HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 June 1980

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject the Prostitution Bill was presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 428 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by the Hon. P. B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 357 residents of South Australia praying that the House pass the Prostitution Bill without delay was presented by Mr. Millhouse.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRICITY CONCESSIONS

Petitions signed by 11 300 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant concessions on electricity charges to persons receiving social welfare pensions were presented by the Hons. D. J. Hopgood and R. G. Payne.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Honourable members will recall that I made a statement yesterday regarding speculation in shares of the South Australian Gas Company, I understand that there has been further speculative trading today, apparently as a result of statements on radio in Sydney. For the benefit of people who might be misled by such statements, I wish to re-emphasise that, in the view of the Government, and the South Australian Gas Company, there is no basis for such speculative trading.

My statement yesterday dealt with the matter fully, and I suggest that anyone tempted to take a speculative punt on shares in the South Australian Gas Company consider it very carefully. The Adelaide Stock Exchange has indicated that it regards the market as "adequately informed". In these circumstances the Government considers that buyers enter the market at their own risk.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PARA HILLS PADDOCKS

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Recent statements in the northern suburbs local press and a question in Parliament have indicated that there has been considerable disquiet in the local community over the area bounded by Main North Road, Kesters Road, Bridge Road and Maxwell Road. This is an area known locally as the Para Hills Paddocks.

The issue dates back to 1972, when there were various communications between the Para Hills Progress Association, the local member, Mr. R. J. Giles (Chairman of Save the Paddocks Committee), the Salisbury council, the then Premier, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and the South Australian Housing Trust. Local residents had met on a number of occasions and had expressed their opinion publicly on the issue in question. There was great concern that the allocation of open space within the Para Hills subdivision was below the standard generally accepted for the metropolitan area. This concern was eventually expressed by strong opposition to the South Australian Housing Trust plans to subdivide all of the land known as The Paddocks for residential purposes.

The local residents were thus intent on preserving a reasonable proportion of land for recreation. This proportion varied between 15 per cent of the 156·5 acres owned by the Housing Trust and the full 320 acres.

Discussions involving the General Manager, South Australian Housing Trust, and the then Premier between July and September 1972 led to a Cabinet decision that the land be developed and that a significant proportion be devoted to open space. The then Premier announced this decision in the *Advertiser* of 19 September 1972 when he stated at a public meeting in Para Hills that a Governor's Warrant had been issued for $500 000 to buy 280 acres of land, half of which would be open space.

The original suggestion was that the State Planning Authority should acquire the open space area. However, complications became apparent which were never resolved by the Government of the day, and the land was eventually acquired by the South Australian Housing Trust. This was done with the proviso that the recreation area would be held by the trust until such time as title could be passed to the State Planning Authority. The original concept was that the land should be acquired by the State Planning Authority out of Loan funds with changes in Metropolitan Development Plan regulations to allow this to occur.

However, since 1972 the original intentions of the Government were lost in what has become an extremely confused situation. The upshot of the problem is that the Housing Trust has held this land since that time and now quite rightly wishes to see the matter settled. In addition, the Salisbury council is concerned that it does not become involved in acquiring the land as it was its original understanding that this would be covered by the State Government. Thus, although there has been considerable deliberation, including a major report from the Para Hills Paddocks Committee on future land use in the area, the whole question of ownership and development of the open space remains vague and confused. The Housing Trust has carried out its part of the agreement, and since 1974 has developed the bulk of the residential land, while providing an open space area according to the recommendations of the Para Hills Paddocks Committee Report.

Following eight years of confusion, the Government has taken steps now to settle the matter in accordance with the

understanding of all parties. It is the Government's intention that the following steps be undertaken to carry this out.

The State Planning Authority is to prepare a Supplementary Development Plan to designate the 35·27 hectares of land that has been developed for recreation use as a proposed open space reservation and, following this procedure, the State Planning Authority will purchase the area designated as open space reservation from the South Australian Housing Trust for the sum of $225 000.

It is the intention of this Government that agreements previously made with the Salisbury council and local residents are honoured and, therefore, the land will be transferred free of charge from the State Planning Authority to the Salisbury council on condition that the council agrees to maintain and further develop the open space for the citizens of the area. It is considered that this procedure will bring to an end what has been eight years of confusion and indecision.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SERVICE POSITIONS

Mr. BANNON: I direct my question to the Premier. Was Mr. Ross Story, personal aide to the Premier, a member of the selection panel for the Public Service position of Commissioner for Equal Opportunity? Was another of the Premier's political aides, Mr. Graham Loughlin, a member of the selection panel for the Public Service position of head of the Premier's Department research branch? If so, what Public Service positions in future will be subject to political scrutiny, rather than being decided by normal Public Service procedures?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer to both those questions is "Yes". It follows a practice that was established by the previous Government on occasion. I am not able to say in what circumstances it will apply in the future.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Can he inform the House how much will be spent on the Stuart Highway for the financial year 1980-81, and can he say what sections of that road will be upgraded? The House would be aware that recently the Commonwealth Government has made announcements in relation to the amount of money that will be made available to the States for highway construction. In view of the importance of future trade opportunities between South Australia and the Northern Territory, and the great concern that has been expressed by large sections of the community at the slow rate of progress on this road, can he give the information I am seeking? In some financial years there was no allocation whatsoever.

