleague the Minister of Business and Regional Development says, to provide those enterprise zones to attract investment and new industries.

The Opposition does not like to hear about the MFP, but the honourable member asked me a question and it is important that we look at the range of options and solutions that the Government is currently pursuing. With respect to the MFP, I can assure the House and the honourable member who asked the question that we are looking at attracting not only new environmental and good technology industries but we are also looking at establishing Adelaide as the city of education and culture.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is interesting, and I would like the public record to show that the Deputy Leader finds it amusing that we are going to have a centre of education and culture as a national and international focus. Well he might laugh when we achieve that, and I shall be one to remind him. It is important that we build on our strengths in terms of our own cultural position in the world.

We have one of the best festivals in the world, and that is recognised by anyone who travels. This Government is working on a number of initiatives and, if for one moment I believed that the honourable member's question was genuine, I would be prepared to share those initiatives with him. I found it amazing that, while I answered the question, the honourable member not only talked through the whole answer but also had his back turned to me for most of it. That would prove—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that she now has her back to the Chair. I ask her to finish her response.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. Members on this side are genuine about creating employment, working with people and understanding the issue. The charade we have seen from the honourable member opposite in terms of his question and the way that he responded to my answer indicates that it is nothing more than crocodile tears and a sham.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

REVEGETATION

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. What steps is the Government taking to coordinate initiatives by the community and Government agencies to undertake revegetation programs in South Australia? The history of over clearance in this State is well documented and very apparent. It is also very apparent that the effects of over clearing of agricultural land are rapidly becoming serious and a major threat to the productivity of our rural sector. The current situation in the South-East of rising watertables and increased salinity highlights the urgent need to revegetate those areas that have been over cleared and to do so in a way that is coordinated and well targeted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is a serious issue that we are confronting, and I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Primary Industries would support that comment. While I was Minister of Agriculture for 3½ years, this issue was becoming quite critical in the middle to late 1980s—more so perhaps in Western Australia than in South Australia—but we have now almost reached a watershed period where we need to address this issue dramatically. As a consequence of initiatives taken by the Government, we now have the report of a working party on the rural revegetation program that sets out a whole range of criteria that we should follow with the community. We are, I believe—and I am sure that my colleague would endorse this—seeing wide and varied activity and enthusiasm from community groups in their support of revegetation programs; and that is occurring right throughout the State of South Australia. We must capitalise on this as a community to do as much as we can to recover the situation, protect what we have and ensure that we regain those areas that we have lost for the purpose of productive development.

The Government has established the State Revegetation Strategy Steering Committee which, under the auspices of the Natural Resources Council, has embarked on setting up a program to integrate revegetation in all areas—roadsides, reserves and heritage areas together with regeneration of existing vegetation throughout the whole of South Australia. So, there is an overview plan for the whole State. The steering committee, which was initiated in March this year, has outlined some terms of reference in its first report. That group will now proceed with the community, in the light of the huge enthusiasm that exists particularly in the rural community and also in metropolitan regional centres, to embark on a major revegetation program.

I hope that the final outcome of the terms of reference of the State Revegetation Strategy Steering Committee will be the establishment of a revegetation program which I hope will be set down later this year for the whole of this State to follow. This is a critical issue; the clock is ticking on and we have little time in which to address this matter. We must work together as a community. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the community at large to ensure the establishment of a massive revegetation program throughout South Australia.

TAXATION

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Why does the Government persist with its assertion that it has maintained South Australia as a low tax State when over the past 10 years it has increased taxes at a faster rate than any other State? The Government's assertion in the Economic Statement that South Australia is a low tax State has been contradicted by the report released yesterday by the Centre for Economic Studies. That report states:

> The traditional position in South Australia of having one of the lowest tax rates of the States has been eaten away, because taxes in this State have grown faster than elsewhere.

The report grasps the fact that the last Liberal Government reduced State taxes, as a percentage of household income, to the lowest in Australia. However, the South Australian tax share of household income has increased by 37 per cent over the past 10 years—by far the largest rise of any State.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is true that, over recent years, South Australia's taxes have increased, and it may well be true that they have increased in some areas at a greater rate than the national average. But—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I thought the Leader had been warned. I thought the Leader would have the nous to just be quiet for a moment, but from what base—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I advise the Treasurer that such decisions are those of the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir, I appreciate that; I was merely trying to help the Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: But from what base? Of course, it was from a very low base, indeed. That is one of the difficulties—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has been warned.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—you get into when you want to quote statistics. You can argue that, if the rates have increased, the pace has changed. What you cannot argue is what is the rate today. The latest figures for 1991-92 are contained in the *Advertiser* of Friday 23 April 1993—members do not have to take my word for it: the figures are here in the press. I will have to go

through them so the comparisons can be made. Taxes, fees and fines (and this is expressed in Australian dollars *per capita)* in New South Wales, $1 530; my suspicion is that Victoria's rate will have increased considerably since this figure was calculated, but nevertheless it is $1 390; Western Australia, $1 208; Tasmania, $1 190; and then we come to South Australia, $1 141. But there is one more and, in all fairness, so that the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat. The member for Bragg is out of order. I have warned and cautioned members. We are over half way through Question Time—we are onto about our seventh or eighth question—and I will not be warning any more. The Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In all fairness, to complete the picture, we have the question of Queensland, where its taxes, fees and fines *per capita* are $1 021. So, the figures show that Queensland has a lower rate, although Queensland does have such things as rather steep freight rates on coal—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not so much royalties but freight rates, which bring in a considerable amount. They are the *per capita* figures for the States. It is not my fault. They are the figures that are compiled by the ABS and the various budget papers. Let us do the two comparisons: New South Wales, $1 530; South Australia, $1 141. I also want to say a few words about some of the individual taxes and charges in this State that members opposite, and a few of the outside organisations—the Employers Federation, National Party candidates, such as Rod Nettle—have referred to regarding the level of taxes and charges on business. Which are they talking about? Are they talking about payroll tax?

Payroll tax is the second lowest in the whole of Australia. I concede that for a few months FID was higher: now FID is the same. However, I have never heard of any business saying they went broke because of FID. Nevertheless, we listened to the business people in this State and, when they said FID was bad, we reduced it by 35 per cent. I just wonder what they will complain about next; I will be interested to see. Almost all the imposts that business has in this State are lower than those of other States.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, it depends where you go for your business. Do not forget that much business—particularly small business—is out in the country. I can tell the honourable member opposite—not that he would know, from the leafy glades of Mitcham—that those of us who live in the country, under this Government (with the exception of Queensland, again), have the lowest rates of petrol tax in Australia, where there are tens of thousands of small business people. Having the lowest rate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Around Whyalla, yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat. I have warned, cautioned and had messages sent to some members to behave themselves. Once more I will say it: I will not be warning next time. I ask the Treasurer to draw his response to a close: it has been a long answer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir: I am about to get to my second point. It is clear that taxes and charges in this State are amongst the lowest in Australia. The cost of living in this State is amongst the lowest, if not the lowest, in Australia. The cost of industrial disputes—a very real cost to business in this State—is the lowest in Australia. Payroll tax is the second lowest in Australia—and I could go on. If we are having a debate, let us have all the debate; let us have all the taxes and charges on the table and not just pick out the isolated ones. In this area, this and previous Governments have a lot of which to be proud in the level of services that they have delivered in this State for such a low level of taxation.

MUNNO PARA COUNCIL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise the House of the latest Government funding provided for the development of the Munno Para council region?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in the Munno Para local government area and, indeed, for his advocacy of the often acute needs of people in that local government area. This week, I was able to present a cheque for $150 000 to the Mayor of Munno Para for the first three such State Government annual contributions to particular works in that local government area. This money has been given through the auspices of the South Australian Urban Land Trust for the establishment of a Munno Para Community Development Fund to finance a range of facilities and amenities to enhance the area and to improve the quality of life for residents now and in the future. The fund will also support the involvement of residents in the development of important community facilities.

Another important consideration in the provision of this financial assistance to establish this development fund is that the community is able to obtain facilities and services earlier than would normally be the case. Members would be aware that this is a new growing area.

This Government recognises the importance of improving people's residential environments and their quality of life. In the first year, the Community Facilities Fund will help improve that through the provision of reserves, cycleways, footpaths, recreational facilities and bus shelters. These funds will be put to very good use for the overall benefit of residents. The Government will work closely with council and local residents to ensure that people's wellbeing and quality of life are enhanced and that the community as a whole sees the tangible benefits of overall urban development. This is a good example of two of the integral parts of my portfolio, urban development and local government relations, working hand in hand.

ECONOMY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): What evidence can the Premier now produce to dispute the conclusion of the Centre for Economic Studies that this Labor Government has been an economic and financial failure over the past 10 years? The centre's review of the past decade has concluded that our population growth has lagged behind that of every State except Tasmania, our labour market has been inferior, with high unemployment likely to continue until the end of this decade, labour on-costs are higher than in every State except New South Wales, the public debt position has become 'precarious', retail sales remain dismal, and the Government has failed to show any leadership in the economic reform process.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I think the honourable member is obviously a bit embarrassed. He was reading that question almost so that he could not be heard, because he knew that it had been answered previously by me and the Deputy Premier. It is not my intention to needlessly take up the time of this House, but I simply refer the honourable member to answers I have given earlier and to the answer—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, okay, let us go through some of the information. We are talking about the on-costs, the State taxes in particular. That is what we have control over and what has happened in various areas. I thought I heard the Deputy Premier say—it is certainly my understanding—that we have the second lowest payroll tax rate in Australia. Unlike any other State Government, since payroll taxes were given to State Governments we have reduced payroll taxes in this State at a cost to the budget. How many other State Governments have done that? The member for Heysen is remarkably silent, and deservedly so, because no others have done it. This is the only State Government that has ever done that. We have the second lowest rate of payroll tax in this country.

Then we come to other areas in terms of financial charges. We have reduced the rate of FID. Certainly it was the highest in the country, but now it is back with the national average. Let us look at the cost of electricity and gas and the remarkable reductions in real terms in the cost of electricity to industry. I refer the honourable member to the statistics included in Meeting the Challenge on this matter. In terms of gas, we have the second lowest rates of commercial gas prices in this country. In terms of all the other matters on the budgetary analysis, again I refer to the earlier comments I made and to Cliff Walsh's own words. He was the one who looked at those budget documents that came out every year, and they were his own words.

Let us come to the substance that the Opposition is not prepared to discuss with respect to the report that was tabled yesterday by the Centre for Economic Studies. What that report wants to do is precisely what the Liberal Opposition in this State wanted to do, but it has found itself out-manoeuvred because of the defeat of the Hewson Federal Opposition. It has found itself out-manoeuvred because of the disrepute that Jeff Kennett has brought himself into with his polices, and therefore members opposite are running for cover.

Not once today have we had a question asking, 'Why isn't the Government doing what Cliff Walsh says you should do? Why aren't you cutting more out of the public sector? Why aren't you doing more of those sorts of draconian things?' We have not had such questions because they know they have been found out, and that sort of policy has been found out. What is recommended by Cliff Walsh and his centre is precisely what Jeff Kennett and his Government have done. But what happened? They were lambasted by the economic commentators, by the newspapers around the country, as threatening to drag Australia back into second dip recession. The editorials not only in Victoria but also in this State criticised the Victorian Government for those sorts of policies.

Members opposite cannot have it both ways. They have to go for a policy that aims for real growth, not just to satisfy some kind of deep, ultra-dry economic rationalist heart that may beat in the breast of the likes of Cliff Walsh and, I know, of members opposite. They are really desperate now, because they do not know where they go from here. I note that they are not endorsing this document's views with respect to Government spending. They are very silent on that. I would invite them to give us their views on the economic spending opinions of the centre's study. What do they believe about that? Do they like it or do they not like it? If they do not like it, it really does not behove them to pick up other things in the document and simply suggest that that is a fair criticism to make when they have rejected other findings of this centre's study, as they have. We knew it was an option, but it was not a fair option. It was not a socially just option, and for that reason we rejected it.

TOURISM OCCUPANCY RATES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Tourism provide details to the House on the occupancy rate and room demand in the hotel/motel accommodation sector? A recent media report linked the member for Bragg, as Opposition spokesperson on tourism issues, with statements that accommodation occupancy rates are at their lowest in eight years.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is very important that we put this into perspective, because it is unfortunate that the member for Bragg feels obliged to talk down tourism in this State. I do not say that lightly, because that is not my way. When I was in New Zealand a few weeks ago—and members opposite can all look up at the cameras, all a bit forlorn and hope that Channel 10 might look after them—I led a delegation of tourism industry people for a major promotion that has been spectacularly successful.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will get onto Cliff Walsh in a minute. Who did we see on the front page of the New Zealand *Herald* absolutely dumping on South Australia's tourism effort—the member for Bragg. So, for all the work done by the local industry people, that is the patriotism of the member for Bragg, who is desperate to knock his next door neighbour.

As for Cliff Walsh, let us not mince words about Cliffy. He was Malcolm Fraser's economic valet—we all

know that. He has as much credibility in saying that he is independent as those who say that the member for Kavel has only three votes in the leadership campaign. Cliff Walsh is a good knockabout right wing journo. He scrambles around, along with the centre, to get a bit of money from places—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I do not believe this is relevant to the answer and I ask you to rule on relevance.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and bring the Minister back to the subject of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know we were all disappointed that Judith Sloan was unable to join the outer Cabinet of John Hewson, but let us put these people into perspective. I am pleased to say again that the member for Bragg was wrong. The latest summary of hotel/motel performance in South Australia which was released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics last month shows that our occupancy rates have in fact increased, not decreased, as the member for Bragg would have us believe. These figures, which are the latest available, compare the December quarter in 1992 with the December quarter the year before, and they show that the number of rooms available increased by .6 per cent to 10 763, and the total room nights sold in South Australia increased by 2.2 per cent or by 10 162 rooms.

I know that the honourable member puts out his stories on a Sunday hoping that somebody will be silly enough to run in without checking them. The fact is that the member for Bragg has about as much independent credibility on statistics as has Cliff Walsh.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Bragg defying the Chair?

Mr Ingerson: No, Sir.

POLICE UNIFORMS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Why at such a time of extreme fiscal restraint has the Government required all police officers to replace their shirts by tomorrow at taxpayers' expense with up to seven new ones of a different design, and why, when unemployment is at a record level, has the Government purchased shirts manufactured in Malaysia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the Minister, I wish to be able to hear the answer. The Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will investigate the honourable member's accusations and whether they have any validity before I respond.

HOUSING TRUST, RIVERLAND

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What improvements has the Housing Trust made to services in the Riverland community?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to advise the honourable member and other members that very substantial improvements have been made by the Housing Trust—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member might not be interested in the question but I am sure others are. I can say that in 1984 the trust's Riverland operations were managed by 2.5 staff, who were able to provide a limited maintenance and tenancy service to tenants in Barmera, Berri, Loxton, Lyrup, Moorook, Morgan, Paringa, Renmark and Waikerie. In November last year, the trust's new Berri office was opened to accommodate the 11 staff who now provide for the first time the complete range of Housing Trust services to the Riverland community.

Prior to that time those services were available only in the city. Each tenant now has more direct access to the housing manager for the area, who ensures that maintenance, rent and tenancy services are available to tenants in the Riverland. Services for homeless people and those experiencing difficulty in the private rental market are now provided directly from the Berri office, with the appointment of specialist officers to provide advice, information, referral and financial assistance.

The South Australian Housing Trust board and senior officers of the Housing Trust recently visited the Riverland and held a board meeting there. They inspected trust offices, met staff, inspected trust estates and met tenants and local community representatives, including local government representatives. Given the success of that visit, I am hopeful that many more such country board meetings and visits can be arranged.

HERITAGE LISTING

Mr GUNN (Eyre): What steps will the Minister of Environment and Land Management take to protect the legitimate concerns of pastoralists and of the mining and tourist industries about the Commonwealth Government's proposal to place the entire Lake Eyre basin on the heritage list? Opal mining, grazing and hospitality interests have expressed concern to me that the world heritage proposal would mean that large areas of the Far North would be unnecessarily restricted. They have expressed the strong desire to me that the State Government should oppose the listing. This is because the extent of the area proposed would exceed 20 per cent of the land mass of South Australia, but the buffer zone, which would also be included, would include the towns of Oodnadatta, extending to Coober Pedy, Maree and Innamincka and as far south as Quorn. Obviously, this is completely unacceptable to the people of this State.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Discussions are under way between ourselves and the Commonwealth to implement this Government's stated position, which I have previously laid before the House, for a complete scientific study of the whole region to ensure that the continued maintenance of our value-added industries—for example, the pastoral, mining and tourism industries—is guaranteed. That statement has been clearly set out by this Cabinet, and I have taken every opportunity I have had to make it known at every possible level.

The Federal Government and the Prime Minister made a statement that indicated their direction with regard to the Lake Eyre region. We believe that before any direction is taken in that regard there should be a complete scientific study of the region to look at the significant areas and to determine whether or not existing legislation or legislation that has been mooted for a number of years (regarding, for example, the desert river systems) can provide the heritage areas and significant sites, which might be under some threat, with the sort of protection that is required, as well as maintaining those industries which are there now and those which may wish to establish in future, creating jobs, income and profit for the companies involved in those regions.

That is the position that this Government has taken in discussions at every level with the Federal Government and its officers. I have indicated that my intention with regard to the pastoralists in particular (and I have met with the pastoralists' representatives) is that, following our Cabinet meeting later next month, I will travel to Marree to meet with them, and those arrangements have been put in place. Not only can we then discuss that issue but also, hopefully, I can give a clear indication of the State Government's position with regard to the Lake Eyre region.

Those people will then have an understanding of where we are coming from and how we are dealing with this issue and issues such as pastoral land care, as well as matters that have been concerning pastoralists for a number of years. So, my proposal is to meet personally with as many pastoralists as I can, following our Cabinet meeting in the Pitjantjatjara lands at the end of May. Those arrangements have already been put in place.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the next question, I would point out to the member for Eyre that he has asked a question relating to a motion that he himself has on the Notice Paper. He is well aware of the Standing Order that provides that he cannot ask questions anticipating the debate. I ask all members to pay attention to Standing Orders relating to Question Time, including interjections—

SALES LETTER

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister ask his colleague to report on the *bona fides* of a get-rich scheme being promoted in a leaflet being distributed in my electorate which promises that up to $750 a week can be earned in someone's spare time by passing out booklets for an unidentified product? I will read part of that leaflet which a constituent who received it in his letterbox drew to my attention. Headed 'Simply hand out our booklet and make up to $750 in your spare time', the leaflet reads as follows:

This is the easiest money you'll ever make. Just hand out our booklets to everybody you know or meet. See them a couple of days later, pick up the booklet and collect the cash. There is no selling to do at all, and you will have never made money this easily, we guarantee it!

So what's in the booklet?

The booklet reveals a revolutionary new product that's taking the world by storm, there has never been anything like it before. It's so good that once people know about it, it sells itself. A huge success in the US now available to you.

Why is it so good?

Simply because this amazing product both saves and makes you money every day of the year while it actually improves our environment. It's no wonder hundreds of thousands of satisfied Americans use and love it, you will too.

It's proven to work!

One of our dealers simply loaned out the booklet to some people he knew, they immediately became very excited and so did he, because he made over $750 in his first week and that was in his spare time.

But wait there's more—

and we have heard that somewhere before—

You see, you don't even have to know, meet or see people to make real money with our booklet. You can simply mail it to them and collect the cash each time one of them decides to buy and/or become part of this genuine opportunity. It really is one great way to both save and make money while improving the environment. And to help you get started fast we will rush to you a copy of our incredible Money Marketing booklet.

It does not say 'don't send any money' and it does not offer a set of steak knives (for the benefit of the member for Kavel) but it does refer to a risk-free booklet offer, as follows:

Risk-free booklet offer; simply fill in and clip the coupon below and post to—

and it gives an address in Findon. My constituent was considering filling in the coupon, but he asked me instead to raise this matter in the House for reference to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I guess there are two levels on which one can take this question. Certainly, on the more frivolous level, when it was first brought to my attention by the member for Walsh I thought he was suggesting that the department should involve itself in another cash-raising scheme; one of the items it deals with is the environment, and I thought that was the matter being addressed. But, on a more serious level, these schemes are of concern, and from time to time all members receive inquiries from their constituents about them. I will certainly refer this matter to my colleague in another place for her to investigate, and I hope it does not prove our worst fears and suspicions to be correct.

DEVELOPMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 3.30 p.m.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: Order! The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): I find the report that has been issued by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, and perhaps less so the report than the broad statements accompanying it, quite extraordinary. It is one that does not add to the reputation of the centre. Whatever the depth and value of the report's analysis, the fact is that the conclusions drawn and the statements made are based very much around the short term and, as such, I suggest, are making two very fundamental errors. First, the centre is interpreting a decade's achievements on the basis of the last two years of recession; and, secondly, in extrapolating or predicting the state of the State beyond 1993, it is basing it again not on the decade and the very substantial underlying strengths that have been built up but on the basis of the performance over that same two years of recession.

To support what I am saying, one only need go back to the centre's findings themselves. The Premier has already eloquently pointed to the document that was produced as part of the centre's briefings in 1989. The book on budgetary stress, an editor of which was Professor Cliff Walsh himself, acknowledged the strength of the South Australian public sector because of the fundamental good management of the Government of South Australia throughout that decade. There it was, and it is clearly on the record and acknowledged. Let me quote the May 1989 report. The beginning point of this is a very important position to note, as follows:

> There is a considerable array of evidence [this is in May 1989] pointing to an imminent national demand slowdown, but its precise speed, the weakest part of economics, and size are open questions.

Indeed, that was a healthy warning: it was a prophetic warning in relation to the general state of the economy and how one could look at the future. But having said that—and we all know what happened in those intervening years; we all know the dreadful depths of recession into which we got and the monumental failure of the State Bank—this is what the report says:

> South Australia has enjoyed broadly-based growth in the past year which confirms that the stagnation and pessimism of the early 1970s and early 1980s has been left far behind.

It goes on to talk about our employment growth exceeding the national average, the strength in manufacturing (that has already been mentioned) and says:

> The pessimism of the early 1980s turned out to be completely misguided—

turned out to be misguided—on the evidence, on what happened through that decade of the 1980s. It goes on to warn against a new outbreak of provincial pessimism.

Let us go to the end of that year, for this centre which said that we were adrift economically with no policy and no direction through the 1980s, to the October briefing of the institute, where it points to at least two strong votes of confidence gained by the State. One was the way in which interstate migration had turned around; having been negative for many years it was sharply positive, and this was creating demand in our economy and underpinned, as the report says, residential demand by more than 1 000 units annually. That, of course, was part of an economic and promotional strategy launched by this Government through the 1980s. Secondly, it refers to the capture of a substantial slice of the frigate contract, adding to defence and electronics expertise being built up around the submarine project. It says:

> The vote of confidence is not simply that this work has come to the State; more reassuring is the fact that the losing contender for the prime contract also proposed work in Adelaide. The catalyst effect is beginning to work.

The recession has certainly set that back but it has not destroyed it. What concerns me about the institute is that while I can understand its unwillingness to make long-term predictions I cannot understand why it will not recognise that. It is fashionable to put down South Australia. There is an inferiority complex in this State: that provincial pessimism has been referred to. But for Professor Walsh to bring his ideology to bear on it against what he has been saying for the past decade about management of the public sector and the economy of South Australia is absolutely extraordinary. I find it quite unacceptable.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): We have excuse after excuse from this Government about its economic performance over the past 10 years. Here is a report brought down by a quite independent centre, the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. Let us look at this centre. It is actually partially funded by the South Australian Government, which thinks that it is such a good centre that it gives it an annual cash grant to keep its work going. But, furthermore, it specifically gives it work to carry out.

Recently the Minister of Business and Regional Development allocated to the centre a study on tourism. If the former Premier really believed what he said today, as the Premier also tried to suggest—that this centre is not worthy of its standing in the community—why does the Government give it money and why does it give it, on an ongoing basis, work to be carried out in South Australia? The fact is that Professor Cliff Walsh and his team at this centre are regarded as the strongest and most independent team of economists in South Australia. Here is this team that brings down a damning report on the past 10 years of economic management in South Australia. The detail of that report basically endorses all that was contained in the Arthur D. Little study—all of it. It mirrors, point after point, the very study that condemned the past 10 years of economic management under this Labor Government.

An honourable member: Mismanagement.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes. This Government has destroyed the South Australian economy. The centre concluded in its report yesterday:

> Looking back over this 10 year period, what is remarkable is the absence of any clearly enunciated economic development strategy for this State.

Then think of what Arthur D. Little said about shooting at every bird that happened to fly by—the high profile projects that grabbed media attention, grabbed the publicity and then were found to produce very little

benefit for this State. The whole debacle of the Labor Party during the past 10 years has occurred because it has no understanding of how to achieve real and genuine economic development and employment growth in South Australia. The facts are a damnation. The path that concerns me most of all is that our present Premier, the man who leads this State—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, should not the honourable Leader be directing his remarks through the Chair and not to his backbench?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh has made his point. I ask the Leader to direct his remarks to the Chair and not turn his back to it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that the member who now leads this State as Premier has been the chief Minister responsible for economic development in South Australia since 1985. If ever there was a report damning the performance of the Premier it is this report that was released yesterday. It is this report which has highlighted the failure of the Government to control its expenditure and keep down the level of taxation in South Australia; and it has allowed taxes, particularly taxes on business, to rise to a point where now business is suffering as a result of those tax increases.

The report highlights the fact that South Australia has had the highest increase in taxation of any State in Australia since 1982. I highlight one further fact: a Liberal Government took the level of taxation in South Australia to the lowest level in Australia, and it took a Labor Government over the past 10 years to destroy that very advantage that this State had had and cherished ever since the days of Playford. This Labor Government has done more to undo the manufacturing industry, the economy, the rural industries and the mining industries of this State than any other Government.

Just look at the damage that it has done, for instance, through its lack of planning. It does not have an overall strategic direction for the whole of the State. It puts up a piecemeal program, which is based more on glossy reports, like the report of last week, and less on achieving results and making sure that this State has a long-term economic future. It is because of that that this State is suffering.

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

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: What is your strategy, apart from protecting your back from the member for Navel?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): What a sad thing it is that after 10 years in Opposition this group opposite is so devoid of any new ideas. One would think that after 10 years of languishing over there in Opposition it would have come up with at least one new idea; that it would be able to put forward some policies for the future of this State. However, all members opposite can do is knock. I would also like to talk about the Centre for Economic Studies. I well recall Professor Cliff Walsh. Indeed, he was one of my lecturers during my time at the university. I think he bears out very capably the description of economics as the dismal science. I think Professor Walsh is a living manifestation of that—not that I want to criticise Professor Walsh. I think even economic institutes, such as the Centre for Economic Studies, have to grab a headline occasionally to attract some funding, and no doubt that was what he was on about with his most recent exercise.

I heard Professor Walsh this morning on the *Keith Conlon* program. Of course, what Professor Walsh would like to see happen to the South Australian economy is, first of all, an income tax surcharge to raise some $300 million—I think that was the figure he mentioned—and, secondly, he also thought that there should be job cuts of 9 000 in the Public Service of this State. I think I heard at least one member opposite say, 'Hear, hear'. I hope that is recorded in *Hansard,* because it is an indication of the Opposition's hidden agenda. Perhaps after 10 years members opposite do have a policy. Perhaps they do agree with Professor Walsh that we should have an income tax surcharge and 9 000 jobs should be cut above those already announced in the Public Service.

What I would like to talk about is the Leader of the Opposition's vision, since that is very much in question with this issue. I was interested in what the present Leader of the Opposition had to say just some six months after he ended his term in Government, and I refer to his address in reply speech back in August 1983. What did he think about the future of South Australia some 10 years ago? What was his foresight? His comments are very interesting. He said:

> During the next three to four years, a number of factors will cause major permanent changes to our manufacturing and other industries. The first of these factors is the present economic recession.

He was talking about the recession that existed some 10 years ago under his Government when he was the Minister of Labour. He went on to say:

> The first of these factors is the present economic recession. We have lost thousands of jobs during the past year and many manufacturing companies have reduced the scale and scope of their operations. When recovery comes in 1984, many of the jobs already lost will not be recreated. Companies will increase production, not by returning to previous employment levels, but through increased automation, greater efficiency, and increased imports. Therefore, unlike previous recessions where recovery has led to a sudden jump in demand, stock shortages and increased production and employment, this is not expected to occur this time. Recovery will be very gradual and will not lead to a sudden improvement in jobs.

That was the view of the current Leader of the Opposition some 10 years ago—the period that was reviewed by the Centre for Economic Studies. His prediction in that day was that things would be really bad. There would be no recovery in jobs and things would be very grim indeed. He went on to talk about how, in 1971, 25 per cent of all employees had jobs in manufacturing but by February 1983, at the end of his period in Government, that level had dropped to 19 per cent. He went on further to say:

> The recession is also forcing a major rationalisation of existing manufacturing companies, so Australia will have fewer and larger companies but employing fewer people.

That was the foresight of the present Leader of the Opposition some 10 years ago. We know that during the past 10 years this Government was actually able to increase the level of employment in manufacturing, and indeed contrary to the then Leader's predictions, contrary

to all of his doom and gloom in those days, this Government was able to see manufacturing grow, and the Premier has already pointed out those facts.

The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition has a highly negative view of the State economy. What his statement shows is that members opposite really have no ideas at all about how to handle the current situation. All they can do is knock. If there is any reversion to the past, the current Leader is reverting to the policy of his current rival, the member for Navel, in knocking. We saw plenty of that during the mid 1980s and it appears that, if the present Leader of the Opposition cannot beat the member for Navel, he is going to join him with the sort of knocking that we were witness to during the early 1980s.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The matter I have to bring to the attention of the House today gives me no pleasure whatever. I point out by way of preface that as all members know the Valuer-General answers to the Parliament and not to the Government. I refer to a letter dated 24 April last, addressed to the Deputy Valuer-General. It states:

At our meeting in your office on 23 March 1993, I mentioned the major troubles we were having in getting fair and realistic valuations on areas of native vegetation refused clearance and therefore eligible for compensatory payments. The landholders concerned were all valued by the Mount Gambier office of your (Valuer-General's) department. The valuations were inconsistent with the valuations elsewhere in the State for similar country.

At the instigation of Mr John Riggs, Manager of the Native Vegetation Branch of the Department of Environment and Land Management, some 11 landholders met with Mr Colin Howard, Mr Clem Backen and Mr John Riggs to try to resolve this impasse. This meeting was in Mount Gambier on 3, 4 and 5 November 1993. As a result of the Mount Gambier meeting Messrs Howard and Riggs made on-site inspections of three properties in the Hundreds of Pendleton, McCallum and Shaugh on 3 and 4 December 1992.

All these efforts were to prove completely unproductive as Howard refused to alter his valuations of 1991, 1992, even as late as February 1993.

By way of explanation, I point out that they were considered to be low valuations. It continues:

It is therefore extremely significant that this same valuer (Howard) in March 1993 has increased the value of properties in the same area by 30 per cent when valuing for the Tatiara District Council in March 1993. This is barely one month on from his refusal to change valuations. Obviously one rule for one group and another rule for another group. Before the ink was dry on the valuations for the District Council of Tatiara, this same valuer increased the value a further 30 per cent on a property in the Hundred of Cannawigara. This property happens to have been owned by myself and my wife and we were in the process of transferring to our son. This latest valuation was at the request of the Stamp Duty Office in Adelaide. The three exact figures were: 1992, $173 000; March 1993, $225 000; and April 1993, $275 000.

I find it extremely reprehensible that an officer of the Crown can behave in this way and I look to you to take immediate appropriate remedial action. I would request you to furnish me with a full explanation as to how you can justify a 30 per cent increase in valuation only a matter of three to four weeks after having already revalued the property 30 per cent higher than the previous year. If it cannot be justified I would request that you notify the Stamp Duty Office of the error immediately. I hope you will give this matter your attention as a matter of urgency and I look forward to your reply in the very near future.

That letter is signed by Michael Gaden. A copy of it has been sent to the member for Victoria, me and Mr Dennis Mutton, the Chief Executive Officer of the department concerned.

I share the concern that Mr Gaden has expressed. I believe that valuers in the Lands Department, under the control of the Valuer-General, have not been giving fair and honest valuations and that they have been motivated, as in this case, by malice. A note pinned to the letter that I just read into the record points out that Michael Gaden is the Chairman of the Natural Resources Division of the South Australian Farmers Federation, and in that capacity he attended at the three days of conferences in Mount Gambier in an effort to assist landowners who had native vegetation clearance problems in their interviews with the Valuer-General. He states:

I believe Howard is being vindictive to me as a result—hence the additional $50 000 on the property—

that is his property—

in April. Any help that you can offer would be appreciated.

I do my bit, I do my best and I do hope the Valuer-General wakes up to his responsibilities before we find it necessary to move a motion of no confidence in the decisions that he and his staff are making. They are not professional.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is fair to say that, as a person aged 55 years, in my time I have been able to dish it out and I believe I can take it. Sometimes I do not like taking it, but I know I have to wear it. However, it was with considerable anger that I raised matters with the Economic and Finance Committee this year pertaining to poker machine legislation. Members will be aware of my comments reported in the media last night and in the *Advertiser* this morning. Let me say to all and sundry that anyone who attempts to besmirch my name or that of my colleagues from either side of the House will find that I will do all in my power to have their guts for gaiters, to use an Australian colloquial term.

People should not think that that is a threat—it is a promise. No-one can attempt to impugn my character and that of my colleagues and get away with it. Indeed, when these rumours were brought to my attention that in some way I was receiving some backhander or benefit as a consequence of the poker machine legislation, I raised the matter in the Economic and Finance Committee. The minutes of that committee of 3 February 1993 state:

During the discussion Mr Hamilton raised points in relation to the gaming machine legislation. He made reference to certain allegations which he felt may have impugned both his own reputation and the reputation of other parliamentarians. At this stage it is not certain whether these matters will directly relate to the deliberations concerning the discrepancy before the committee.

That discrepancy was in relation to evidence given concerning consultancies, the matter being considered by the Economic and Finance Committee. I refer to page 5

of the minutes of evidence of that consultancy inquiry of 21 April 1993, as follows:

Mr Hamilton: ... As you would be well aware, in the meetings of this committee, Mr Chairman, I have raised those particular matters. It is my intention to pursue them with your concurrence and that of the committee.

I went on to say that I would not be deterred by anyone. The transcript continues:

Mr Hamilton: I want to follow up on what my colleague asked in relation to that because that was the hidden agenda I was concerned about. There were rumours that some $40 000 was being bandied around and that was the reason why I asked the question. I want to put on the record so people understand that, and it appears from your response to the member for Stuart that you may have heard that there was an amount of money being bandied around in some circles. Is that the case in relation to money being handed out to members of Parliament? — No, I did not hear that.

Mr Hamilton: That is one of the reasons why I raised the question and why I wanted that to be put on the record. There were allegations that were being bandied around to that effect and I wanted to know, in a public forum, whether or not you had heard whether any member of Parliament had been on the take in relation to some $40 000. It is not an inquisition, I want to get that on the record?—I can understand you wanting to do that.

The Chairman then said that he could understand my response. I am relentless in pursuit of my duties to the Parliament and the committee so, when I had the opportunity, I went on to say:

Mr Hamilton: Are you aware whether or not members of Parliament have been lobbied by people within or representing the commission at any stage; were members of Parliament, individually or collectively, lobbied in relation to poker machine legislation and/or poker machines themselves or the manner in which poker machines would be purchased; and, if so, who were those members of Parliament?

I would never hide behind anything. I say to those gutless, spineless dung beetles out there who do not have the guts to come out and make allegations to the police, the NCA or the Economic and Finance Committee: if you cannot put up, shut up. If they have any guts, they ought to come out and make the allegation. If they have any evidence against me or any member of Parliament, they would have my support for any inquiry about this matter. I hope that puts this matter to rest.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): As usual, today the Minister of Tourism reverted to his usual fabrication role. Last Sunday I put out a press release stating that unfortunately tourism continues to be in decline. Attached to that press release was an ABS statistical record. Today in this House, as the Minister often does, he used statistics to suit himself. Let me put on the record what the facts are. According to the ABS report 'Hotels and motels etc. with facilities: number of room and guest nights and room and bed occupancy rates', the number of room nights occupied in South Australia in 1990 was 1 877 000. In 1992 it was 1 832 000, which is a decline of 40 000 room nights occupied.

The room occupancy rate as a percentage in 1990 was 50 per cent, but in 1992 it was 46.6 per cent—a further decline. In respect of guest nights, we had 3 205 000 in 1990 and 3 062 000 in 1992—a further decline of 140 000. In bed occupancy rates as a percentage we had 30.5 per cent in 1990 and 27.6 per cent in 1992. The purpose in putting out these press releases is not to criticise the Government but to show that the Government is not doing the right thing by South Australia in the tourism area.

Members on both sides of the House have supported tourism as an opportunity for growth in South Australia, but the point we are making is that, after 10 years of Labor, tourism, like every other industry, is declining in South Australia. These statistics are not mine—they are ABS statistics put out by independent researchers. South Australia's share of international visitors was 11.5 per cent in 1985-86, and in 1991-92 it was 9.9 per cent—another decline.

With respect to interstate visitor nights, it was 9.3 per cent in 1985-86 and 8.7 per cent in 1991-92. As to international visitor nights, which is the most important indicator—the number of nights that international visitors stay in this State— in 1985-86 we had 8 per cent, and in 1991-92 it was 5.2 per cent. Every major statistic registering the tourism indices in South Australia is in decline, and that is what we are complaining about.

We believe that this Government needs to do something about tourism, which is why three weeks ago in this Parliament we supported the establishment of the Tourism Commission in this State. The marketing board has been set up but, while that is occurring, these declines continue. It is the Opposition's role to bring before the State and the Parliament instances where the Government is not performing. Today the Minister came into the House with his usual gall and blamed and criticised the Centre for Economic Studies.

Today the Minister advised me that studies on tourism are being undertaken by the Centre for Economic Studies. What a hypocrite the Minister is in criticising the centre when it brings out a major 10-year report on the State, yet he goes ahead and uses the centre on tourism matters because it is good at doing independent economic studies. What has really happened in tourism over the past 10 years? What has happened to the project at Wilpena? Where is the Glenelg project? What has happened to the project at Mount Lofty? We have had Tandanya, and hopefully that will be there. Where is the Sellicks project? Fortunately, a development was announced today in the Barossa Valley. Let us hope that that gets off the ground in the next two years. All we have had in tourism is gloss, gloss and gloss and the fabricator.

The SPEAKER: Order!

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (COMPULSORY RETIREMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill amends the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 (the Act) by extending the sunset period within which compulsory retirement is allowed to remain as an exemption to the general provisions prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in the Equal Opportunity Act.

Honourable Members will recall that the Act required the Government to prepare a report on those Acts of the State that provide for discrimination on the ground of age. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity convened a Working Party to ascertain all such statutes and to make recommendations to the Attorney-General concerning their retention or amendment. The Working Party has undertaken significant consultation with agencies and the full report was tabled on 28 April. This does not allow sufficient time to prepare and introduce amendments to those statutes which do contain discriminatory references before 1 June 1993, which was the date by which compulsory retirement was to be abolished.

While the report prepared by the Commissioner was complete within the time-frame established by the legislation, with the benefit of hindsight, the time-frame itself could have been more wisely framed by allowing a period of time after the tabling of the report to allow for implementation of the recommendations made in it. As it is, we are faced with the situation that a report has just been presented in which the State's legislation is examined and in which recommendations are made concerning reform or maintenance of the status quo in relation to age discriminatory practices including compulsory retirement.

Compulsory retirement in the public sector is governed by specific statutes which provide for retirement of employees at specified ages. These specific statutes override the general provisions contained in the Equal Opportunity Act. Those general provisions will of course be binding on the private sector immediately upon expiry of the two year sunset period which was included when the anti age discrimination provisions were put in the Equal Opportunity Act. Thus, as the law stands now, compulsory retirement would be unlawful in the private sector on 1 June 1993, while the public sector would not be subject to the same obligation unless legislation is passed prior to that date.

When the anti age discrimination provisions were being prepared it was envisaged that two years would be an adequate period within which to assess the implications of abolishing compulsory retirement ages.

The Government is concerned to ensure that the implementation of the abolition of compulsory retirement proceeds in an orderly and measured fashion. The Government believes that it is not appropriate that the policy be implemented in the private sector before becoming applicable in the public sector. To this end, the Government has put forward this Bill to ensure that compulsory retirement does not become unlawful in the private sector on 1 June 1993, while the public sector, with its special legislative provisions, could lawfully continue to require its employees to retire at specified ages.

The Government is still firmly committed to the abolition of compulsory retirement ages, but it is not going to insist on the original implementation schedule where it has proved impossible for it to put the proper procedures in place to enable its implementation timetable to be achieved.

As it is not practicable to have legislation dealing with the public sector in place by 1 June, the Government introduces this Bill to defer the operation of the provision abolishing compulsory retirement until 31 December 1993.

I commend the Bill to honourable Members.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 85f—Exemptions

Section 85f(5) of the principal Act allows employers to impose a standard retiring age in respect of employment of a particular kind. This provision expires on the second anniversary of the commencement of Part VA of the principal Act (1 June 1993). This clause defers the expiry of section 85f(5) until 31 December 1993.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 April. Page 2848.)

The Hen. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Opposition supports this legislation. In October 1992 the National Parks and Wildlife (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill was introduced into Parliament. That Bill contained amongst other proposed changes provisions for the taking of animals for commercial purposes and increased penalties for the taking or harming of marine mammals. The Government decided not to proceed with that Bill on the basis of concerns raised about the fact that insufficient consultation had taken place. The provisions of that Bill are now being re-examined in conjunction with the current review of the national parks and wildlife component of the Department of Environment and Land Management.

There are, however, two components of the 1992 Bill that the Government believes should be proceeded with. These are provisions to facilitate emu farming and to provide penalties for offences relating to marine animals. I will deal with the marine animals part of the legislation first. The Bill makes provision for protection and financial penalties to deter people from taking and harming marine mammals. 'Marine mammals' are defined to include seals, sea lions, dolphins and whales. The Bill contains amendments that will provide for penalties to be consistent with the fisheries legislation whereby a common penalty between the two pieces of legislation will be $30 000 for the taking, harming or possession of any species of marine mammal. These provisions will also support proposals to prescribe the Australian whale watching guidelines as enforceable standards of behaviour under the wildlife regulations.

The Opposition strongly supports these provisions in the Bill. It is important that the community recognise its responsibility to abide by this legislation. It is interesting to consider the amount of interest that is now being shown in various forms of marine mammals, such as whales and seals. One only needs to go to places such as Seal Bay on Kangaroo Island to recognise the interest that is being shown in seals. It is good to see, but it is also good to have the type of penalties that are now to be introduced to deter any irresponsible people—I cannot imagine that there would be very many—from taking or harming these marine mammals. So, the Opposition

strongly supports the introduction of that part of the legislation.

However, we have some concerns with the other part relating to the farming of protected animals, in this case, emus. We will support the legislation, but we do have concerns. It has been determined that, rather than try to amend this legislation, we should accept the Bill in its present form on the basis that on coming to government we will look again at these provisions. As I said, at this stage emus are the only protected animals that are being considered for farming by the Government. The amendments introduced in this place by my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee on 17 February 1993, which were defeated by the Government, were well received by those people who want to be involved in the farming of emus. I have received representations from some of those people, and I support their claim that they deserve—and they have been looking for this for some time—the support of Government to enable them to continue the farming of emus.

The legislation introduced by my colleague also would have established a framework within which the industry could have been self-regulating and viable. It is important, if the industry is to be given the go-ahead, that it should be viable. Certainty of rights to farm the species commercially was an essential feature of the legislation. In other words, the Government or the Minister would not be able to prevent someone from farming emus or to exercise discretion to revoke permission once granted. So, there was a considerable amount of certainty in what the farmers could do in the farming of emus.

This legislation provides the Minister with that power: in other words, there is much more opportunity for interference on the part of the Minister. The Government Bill will also impose a royalty on animals or birds to be paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. That, too, is in contrast to the proposals in the member for Murray-Mallee's legislation, which proposed a fee for each bird so that the funds necessary for research into commercial aspects of production of these species would be provided. The industry would have had the chance to determine for itself the way in which funds collected per bird would be applied for research in and development of the cultural, husbandry, disease control and market research work.

The Government Bill, the one that we are now debating, provides for permits and royalty fees to be paid through the Wildlife Conservation Fund for administration of the farming provisions. I have considerable sympathy for that organisation. World Wildlife, and the Wildlife Conservation Fund, is very worthwhile, but I do not believe that it is totally appropriate that that fund should be used at this time, even though it would be to the benefit of the industry and of research into conservation of the species.

There are a number of areas in this legislation about which the Opposition feels strongly but, as I said at the commencement of my contribution, it is the decision of the Opposition to support the Bill in its present form. My colleague the member for Murray-Mallee will expand on some of our concerns and some of the suggestions that he would like to make regarding changes to improve the legislation. At this time, the Opposition supports the legislation.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Ten weeks ago, the Minister said it would be a couple of weeks or so before he would bring in his own legislation, after having withdrawn earlier legislation, to deal with these matters. The precise date that he arranged for the defeat of the propositions that I put before the House was 17 February; it is etched in my mind forever. I find no difficulty with the necessity for us at this time to pass this legislation and I, like my colleague the Liberal Party spokesman on such matters, wish it swift passage both through this Chamber and the other place. I wish to make some remarks about the matter along the way.

I emphasise the big difference between this legislation and the form in which we believe the industry ought to be structured. The first and most glaring difference is that there is no certainty of right to farm. What that means is that the Minister can withdraw the permit to farm that is provided under the terms of the proposed legislation and, in the process of doing so, just simply destroy somebody. No other livestock are farmed under permit from a Minister of Government—a Minister of the Crown. I do not see why we should make a distinction because the protein and the product we seek to get from this species happens to be from a species indigenous to this continent—

I do not know whether that necessarily makes it of any greater concern that the birds will be treated differently: they will not be. We already have adequate prevention of cruelty to animals in our legislation, and we put that there not just because we are concerned about the treatment of animals and birds that are being dealt with by human beings: our greatest concern is that we want to signal to each and every individual in society that it is not appropriate to behave in a sadistic fashion in dealing with anybody or anything that is living. That kind of behaviour is primitive and unacceptable in a civilised society, so we ought to outlaw it. Those provisions apply to all animals, be they pets or animals used for commercial purposes.

Therefore, we really do not need to have such draconian provisions in law as would remove the right from any citizen to continue farming any species—emus or others. The means of dealing with any miscreant activity are already there. Likewise, if it is not cruelty and it is said to be something else the individual has done, there are other ways of addressing that in law. If it is a crime, you deal with it accordingly: you do not destroy someone's assets and take away their rights to obtain their living in the way that this legislation will allow. However, we can fix that later on coming to government. The most important thing is that we allow those people who presently have stocks of emus held as pets under the general permit provisions of this legislation, the principal Act, to transfer them into the domain where they can be used commercially.

The other substantial difference between this legislation and that which I had drafted in consultation with people involved as nature lovers and bird watchers, as well as those who wished to become involved with the industry, is that, once the grandfather clause to enable that transfer of stock from the pet permit system into the commercial

flock had been undertaken, there would be no more recruitment without the consideration of a board of the industry—no more recruitment from the wild. There are two reasons why the industries and the bird watchers, and so on—the people who expressed concern to me and with whom I consulted—gave me that impression, and I agree with both the reasons. First, if you allow recruitment from the wild stock, what you will do is put inferior meat product on the market as emu meat against that which has been raised domestically—probably grain-fed. The wild product would have been fed on horehound, false caper and a whole lot of other things which can cause the meat to be much more rank and less palatable.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That, too. So, it will destroy public confidence in the product if we allow that to happen. This legislation envisages that that will be possible if the Minister chooses to issue a permit to enable it to happen, and that is quite wrong. The other thing that the Minister can do under this permit provision, through that recruitment, is to destroy the value of existing domesticated breeding stock. If, say, the breeding stock population is fairly steady in the industry in five, six or 10 years at some 100 000 birds, or whatever it is (I do not know where it will end up, but it will be a big industry, there is no doubt about that), if it is static, if in a drought year the Minister issues permits all over the place, and if both the National Parks and Wildlife staff as well as land-holders who are being invaded by the birds that would otherwise die from starvation naturally on the continent before European farming was introduced here recruit those birds, that will destroy the value of the breeding stock, because it will over supply birds into that market. I do not think the Minister—I do not care who he is, whether it is the current Minister or anyone else—should have the prerogative to do that against the interests of the private citizen. In any event, any attempt to do that, if it is to be done, ought to be done in close consultation with a representative body of the existing commercial growers who have their grubstake invested in that industry.

Another matter to which I wish to draw attention is the way in which the Minister proposes to collect funds as royalties from the people who are involved as commercial producers and apply them to the Wildlife Conservation Fund. I do not have any problem with the Wildlife Conservation Fund having adequate finance in it, but that is there for an entirely different purpose and revenue to finance it should be obtained from entirely different sources. To require people who are farming a particular species to finance those operations is about as crazy as telling everybody with a builder's licence that they must pay an additional surcharge on their builder's licence to restore heritage buildings. I do not think that is on; that is not appropriate. Why should someone wanting to build a house anywhere pay an additional surcharge to restore a tumbled down wreck or maintain one that is already needing some repairs and maintenance? Yet what the Minister is proposing here, namely, to siphon off funds from the commercial farming operation into the Wildlife Conservation Fund, is exactly the same—it is for conservation and heritage reasons that he is doing it. It is wrong. By some marginal measure, it will destroy the profitability of the industry in South Australia compared with that of China, Canada, the USA, Europe or anywhere else that emu will be and is being produced. They do not have to contribute to the Wildlife Conservation Fund, yet they will be selling their product in competition with South Australian emu farmers on the world market. So that is the margin by which there will be some difference.

Another aspect of the legislation about which I and the people with whom I have consulted have a worry is that the Minister said, in the course of his giving his reasons for choosing to defeat the legislation we had before us previously, that it would involve too much red tape and regulation. Well, that is a laugh! The provisions in this Bill are all to be established by regulation; the way in which the industry will be governed will be determined by regulation—subordinate legislation. There is no reduction in the amount of red tape that is to be involved. There will still be a fee, and the industry does not have control of it. That shows that the Minister was not really being sincere when he said that. But I do not mind. I am not miffed about that, and neither is anyone else. We want to get on with the job.

Finally, under this legislation there is to be a draft code of management which must be published in the *Gazette.* No-one will be able to farm emus unless the Minister has adopted that code of management, so I hope he gets on with that job. It is another part of the red tape. The quaint thing about that code of management deal is that we do not have a code of management for chickens, turkeys, cattle, sheep, pigeons, pigs or any other commercially farmed species, nor do we have such codes of management practice for turkeys that were recruited as a species from the wild a couple of hundred years ago in North America or anywhere else.

This code of management deal comes from a small rowdy minority called the Animal Liberation Movement, which is determined to impose on this industry more draconian measures as to what can and cannot be done with the birds than will be imposed on any other commercial live animal production enterprise in this State, or on any other emu enterprise anywhere else in this country or overseas. It will make it more difficult and expensive, so that will need to be looked at when we come to office.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, we already have adequate provisions to prevent cruelty to those birds, the same as we have adequate provision to prevent cruelty to any other animal farmed commercially. There is no necessity to go further than that. I will be seeking information from the Minister about that draft code of management if he has it already. Only last Friday I was told that as yet it had not been drafted, but I understand that the Minister's minders have been telling those who wish to become part of this industry that it is all ready to go. One way or the other, someone has it wrong. Someone has not been telling the truth.

I also request that the Minister provide us with such other regulations that he has on hand so that we can look into them. Normally we would kick up a fuss and insist that we get the regulations before we agreed to debate the legislation, but we do not want to delay it because we know it is the Government's intention for Parliament to rise at the end of next week, and if this legislation has

not been passed by then it will cost some prospective emu farmers each some hundreds of thousands of dollars in losses and really set back the industry a couple of years. Those people would be left with no alternative but to destroy some of their stock because they would be unable to otherwise dispose of them.

I am curious as to why the Minister has included a provision which requires people who wish to join the industry and who seek to obtain a permit to first join an association or organisation which has as its sole purpose the farming of emus. That is another thing which the Opposition has difficulty in accepting. We do not believe in closed shops. We all would urge members of any industry from which they derive a living to join an industry association. That has always been our platform, and I know that is the way the member for Flinders views the world. However, to require someone to join such an organisation before they can become involved in commerce or the industry is a little like closed shop trade unions, and I suspect that that is where this provision has evolved. No matter, we will deal with that when we come to office, whenever the next election is held. We have reservations but we will cause the Minister no difficulty whatever in allowing swift passage of the measure through this place, and we trust that he will prevail upon his colleagues in another place to see it safely through that House next week.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I add my support to this piece of legislation. I concur with the caution expressed by the members for Heysen and Murray-Mallee. It is important that the legislation be put in place. Whilst there are aspects of it with which I do have some concern, it is a tread softly softly industry; we are breaking new ground. It is therefore important that cooperation from all sectors of the community be encouraged along the way. I would hope that the fears expressed by the member for Murray-Mallee with respect to too much outside interference in the industry will not be warranted and that it will become an industry-managed enterprise and, as such, all will benefit by it.

There is concern that people have some reservations about farming a native animal, or in this case a native bird, from Australia, but we must bear in mind that the Americans are doing very nicely out of our native species. They are farming them very well, and it seems to be an utterly ludicrous situation that we have not been allowed until now, whereas another country has been able to make a fortune from our wildlife. That is wrong, and I do not see any need for that to continue.

I applaud this legislation for being the first of the stepping stones into the arena of emu farming. At the same time I mention the member for Murray-Mallee's first amending Bill which has created much of the discussion to bring about this Bill. It is partly due to him that we have this Bill, and there have been several stepping stones that have enabled input from organisations and further detailed discussion and consideration by the Government. I know that a number of people on Eyre Peninsula will be farming emus. I do not doubt that there will be a larger number once the industry has been properly recognised and a code of practice has been put in place. More particularly, the turning point will be when the number of farmed animals is such that we need slaughtering requirements.

Quite frankly, my mind boggles when I consider the first semi-trailer load of emus arriving at Gepps Cross. It could be a rather interesting day. There are many aspects in relation to it, from the slaughter of the animals, to the process, to the extraction of the oils and the preparation and marketing of feathers. However, every step of the way is potentially another industry, and it is something from which our farming, processing and manufacturing communities hopefully will all derive some benefit.

I know of about eight people on Eyre Peninsula who have small mobs of emus under the licence arrangement currently available through the National Parks and Wildlife Service. We all know they cannot process those birds: they can breed and sell them under permit, but they cannot process them. We are getting to the stage where it will be necessary for this legislation to pass so that some of those farmers can continue into that new industry. I make that comment because the industry is growing, as is the ostrich farming industry.

I have been asked to open a field day next Sunday of ostrich and emu farming on Lower Eyre Peninsula. I am told there will be a considerable number of people in attendance, not only those already involved in the industry but those who are looking at it seriously as an alternative enterprise that could be undertaken by some of the farming communities.

I say that, with the reservation that I believe that we will have to take stepping stones along the way and will have to make the necessary arrangements. I take up the point that the member for Murray-Mallee made about codes of practice. There are codes of practice in some industries. The pig industry, the intensive sheep husbandry industry and one or two others have codes of practice. I see nothing wrong with that, as long as it is motivated by the industry and brought about in that way. Somebody expressed concern about the welfare of animals: it needs to be made perfectly clear that, unless any animal (and that can include a human being, if we want to be so brutal) lives in a clean and secure environment, free from stress, it will never produce. So, it is in everyone's interests to make sure that the environment in which those animals or birds are kept is appropriate. Commonsense would tell us that that is the way that any farmer of animals or anyone involved in animal husbandry has to go. I support the measure.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will be very brief in my comments, but I want to add my support for the Bill. I know that the local government people in my area are watching the process of this measure very keenly, because they are looking at emu farming. The member for Flinders mentioned prospects for diversification for farmers who have experienced a lot of problems in the West Coast area in the past few years. I know that also a number of my Aboriginal constituents in the northern parts of the State just north of Port Augusta and someone from Ceduna to whom I was speaking today are interested in emu farming. I would support the member for Flinders' comment on that matter. It seems ironic that millions of dollars are being made in America from the farming of emus, which is one of our native animals,

and yet we have not been able to do anything until this time. So, I totally support the Bill.

I am aware that in October 1992 this proposal was included as part of the Native Parks and Wildlife (Miscellaneous) Bill, but for a number of reasons it did not proceed at the time. I am very pleased that the Minister has now brought this Bill before the Parliament. So, on behalf of those people in my area who are actively seeking to be part of the emu farming community, I would offer my total support for the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the Bill. It is just over three years since I asked a question in this House of the then Minister of Agriculture, now the Premier, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, about when emu farming would be introduced in this State. I was given the clear impression that moves would be made later that year (1990). I know that several of my constituents are interested in undertaking emu farming on Yorke Peninsula and perhaps beyond that. My one regret is that we are three to four years behind in getting this legislation before the House, while Western Australia has scooped the pool, Queensland has followed suit and I believe that New South Wales and Victoria are not far behind. It is one further example of where South Australia could have been at least out in front in an equal capacity with Western Australia. We could have been reaping the rewards and advantages right now when we really need them, but it did not occur, even though the Minister responsible then gave a clear indication that everything was in hand and that it was just a matter of a few weeks or months before the matter would come before the House.

I compliment the member for Murray-Mallee, who undertook a lot of work off his own bat in introducing the last Bill which was not agreed to by the Government but which at least did finally force the Government to move on this matter. While we are in the second to last week of sitting for this session, let us hope that this measure has a speedy passage through both Houses, so that South Australia can start catching up to where it should have been in relation to this enterprise.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): First, we are dealing with a protected species: that is the reason for having a code of practice. It is a very sensitive issue. It may not appear sensitive to one member opposite, but in the community it is a very sensitive issue and one which has to be dealt with very carefully. There are other codes of practice; I know as a former Minister of Agriculture that a code of practice has been adopted in animal husbandry in relation to a number of animals within domestic production industries. This is no exception; in fact, it has to be provided to ensure the passage of this Bill through both Houses. That is its purpose.

I do not believe the method we have adopted in dealing with it will be bureaucratic. The issues involving the associations and the code of practice will be established in conjunction with those associations and the Minister of Primary Industries. Members will note in the Bill particular references to the code of practice and the role of the Minister and the Department of Primary Industries. That is the purpose of the relevant provision. It is accepted that we will learn as we go, and we will learn much from the establishment of this industry, with improvements following in terms of efficiency. I wish success for those members of the industry when this Bill has passed both Houses and been proclaimed. It is an opportunity for many of our struggling farmers who are feeling the pressure of collapsed commodity prices in their industry at the moment to diversify their businesses.

When the member for Flinders attends the launching of the undertaking at a field day on Sunday, I ask him to pass on my best wishes to those people embarking on this venture. I look forward to this Bill becoming an Act and to this industry becoming one of our healthy export industries, not only exporting internationally but also exporting to other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, which are still dragging the chain in a number of areas, and this is one of them. We can make an inroad particularly into the New South Wales market, and this will be an opportunity for us to see a value-added return for this State. I thank the Opposition and the member for Flinders for their support for the Bill and I, too, wish it a speedy passage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Insertion of division IVA into part V.'

Mr LEWIS: This is the bit where the rubber hits the road. It is a very long clause, and it relates to the insertion of seven new clauses in the principal Act. Does the Minister have the code of management practice to which the legislation refers in new section 60b(3)(a) in the first instance and also in this clause? Does he have that and the other regulations in hand? If he does, may we have a copy of it and, if not, how long does he think it might be before he does have it so that we can obtain a copy of it?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: What we will be using as a foundation for our code of practice is the Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals, Husbandry of Captive Breed—Emus. That has already been prepared, although it has not yet been adopted by the Australian Agricultural Standards which I hope will occur. I hope that my colleague, who is a member at the supreme level, will be adopting that shortly. We anticipate establishing the code of practice in six weeks. I have a copy available for the honourable member. If he or any member would like that copy, I would be more than happy to make it available. The member for Flinders has indicated that he would like a copy; I am more than delighted to be able to provide it.

Mr LEWIS: So The next matter about which we are curious is whether or not the Minister will be establishing provisions within the meat hygiene subordinate legislation to enable the slaughter of the birds to be undertaken by mobile slaughtering and dressing works as well as providing permits to those facilities which are near enough at hand to any proposed farmer to have them done at the fixed facilities. In many other places, and with other species such as turkeys, we have mobile slaughtering facilities. Because of the peculiar temperament—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Goats.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, goats is another species; and I thank the member for Heysen for reminding me. Because of

the temperament of these birds, as they approach adolescence—and that is the ideal time to take them to market—we ought not to require them to be transported long distances, because it results in damage to not only the leather and the legs but also to the meat, which will not set as well because the birds get excited. The Opposition as well as those people to whom I have spoken in the industry and those who would otherwise become part of the industry, were they permitted to do so, believe that that is easily the most sensible way to go. Can the Minister give us a simple statement of what the Government has in mind, as I think it would be good to have it on the record?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not want to steal my colleague's thunder in this issue but I know that he is undertaking a major review of this whole area. As part of that, this matter will be addressed. If the honourable member refers to the Bill he will see that it makes reference to the consultation which I must undertake with the Minister of Primary Industries, and this has already taken place with primary industries officers. There is a deliberate and direct role for primary industries in the production side of the industry. The honourable member is quite right: from my knowledge the birds are easily stressed and the meat can be quickly damaged. I would be looking along the lines of what the member has suggested. That is the way in which we are moving. My colleague will be making some comments about that in due course, and I do not want to move across his territory. I assure the honourable member that the matter is well in hand.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to proposed new section 60c(4). Does the Minister intend to recognise the newly formed Emu Farmers Association of South Australia?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The brief answer is 'Yes'. In addition, it is obvious that the Farmers Federation is another organisation which might be represented under this legislation. However, there might be some agreement between the Emu Farmers Association and the Farmers Federation. The purpose of this is not to create a closed shop in the sense indicated by the honourable member; it is to ensure that there is an organisation that can take responsibility for the industry in regard to its code of practice and application so that it is an industry driven issue. Negotiations with the Department of Primary Industries with regard to the implementation of the code of practice will be through that industry organisation. That is the purpose of it, so that we can see a responsible body speaking for the industry as a whole.

Mr LEWIS: The only reason I and other members of the Opposition came to the conclusion that it was not to relate to any more than just the one type of organisation was that paragraph (a) uses the words 'that has as its sole object [the only object] the promotion of the interests of persons [farming emus]'. We thought about whether it might be possible to recognise a number of organisations. I understood those words to mean that it could not refer to the Farmers Federation. I am not disappointed that the Minister has chosen to identify that there might be an emu farming section in the South Australian Farmers Federation. On that basis, we see it as the appropriate organisation. Acknowledging the Minister's nod across the Chamber, I have no further concerns or reservations about the legislation during the Committee stage.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 and 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS NAVIGATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 2727.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill consolidates the Harbors Act, the Marine Act and the Boating Act. When a consolidation of this nature occurs, no matter what the subject, there is always considerable concern as to what is being left in, what is being left out and what new material has slipped in along the way about which no mention has been made. That is of very real concern in relation to this legislation. Most of the major concerns we have regarding those three pieces of legislation have been transferred and, in some instances, expanded in the new legislation.

I refer to the provision for blood alcohol testing which is in this legislation. The Bill goes much further than the original amendment I made to the Boating Act some time ago which brought into effect blood alcohol limits and testing for boat operators driving or controlling a vessel when under the influence of alcohol or other prescribed drugs. That provision is in this legislation.

Possibly one of the other main areas of concern has been the Government's introduction of a levy, on top of the already existing charges in relation to the Boating Act. Organisations such as the South Australian Recreational Boating Council and the Boating Industry Association of South Australia might have said that they accept a levy being placed on boat operators and owners, but it is only as a result of sheer frustration because no funds have been provided whatsoever in this area. I know of no other section of the recreational industry that has suffered with so little contribution, even though it has many participants.

Of course, if we look at the costs for a recreational boat owner and operator, we start with the Federal sales tax on the purchase of the boat and the cost of registering it. Then there is Federal fuel excise and the State franchise tax on fuel. The taxes applied to a recreational boat user are quite enormous indeed. Then, of course, if you add the trailer registration to get the boat to the water and the cost of the vehicle to tow it, there is something like six taxes and charges before the boat even gets into the water.

The moneys raised from this levy will be paid into the recreational boating fund, or whatever name the Minister proposes to give it. I wish the industry well, and I hope that those moneys will be totally used in that direction. In the mid 1970s I moved an amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act so that all moneys collected from hunting permits in South Australia would be paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. The Government opposed that for something like 18 months and, because the legislation did not go through the Legislative Council, no hunting permit moneys were collected during that period. In the end the Government agreed to the moneys being

paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund rather than into general revenue, and then in the budget the following year the Government reduced the budget line to National Parks and Wildlife by the same amount that was collected from the hunting permit moneys and, as a result, I achieved absolutely nothing for wildlife conservation in South Australia.

My fear is that we will see the same thing happen in this area. We already know that the $500 000 allocated for recreational boating by the Tonkin Government was whittled down to $250 000, and in the past two years it has been completely abolished altogether. I fear that what happened in relation to the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wildlife Conservation Fund will be repeated here. On top of the six taxes and charges that recreational boat users pay before they get into the water, they will now have a seventh levy placed on them to make sure that the costs are such that they will not be able to go too far.

That is of grave concern to me and to most other people involved in recreational boating in South Australia. The Government will have to convince the people of South Australia, because there are many thousands of recreational boat operators in this State, that the moneys collected will be of some benefit to the recreational boat operator. Another area of concern is that when we have a Bill of this nature, which consolidates three Acts, we tend to see the legislation become more of a framework and much more is left to regulations. Boating safety is an area where South Australia, for some reason or other, has not been inclined to fall into line with the rest of Australia and the Uniform Shipping Laws Code. Consequently, boats that qualify within the requirements of legislation in South Australia do not really qualify anywhere else in Australia. That is an absolutely absurd situation.

If we are looking to have our recreational boats and yachts cruising the coastline of Australia and participating in events interstate, under the Government in South Australia those vessels, once they leave our shores to go interstate, are not adequately covered. They cannot compete. I refer to an article that appeared in the *Australian Yachting Monthly* in September 1991. The article refers to the regulations that went before the Subordinate Legislation Committee in 1991, and I have the minutes of the hearing of Wednesday 23 October 1991, where safety regulations for recreational boats were debated at considerable length with a number of witnesses. The article states:

> Recently drafted boating regulations in South Australia have safety standards which fell well below those required by the Australian Yachting Federation (AYF). This has occurred, despite industry's call, to establish uniform safety regulations on all sailing vessels to the AYF Blue Book rules. Vessels equipped to the South Australian Government's proposed regulations would not be eligible to enter any club event anywhere in Australia. In rejecting industry's call, the South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors has lost the opportunity to do away with the current ridiculous situation of vessels in the same waters having three different sets of safety requirements. Not only would uniformity lead to higher levels of safety but it would give both charter companies and private owners of vessels more flexibility in using the vessels.

It went on to say:

> The proposed regulations also confuse the AYF's move to give potential boat builders the opportunity to build vessels approved by classification societies. The proposed regulations give the director power to reject vessels that have been built to the standards of listed, approved classification societies. These powers throw doubt in the minds of any potential investor about the validity of construction of any vessel and are presently being strongly opposed by industry. The proposed regulations fall well below the charter industry's requirements and they are calling for a full review before the new regulations are implemented.

The article goes on in that vein. All I am saying is that surely, now that we have a new Bill before the House, South Australia will fall into line with the Uniform Shipping Laws Code and we will have some uniformity.

Besides the concern I have with the levy and how that will be used, and whether the recreational boating industry will get the full use of it, we have other concerns. One relates to a clause which binds the Crown, yet at the same time there is another clause that has the effect of not making the Government liable in many instances. I will deal with that in more detail in Committee.

The other area about which I have always been interested, because of my involvement in recreational sailing, is navigational aids situated around South Australia's coastline. I have raised this matter on a number of occasions and in Estimates Committees to ascertain the department's or Government's responsibility and how seriously they take that responsibility. For recreational users of the coastal waters of South Australia, those navigational aids are of considerable importance. Possibly they are of no great importance to large vessels which are fitted with satellite navigation or GPS systems where, so long as the electronic equipment is working effectively, one can pinpoint and know exactly where one is at any minute of the day.

As to smaller recreational vessels, owners often do not have the resources to install much of the sophisticated equipment that is available, and the navigational aids around the coast and the lead lights into various ports are absolutely essential. It is disconcerting in rough water in the middle of the night when you believe you are in the area of a certain navigational aid only to find that the light is not burning. I note in the legislation that the Minister will provide navigational aids, but there is no commitment that the Minister will maintain those aids. Although we have a number of concerns, in view of the time, I will raise the concerns in Committee.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): This Bill has been a long time in gestation, and I have to say that I am very proud to be involved with it in this House because I am sure that members are aware of my ancestry—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —as a descendant not of pirates but of Cockney bargees who operated colourful trading barges—as a small business of course, which is probably one of the reasons why I have carriage of the business area—on the River Thames. Of course, these critical navigational issues were of great concern then as they are today. In many ways, what we are doing is consolidating, cleaning up and going through the regulations of three Bills concurrently, and we are

providing for the administration, development and management of harbors and safe navigation in South Australian waters, repealing the Harbors Act of 1936, the Marine Act of 1936 and the Boating Act of 1974. This basically follows an extensive review of the Australian waterfront industry by the Interstate Commission in 1989, a comprehensive restructuring program implemented during 1989-90 by the Department of Marine and Harbors to support a user pays public sector business approach and the deregulation policy of the Government announced in 1987.

The department has taken the opportunity to bring all these threads together to provide the catalyst to review those three Acts. The principal objective of this Bill is to provide for the efficient and effective administration of the management of the South Australian harbors and harbor facilities for the purpose of maximising their use and promoting trade. I paid great attention to this Bill when it was debated in the Upper House and I noted the contribution of all members. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time. In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 4, line 24—Leave out paragraph (c) and insert:

(c) a surf board, a wind surf board, a motorised jet ski, water skis or other similar device on which a person rides through water;

The existing definition of 'vessel' in paragraph (c), 'a surf board (including a wind surf board) or water skis', was moved by the Opposition in the Legislative Council and subsequently accepted because it was thought that other devices such as motorised jet skis could be dealt with by regulation. That has turned out not to be the case and the definition of 'vessel', we believe, requires amendment. The department is regularly asked to regulate the activities of devices such as surf boards and motorised jet skis, and so on—one is called a 'hot dog' but the member for Kavel probably knows more about it than I do—by seaside councils and requires the definition of 'vessel' to encompass these devices.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—'Crown bound.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This clause binds the Crown. I am fascinated, because the clause provides:

(1) This Act binds the Crown not only in right of South Australia but also, so far as the legislative power of the Parliament permits, the Crown in all its other capacities.

(2) Nothing in this Act renders the Crown in any of its capacities liable to be prosecuted for an offence.

I have no problem with that. However, clause 89, which deals with officers' liability, provides:

(1) The Crown, the Minister or the CEO incurs no ... liability in consequence of—

(a) The issue of any licence, certificate, exemption or consent under this Act—

The list then continues. Clause 5 binds the Crown yet clause 89 provides all the exemptions from the Crown's being bound.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Crown is obviously bound in terms of its survey work in all respects other than in the individual departmental and personnel responsibilities.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Is the Crown bound or is it not? It is bound, but it is not bound in all these different areas. I have never before seen that in any piece of legislation that has come before this House. It seems to be an absolute cop-out.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is not a cop-out. The matter came up in discussions in the Upper House when clear questions were asked about whether the Crown would be bound. Under usual legislation the Crown is bound unless it is specifically spelt out where it is not bound, and it was felt that some clarification was needed. Obviously, some protection is given to individual departmental officers.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Delegation.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I move:

Page 6, line 22—Leave out 'or to any other person'.

The Opposition has no problem with the Minister's being able to delegate his power to the Chief Executive Officer, but how far does one go? We are talking about ministerial responsibility in this place. If the Chief Executive Officer, having received delegation from the Minister, can just palm that off to any officer in his department, in my view it seems as though the Minister is abdicating his responsibility by allowing that to occur.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In opposing this amendment, I point out that the Crown is clearly bound under the legislation except in specific circumstances, such as the issuing of a licence, a certificate of exemption or a consent under this Act. Those areas are clearly specified. This was the result of questions regarding clearer definition in the other place. The Bill allows the Minister to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer or to any other person any of the Minister's powers under this Act. This provision has been drafted in such a way as to provide flexibility, which may be desirable in the future as the department continues successfully to reform its commercial operations.

Similar provisions have been used in respect of other port authorities throughout Australia. Power that is delegated to an individual cannot be delegated to another by that individual. If the Minister delegates to the Chief Executive Officer or another person, those powers cannot be delegated to another. That is absolutely clear and usual practice. I as Minister of Tourism might want to delegate powers to my department head because I am going to be away. If he is overseas, rather than allowing the permanent head to delegate to a clerk down the line, I would have the power to delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, and I still remain accountable to the Parliament, because it is my butt that is on the line.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Those powers having been delegated to the Chief Executive Officer, does the Chief Executive Officer have any powers of delegation?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No. He has powers of delegation that are specified, but he cannot delegate the Minister's power. The Minister delegates his power to the Chief Executive Officer or to another person. So, if the Chief Executive Officer is away or if that is not appropriate in certain circumstances, the Minister can choose to whom he or she wishes to delegate the power.

Therefore, the Minister remains accountable. So, the delegation power cannot be passed down willy-nilly without the Minister's consent.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Powers of an authorised person.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I move:

Page 9, after line 3—Insert—

(3) An authorised person who—

(a) speaks offensively to another in the course of exercising powers under this Act; or

(b) hinders or obstructs another, or uses or threatens to use, force against another, without reasonable grounds to believe that the authorised person has lawful authority to do so,

is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 6 fine.

This amendment relating to the powers of an inspector has been moved on numerous occasions in respect of other legislation. In the past, the Government has accepted it, as far as I know, in all cases. It puts a little bit of balance back into the legislation. As a recreational boatie, I have never had any conflict with an inspector—in the main, the people who are appointed to these jobs are exceptionally good—but every now and then we come across a person who is over-zealous, a person who wants to throw their weight around, and a little bit of power goes to their head. In the past, the Government has seen this sort of amendment to be reasonable and has accepted it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I oppose this amendment. I do so somewhat reluctantly, because I understand the spirit in which the amendment was moved. That spirit of thinking encompasses all our concerns that the public should be treated civilly on all occasions. This amendment was opposed in the Legislative Council because there are appropriate provisions in the Government Management and Employment Act which cover the behaviour expected of public servants, including when they are acting as authorised officers.

Section 67 of the GME Act relates to standards of behaviour and powers of discipline for those who contravene acceptable standards. I am also Minister responsible for deregulation in the business area. I think there is no point in inserting more regulations that say exactly the same thing. I hope the Liberal Party will join us in that approach and say that there is no point in doubling up. This matter is already covered under the GME Act. Most authorised officers that are covered by the Harbors and Navigation Bill will be either public servants or local government officers. Therefore, the highest standard of customer service is expected of them. If that does not occur, there is legislation that already contains provisions to cover that behaviour.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What the Minister has said is absolute rubbish. The Government employs people who do not necessarily have the best will of the public at heart. I have never heard such a ridiculous statement. Perhaps we should include in the legislation something that identifies to the average person their rights, because they will not read the other legislation as they do not even know it exists. Recreational boating people will look to this Act to determine their rights. The average inspector would know perfectly well that the average person on the street would have no idea of what is contained in the Government Management and Employment Act; they would not even know where to look for it.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is right. It is interesting that, just because the Minister responsible for this legislation in another place has for one reason or another broken with the practice of all other Ministers in this Chamber, this Minister now, rather than speak to the responsible Minister, finds it easier to defeat this amendment. Surely, if we are ever to get anywhere in this place in government or anywhere else, a little bit of consistency might go a long way.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is the whole point—consistency of one Act with another. The GME Act already spells this out. I am sure that all the honourable member's friends spend their time reading his words in *Hansard* as do mine. There are occasions when someone has a beef or a gripe about the way in which they are treated. We all accept that there are people in the private and public sectors who are bloody good and there are people who are offensive. That will always happen—that is real life—and public servants are not in any special category. That is why under their terms of employment under the GME Act there are specific provisions to cover their behaviour and to cover customer service.

The point is: I do not believe that, when someone telephones my or anyone else's electorate office and says, 'I am really brassed off because the public servant in X department has treated me quite rudely over the telephone', they will then rush away to look at the Act. What they are looking for is fairness and natural justice. But there is an Act that covers it. So when the department is telephoned, it can say, 'Okay, we will investigate this,' and apply the standards that should apply for behaviour under the GME Act.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is certainly what we and the public are looking for—fairness. I find it quite remarkable that only last week the Minister of Primary Industries accepted exactly the same clause, but perhaps he has a different attitude towards the public.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is not worth considering. Everyone knows that the Minister of Primary Industries and I both have an interest in client service, particularly in regional areas.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Rateability of land.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 12, after line 11—Insert new clause 20 printed in erased type in the Bill.

This is just a simple form of clarification.

Clause inserted.

Clauses 21 and 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Establishment of navigational aids.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I move:

Page 13, lines 9 and 10—Leave out subclause (1) and insert—

(1) The Minister may establish such navigational aids as the Minister considers necessary or desirable for the safe navigation of vessels within the jurisdiction and must maintain all such navigational aids.

The purpose of this amendment is one that I have highlighted on numerous occasions in this House and particularly in the Estimates Committees where it was brought to my attention. I have also had experience of sailing the coastal waters. I have expected to find a light in the middle of the night, but it has been out. This situation might be fine for professional fishermen and for larger vessels that are using the waters constantly. However, recreational boat people, in particular, who are not out there regularly rely on their charts and, if a chart says there is a light at a particular point, they are sailing through the night and looking for that light and it does not exist, it makes things fairly difficult for them. This is a safety matter, and I believe that it is absolutely essential. I understand the department is meant to maintain these lights, but on numerous occasions these lights have been out for weeks. Of course, in the past it has led to vessels finishing up on sand spits and being stuck there. That probably does not matter a great deal so long as the weather is calm but, if a heavy sea is running and you finish up on a sand bar, it can be quite devastating for the owner of that vessel.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This amendment is opposed. Again, I understand the spirit with which the honourable member is moving this amendment because he, like me, has a strong interest in maritime safety. This amendment was opposed in the Legislative Council, as it would restrict the power of the Government to negotiate with other bodies to maintain some navigational aids. Quite frankly, the way it is being moved—somewhat naively but in a good spirit—would create a litigious nightmare. This is the bush lawyer's clause—or perhaps we should say sea lawyer's clause. There are instances where the Government, through the Department of Marine and Harbors, has determined that it is desirable for navigational aids to be established in such places as Whyalla and Port Stanvac, for example, where relevant bodies such as BHP and petroleum refineries have actually taken over the responsibility and the cost of maintenance.

The Government wishes to preserve the opportunity to be able to reach agreements of this sort with relevant bodies if agreement is possible. Of course, the amendment was also opposed by our mutual friends the Democrats as they had concerns centering around what 'maintain' means and what level of maintenance would be considered adequate. The fact is that, if something goes wrong and the department finds out about it, often as an interim measure it will issue a maritime warning of possibilities of faults until they are repaired, and obviously that is the way it can be done. Quite frankly, under the present system, we would be opening ourselves up to massive litigation as a replacement for commonsense.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I was quite content to sit and watch the Minister take this Bill through in a safe and orderly manner without the need for navigational lights or whatever. I do take issue with this amendment—not that I am supporting the amendment moved by the member for Chaffey. However, the Minister says it is a lawyer's amendment; that may be true, and the Minister is correct when he said that, possibly stemming from this, it could result in massive litigation before the courts. Accepting those points that the Minister made in relation to the amendment, how sure can the Government be that anyone who uses our waterways will be guaranteed safety as they go about their business? Where do we draw the line between safe passage on waters and the possible cost involving the courts?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I guess what we are talking about is maritime world best practice, because the practice we are talking about is really the same as that on the roads. Obviously, it is the intent of councils, of transport development, that all traffic lights should be working properly. If someone knocks over a traffic light, it is repaired as soon as practicable and possible—usually very quickly. The point is that, in the interim, the people who are using the road do not have such blanket powers to break every single road rule because they can see a traffic light that has fallen over. They are required to obey the laws of the road and exercise commonsense.

I think the department has a very good record in terms of repairing broken navigational aids and will continue to do so. It requires the cooperation of recreational as well as professional and trading vessels and their users. If a light went out on the River Murray and the member for Navel's boat *Leadership II* was travelling down the Murray towards Mannum and he spotted a problem, as a concerned citizen he would telephone the department and ask for it to be fixed quickly. Obviously that would be done, but we are saying that it would be stupid to leave them open to litigation because someone had gone down before and broken it deliberately, that the department should be required to pay massive compensation, when commonsense and the usual rules of the seas and rivers should apply.

The CHAIRMAN: During this debate there has been much reference to the Legislative Council. We do not acknowledge that there is such a thing as the Legislative Council. We do not even know where the Legislative Council actually is. I refer to *Practice of the House of Assembly* by Blackmore, where it is states:

> No member shall allude to any debate in the other House of Parliament, or to any measure impending therein.
>
> The object of this Order is to prevent arguments and recriminations between two distinct bodies who are unable to reply to each other. The theory underlying the rule is that the debates of one House are not known to the other. The rule is occasionally evaded by an ambiguity of speech; and the strict observance of the rule has not been enforced where a Minister of the Crown has made a declaration, particularly as affecting the House.

So, I would ask members to be very careful when they are debating questions such as this, remembering that we do not even know where the other House is.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I would like to both apologise and withdraw any mention of the Legislative Council. I must say, Sir, and I am sure you would be aware having been Deputy Speaker for many years, that I have always avoided mentioning the Legislative Council, but I was a bit overwhelmed by the majesty of this legislation and was temporarily overcome.

The CHAIRMAN: Your apology is accepted.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The reason for moving this amendment is that in recent years the department's track record in this area has not been good. I do not know what experience the Minister might have had out

on the waters in the middle of the night, but I can tell him from personal experience that I have had instances where the lights have been out and, when I finally arrived at port, I was told, 'Don't worry, that light has been out for a fortnight.' What sort of parameters is the Minister setting down? I do not mind a light being out. Any light will go out, but if it is left out for a fortnight or three weeks there is a real threat of danger and a lack of safety to which the Government is subjecting the public. Let the Minister say publicly if he feels it is fine as far as the Government is concerned for the river to go two or three weeks without navigational lights or aids?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: To put this into a commonsense perspective, and without reflecting on any debate in another place on this matter, it should be pointed out that, when a person such as the honourable member sees that situation again, rather than going off to the roadside cafe and whingeing about a broken light or a fault of some sort and being told that that has been the case for the past two weeks, I believe it is incumbent on the honourable member to telephone the department and report the problem. Certainly there has to be something about rights, but there are also responsibilities and duties.

I know that the honourable member believes in the nanny state applying to navigational aids, but the point is the department does its best to fix these things, but relies on the public to report various faults. Depending on the availability of personnel and resources, it tries to fix them as quickly as possible.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In response to that, what I intend to do is to bring it to the attention of the responsible Minister in Parliament, with absolutely no success whatsoever.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have never heard the honourable member raise these issues in the Parliament, but perhaps that is a question of clout.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Perhaps the Minister should attend the Estimates Committees and he would hear more of these things raised.

The CHAIRMAN: The debate is deteriorating!

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 24 to 90 passed.

New clause 90A—'No compulsory disclosure of certain information.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I move:

After clause 90, page 45, insert:

90A. The master or owner of a vessel or a shipping agent may not be required to provide information to the Minister, CEO or the department as to the consignee or consignor or importer or exporter of goods to be loaded or unloaded.

Current practice is that shipping companies and container lines must lodge with the Department of Marine and Harbors forms disclosing the ship's manifest. This information is used by the port authority for the purpose of charging. To date the Department of Marine and Harbors has never required or requested a shipping company to disclose the name of the respective consignee or consignor. However, it is proposed that such information will be required from January 1994 when the Outer Harbor container terminal begins participating in a nationwide program to introduce a new system for handling manifests, to be known as Electronic Data Interchange (EDI).

Shipping companies in South Australia are keen to participate in the EDI innovation. But, for good reason, they object to any request that all proposed EDI manifests lodged with the Department of Marine and Harbors in relation to all future shipments in and out of the Port of Adelaide include the name of their clients, South Australian importers and exporters. Such information is deemed to be commercially confidential. As the Department of Marine and Harbors now operates as a commercial business enterprise, it is inappropriate that a shipping company or a container line must provide commercial information to the Department of Marine and Harbors. There are straightforward business reasons why it is not commercially sensible to disclose who you are operating for and the reasons why.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There is a clear reason for opposing that amendment. Quite simply, every other State has agreed to these provisions. They have been agreed nationally. What the honourable member is suggesting would put South Australia at an unfair competitive disadvantage. It was agreed between the National Chamber of Shipping and the National Association of Australian Port and Marine Authorities that the names of importers, exporters, consignors and consignees will be provided as part of manifest data. If South Australia were excluded from the receipt of this information, it would certainly be disadvantaged commercially. It makes absolute sense to have national standards applying here. This issue has not been raised in other States in the same way, where commonsense has prevailed.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is a matter of whether the Minister wants to see South Australia improve its position in shipping or whether as time goes by we will further slip into decline.

New clause negatived.

Clause 91—'Regulations.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

To insert clause 91.

This clause is printed in erased type in the Bill, because it is a monetary clause. It is a point of clarification.

Clause inserted.

Schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise that I do not have copies of my statement available. The Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Bill was an essential piece of legislation, which would have produced benefits for this State. It would have confirmed that South Australia is part of the national and world economies. It would have opened up markets in other States for South Australian manufacturers and producers and would have

ensured that South Australia attracted those businesses and people with the professional expertise necessary for us further to build the economy of this State. In this place and in another place it has been stated that the objective of mutual recognition is desirable. Indeed, I note that on 23 April a member in another place stated that the objective is desirable for a couple of reasons. The first is that the more the impediments to cross State boundary trade and work can be broken down, the better that will be for Australia, but particularly South Australia. There are opportunities in other States and Territories which, if we are not part of this scheme, we may not otherwise be able to take.

In elaborating on these advantages, Opposition members in both places cited the advantages of the approach taken by the Victorian Parliament with mutual recognition—an approach that will see its Parliament able to exercise more control. The Bill as it was amended in another place would not have enabled the achievement of those objectives, which everyone saw as desirable; nor was the amended approach consistent with the form enacted in Victoria, a form which, in compromise, the Government was prepared to accept. The amended form of this Bill would still have required South Australia to recognise goods and occupational standards from other States, but those States would not be required as a matter of law to recognise the goods and occupations from South Australia. My Government is not prepared to support such a one-sided outcome for the citizens of this State.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 April. Page 3144.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill as it comes to this House, albeit with some concerns about matters that cannot be corrected in another place. When it comes to considering the amendments that are to be moved by the Minister, the Opposition is vehemently opposed to the taxing—I use the word deliberately—effect that it will have on victimless crimes, particularly those persons who are apprehended for motor vehicle transgressions. There has been a great deal of discussion in a number of places over an extended period relative to this measure. The Minister in another place accepted and acknowledged that there ought to be some limitation upon an articled clerk being able to make decisions at interlocutory and preliminary court hearings. That matter has been satisfactorily resolved by appropriate discussion, but we have also questioned—and I question again very seriously—why it is that this Government is seeking to use all sorts of ploys to raise large sums of money in the name of some other respected and accepted ploy.

There is no argument from members on either side of the House, I believe, relative to the importance of providing compensation for victims of crime. That has been accepted by the community and it is accepted by members of both the Government and the Opposition. However, the manner in which the Government is using victimless crime activity to bolster income to the Government and not provide a service to the community directly, as was initially intended, is the factor that causes the Opposition concern. If crimes with victims were those from whom compensation levies were being proposed, there would be no argument but, once we get back to this position of taxing people who have transgressed on the road, often with no danger either to the individual or to any other person, I believe the Government has gone overboard, and that is the attitude that we express on this side of the House.

I am not suggesting that people who transgress the law should not pay a penalty, but I do suggest that the penalty should be relative to the transgression and not used as a vehicle for additional taxing measures for the purpose of propping up a fund that the Government and the people of South Australia have indicated they are prepared to meet from normal revenue. This is a false approach to an important matter, and it is on that basis that the Opposition will vote against the provisions that the Minister will seek to move at another phase of this procedure.

There are no other points of particular moment which the Opposition needs to raise, having regard to the very considerable discussion which occurred when the Bill passed in another place. I say to the Government, and I say it quite positively: if you are going to provide a service to the community, be honest about it and do not tax through the back door people who are not directly responsible for the raising of funds.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: (Minister of Primary Industries): I thank the honourable member for his contribution.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Imposition of levy.'

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that this clause is in erased type.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move to insert clause 8 but in an altered form to that which appears in erased type, as follows:

Page 4, after line 28, insert:

8. Section 13 of the principal Act is amended

(a) by striking out from subsection (3)(a)(i) '$5' and substituting '$10';

(b) by striking out from subsection (3)(a)(ii) '$20' and substituting '$40';

(c) by striking out from subsection (3) (b) '$30' and substituting '$60';

(d) by striking out from subsection (4) '$10' twice occurring, and substituting, in each case, '$20'.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: These amendments are not acceptable to the Opposition. It might be claimed that, because there already exists within the legislation the power to raise funds for the purpose of compensation, the Opposition should not be concerned about the increase in that amount. The Opposition on an earlier occasion accepted the inclusion of a fee at a reasonable figure because it was genuinely interested in compensation for criminal action—and that has not changed. What has changed is our preparedness to accept a Government using this as a vehicle for which it was never intended. I oppose the amendments.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It should be borne in mind that if we accepted the position of the Upper House we simply would not be able to fund the shortfall. Whichever way you look at it, I think the shortfall would be something like $600 000; and whichever way you look at it, victims would simply miss out. It is simply a matter of principle. Putting it on expiated offences is a more equitable way of doing it. There is a community responsibility to compensate victims, and that is what the legislation does. The fact of the matter is that the honourable member is doing victims in the eye.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Minister has missed the point that has been made and will be made yet again: the community expects compensation for victims of crime. It has committed itself to that, and that compensation ought come out of general revenue and not by a backdoor method such as raising funds from people who have not committed crime in the sense of causing a problem to a victim. The victim of crime in this case (if one wants to turn it around) is the person which has transgressed a simple law; nobody else has been disadvantaged by virtue of that fact. The criminal compensation is with respect to other issues altogether where there has been loss, injury or damage—an ambit of activities of which every member is fully appreciative. The community accepts payment for compensation under those circumstances, but it ought to be raised as part of the total commitment by the community in its taxing measures and not taken from a group in the community which has transgressed in an area where there is no victim.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member has missed the equitable nature of this change. If victims of crime were paid out of general revenue, the honourable member's objection would have more force. What is being proposed is that, for those who break the law, the consequence flows that they will contribute to the compensation of victims. It is not quite what the honourable member has said at all. It would be the case if it were paid out of general revenue, but it is not—it is only payable by those who break the law. I think that that is a proper consequence. Even if a victim is not harmed, I think it is a more equitable way of dealing with the situation because the only other way of funding the shortfall is to go back to general revenue, which would be—

The Hon. B. C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Yes, that would be the case: if it was funded out of general revenue, the whole community would pay. The honourable member's argument is circular. By defeating these amendments he is bringing about the very situation that he his seeking to avoid because there would be a shortfall that would have to be picked up by the whole community through general revenue. So there is an absurdity in the logic of the honourable member. The equitable way of dealing with this situation is that, as part of a consequence for those who break the law, they contribute to compensating victims. The consequence of defeating the amendments is to bring about the very situation that the honourable member is arguing against.

The Hon. E.C. EASTICK: The Minister talks about logic. If we were to go down the track that the Minister has just presented to the Committee, whenever the Government put on a function for which there was a fee, everybody would have to pay it whether or not they attended. I ask the Minister to not try to shift the blame. It is a matter which the community has accepted as a community cost, but it is very determined that it ought not be a cost against the people who have transgressed and meet that transgression penalty, except for the basic figure which was permitted by the initial legislation. The community says, 'Stop, it goes no further'. It is a cost against the whole community and not a debt to be paid by individuals who have not created a crime in the sense of a victim. These are victimless crimes which ought not to be doubly taxed.

Mr BECKER: I agree with the member for Light. I think he put it extremely well. This is a classic example of where a new tax was brought in. A new method of fundraising for the Government was introduced 10 years ago when on-the-spot fines were brought in. I well remember the member for Albert Park criticising the then Government for using on-the-spot fines as a revenue raising measure to boost the coffers of the Government of the day. The Government then added a victim of crime levy of—I think—$5 to those on-the-spot fines. The member for Light stated that the Opposition originally agreed to the levy as a matter of principle, never thinking that the fee would gradually increase. Now we see that the Government wants to increase the amount substantially.

I do not know how many constituents consult the Minister; certainly members in another place would not be consulted. But, in the metropolitan area and in the country as well, members of Parliament are being continually harassed by aggrieved motorists who are picked up by speed cameras, radar and other means that they use in the country to detect speeding motorists. The first they know about it in many cases is when they receive an envelope with an account in it for the fine plus the victim of crime fee.

That is when the annoyance really hits. I have had people coming into my electorate office shaking, absolutely furious, first to think that they had been detected by a speeding camera—and in quite a few instances we proved that it was not them anyway—and, secondly, to think that they get hit with a victims of crime fee as well. That is what really hurts. The poor police are the meat in the sandwich. They cannot do anything about it. The legislation and the instructions are there, and they process these fines. If it is not paid, you go to court. If the person cannot pay the fine, the police issue the summons and arrest them or whatever. That really is not what people expect the police to do.

But the annoyance is that this is a back door type of taxation; the Government is using it, under a different name, as a taxing method. It is discriminatory because there are no victims at all. Plenty of people can quite safely drive on certain roads under certain conditions well above the speed limit and, for doing that, they are penalised quite severely in the name of victims of crime. I think that is giving that issue a very bad name. That is not what the Parliament wants and the Parliament did not mean that in the first place.

I can fully understand and appreciate what the member for Light has said and I am grateful to him for bringing it to the attention of this House. It is annoying to think

that this legislation has been brought in at the last minute. We do not have the official *Hansard* to refer to as far as the debate is concerned. It was obviously thrown out in another place and we are now being asked to have it reintroduced. That is not on. And so for a small amount of money, something like $600 000, the Minister is creating considerable ill will towards the Government rather than trying to achieve what he was hoping to do—to increase the revenue and to balance the books in the name of the victims of crime.

I do not think we have enough information. We certainly do not have enough economic information available to us. I do not know whether an economic impact statement has been done on this issue, but the Minister just cannot come in here expecting money to grow on trees. That is unfortunately what the Government is expecting to do today and, therefore, I urge the Committee to oppose this amendment.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: As a matter of logic, I am stunned by the arguments of the members for Hanson and Light. We are moving to insert clause 8 in the form shown for the very simple reason that to compensate victims there is presently a shortfall of $2.2 million. The Opposition stance would raise $600 000, leaving a shortfall of $1.6 million. Where does that shortfall come from if the Opposition's move is successful? It has to come from the general law abiding member of the community through general revenue, and that is what the Opposition is saying it is seeking to oppose. So by opposing, it is bringing about the very situation it says it is seeking to oppose.

A more equitable way of dealing with victims of crime is to say that, regarding those people who break the law for whatever cause, whether or not there is a victim, as opposed to the law abiding persons, as a consequence of their breach of the law, a certain surcharge goes to compensate victims. That is a better situation than the situation that members are proposing. It is a more equitable situation. But the logical consequence of the stance adopted by the member for Hanson and the member for Light is the very situation they say they are seeking to avoid—the imposition of the penalty on the law abiding member of the community. It is as straightforward as that. What alternative plan is being put up by the Opposition to make up the shortfall? None. Just leave a shortfall and impose—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The Government gets its revenue from taxpayers, so it has to be imposed generally on law abiding members of the community. It is as simple as A, B, C. So there is no logic; it is a nonsensical position that is being put by the member for Light and the member for Hanson. It is plain because, at the end of the day, the law abiding member of society is going to pay.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Minister stirred me into entering this debate, because I find that we as a society have moved down the path of trying to take from Government the responsibility for raising money to pay for things we believe in. The Government must make the decision and use money from general revenue if need be. General revenue is there for a purpose—to run the State. If part of running the State is to compensate victims of crime, and although we passed laws relating to victims of crime and to apply these penalties, so be it. The so-called law breakers, those who commit traffic offences in particular, get a penalty for breaking the law.

Where is the logic, I might ask, of this Parliament imposing this other penalty to help the victim of crime where that law has not been breached—nobody has been harmed? They have not harmed anybody so that there is a victim of crime. Why do they pay the penalty? Under the existing system, the Government says to the police, 'Get out and collect as much as you can. Put the cameras out day and night, and don't tell the offenders they have offended. Don't stop them and tell them they have just broken the law, because we want to catch them again in the next fortnight or three weeks to get a few more bob from them.' And in every other case in society, the law enforcers seek to prevent people from breaking the law; not only that, if they see them break the law, they apprehend them immediately and say, 'We believe you have broken the law.' In the case of radar, an expiation notice is issued but, in the case of the camera, that is not the case.

The Government of the day sits in power thinking, 'We will get another go at this guy or this woman, the one who drives a bit hard, and we will book them again within the next fortnight so we get a double dip.' Yet on every other occasion, the Government emphasises that, if someone breaks the law, the law enforcers stop them and say, 'You have broken the law. Here is an expiation notice', or 'We are going to report you.' And if we are going to talk about principles as the Minister is trying to do, we must think about that. Regarding those who are a cost to society, what about those who are prosecuted, go before the court and found not guilty? Who pays that bill? It is the individual.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes they do; they are found not guilty, and the prosecution, the Government agency, imposes that penalty on that person.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: That is only on information.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I do not care whether it is on information or whatever. I am saying that in some cases it is thousands of dollars, and the honourable member, who is a lawyer, thinks it is great. There has been an attempt in this place to correct that, but it was not accepted—and he was one of those who would not accept it.

When we talk about increasing the penalty or the compensation, the principle is wrong. I believe the day should come when we as a Parliament say that this action of having victims of crime penalties applied to other offences where there are no victims involved should stop. It would be better for the Government to increase the expiation fee from $120 to $130; at least the person paying that penalty would better understand what is going on. If somebody is booked on the freeway doing 140 kilometres an hour, they get the penalty of $150 plus something else for the victim of crime, but there is no victim in that crime. The principle is wrong and, in every other case in society where the law is enforced, the general public pays. However, if a person is found guilty of doing damage to property, that person is asked to pay the cost of that damage if they have the money—and if not they go to gaol.

In every other case where the law is enforced, the general public pays. If victims or damage are involved, and if it cannot be proven who was guilty, the community still pays for it. Let us be clear about that. A principle is involved that is upsetting the community. I make the point that, even when the police know that a person has broken the law and they do not inform them until three or four weeks later, that is improper.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will be brief, because we have to finish the Bill. First, the Government has mucked it up yet again. We were given assurances when the Bill went through that there would be adequate budgeting, and the Government failed.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is a fact. Secondly, as the member for Davenport has eloquently told the Committee, it is all right for the Government to try to catch some poor mug on a side street and raise $29 million in revenue in the process, yet it cannot allocate $1 from that cake towards victims.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister asks what the solution is—the solution is that the Government has mucked it up. The Government is on a revenue-raising exercise with its speed cameras—

The Hon. T.R. Groom: What's your solution?

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is easy. The Minister is out there raising revenue—increasing revenue every year. The sum of $29 million has been collected and taking $1.6 million out of that will not make much difference.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I wish to make two other points. Latest crime statistic reports show clearly that up to 70 per cent of people when a second offence is committed against them do not, report the incident to police because they have lost faith in the police, who do not go out and investigate crimes against people's property. That aspect is ignored and people lose faith. The Government will not try to change that because, if it did, it would have to take police away from picking up motorists for speeding and other offences. In other words, chasing the real criminals is forgotten but picking up easy targets with a camera that works all hours of the day and night is easy, and it brings in money, whereas other activity expends money. That is why the Government avoids this issue.

Mr BECKER: The member for Davenport is quite right. The Minister asks from where the money would come. I remember that as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee the Minister did not accept a chauffeur-driven car. I appreciated that and it saved taxpayers about $30 000 or $40 000 a year. We could either get rid of the ministerial fleet or do what Jeff Kennett did and cut down on ministerial staff or some of the allowances that we pay to members in another place, who get $20 000 a year and they do not even go past Gepps Cross.

It is a matter of priority of spending. There is no argument about where the money will come from. We have to be honest, as the member for Davenport says. We can increase the fine for speeding, but to tax people an extra sum for victims of crime is really wrong in theory, because it is a victimless crime. There is a vast difference between the two. The Minister should reconsider this matter and perhaps refer it to the Legislative Review Committee.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (19)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, M.R. De Laine, T.R. Groom (teller), K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann and J.P. Trainer.

Noes (18)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning and D.C. Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blevins, M.J. Evans and Gregory. Noes—Messrs Blacker, Gunn and Meier.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendments thus carried; clause as amended inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 4 May at 2 p.m.