I would be grateful if the Minister could inform the House so that the people of this State, and particularly the people in my electorate, can be fully aware of what programmes the Highways Department has in mind.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The House would be aware that the former Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Peter Nixon, and I reached an agreement late last year that the Stuart Highway would be sealed in seven years. Of course, at that time it was hoped that we might even be able to do it in less than that time, and I still believe there is some hope that that will happen. The Premier and I have made continued representations to the Federal Government, the Prime Minister, the former Minister for Transport and the present Minister for Transport (Mr. Hunt), which approaches have included discussions at officer level, in an attempt to bring forward the sealing of the Stuart Highway from the original proposal of 10 years to seven years at the maximum. For that to be done without expending a very high proportion of State funds, we would need a considerably increased Federal grant.

Members would be aware that road funds for South Australia were announced last month by the Federal Government, but I should point out to the House that there was something unusual about this announcement compared to the announcement made the year before, namely, that the road funds announced were for one year only, that is, for 1980-81, whereas normally the funds are for a triennium. The reason for the announcement of funds for one year only is that, at the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, Ministers agreed with the Commonwealth that future negotiations had to take place with the Commonwealth regarding future funding arrangements.

The road funds granted by the Commonwealth showed an 11·1 per cent increase overall and, really, that is an increase to cover or slightly more than cover, inflation. The important increase, as far as the question of the honourable member for Eyre is concerned, is the allocation for national highways, from which the funding for any construction of the Stuart Highway would be taken. The increase on the item of national highways was in the order of a 20 per cent increase over last year. In fact, to be more honest, it was about 19·3 per cent. Of course, that increase means a considerable increase in real terms over inflation.

Honourable members would be aware, of course, of the considerable interest that has been shown by the member for Eyre concerning this matter, which he has pursued in this place for many years, but I must tell him that it is because of the late announcement by the Commonwealth of its road funding proposals that it is not yet possible to approve the Highways Department works programme for the 1980-81 period. However, I can give the member for Eyre some figures.

If we are to maintain a seven-year programme for the sealing of the Stuart Highway without disadvantaging work on other national highways in South Australia (and I remind the honourable member for Stuart about this), we need to step up considerably the expenditure on the Stuart Highway as compared to that in previous years. In 1979-80, $3 800 000 was expended on the Stuart Highway. During 1979-80, $4 200 000 was expended.

To maintain this seven-year programme and not disadvantage the other important works that are presently being planned by the Highways Department (and, indeed, works that are already under construction—I mention the Two Wells-Virginia by-pass and the added work in the Dukes Highway which requires a very large expenditure of the order of $7 000 000 to $8 000 000 on its own, plus normal road works), although I remind the member for Eyre that there has yet been no approval, I can fairly safely give the House an undertaking that we will be spending in 1980-81 at least double the amount that was expended in 1979-80.

The member for Eyre has asked what roadworks would take place on the Stuart Highway if this expenditure were approved by the Government. Current work is expected to extend the seal from Bookaloo to 35 km north by October 1980, and a further 15 km to link up with an existing sealed section near the Mount Gunson turn-off by February 1981,

thus providing a sealed road over the total length from Port Augusta to Pimba. Further earthwork and drainage is under way on various sections through to Baker Well. Survey and design work in various stages extends to Mirikata, and other preconstruction work extends to Coober Pedy. Subject to the approval I have mentioned of at least double the expenditure of last year, it is proposed to let a contract for construction of 52 km of earthworks between Glendambo and Gosses, commencing around October 1980.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier explain to the House why, in his submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission yesterday, he said that South Australia did not seek to deny or disguise the generous nature of the rail transfer, whereas in the House on 27 July 1976, in the Address in Reply debate, he described the railways transfer as a disastrous policy and accused Premier Dunstan of selling the furniture from the front room? The Premier cannot have it both ways.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments are out of order. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I can, and the Deputy Leader should know that. I am perfectly prepared to criticise most trenchantly the handing over of assets of the State to the Commonwealth, as was done by a previous Government in 1976, and, because of that, we now find ourselves in receipt of financial benefits which, I must agree, are generous to say the least. Because of that, we find ourselves in an extremely delicate and difficult position as regards the relativities study presently being made. I am having it both ways. I am complaining vigorously about having handed over our railway system to the Commonwealth but, having done that, I now find that the sum to come to the State from the Commonwealth by virtue of the relativities study presently going on could be severely influenced by that agreement.

It may well be that we will receive far less in terms, as the Deputy Leader will have known if he has read the entire submission I made, because only a small percentage change will mean millions of dollars to South Australia. It is a hurdle we have to surmount, and it is only reasonable that we should be honest and open with the Grants Commission (which I was yesterday) and say that we have received that money, that it was indeed generous and I sincerely hope that it will not in any way prejudice our chances of receiving a fair share once the relativities study has been completed.

PETROL PRICES

Mr. BLACKER: First, will the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, inform the House what action is being taken by the South Australian Government to minimise the fuel price differences between metropolitan and country outlets? Secondly, does the Government support the subsiding of metropolitan discounting by country fuel users? The Federal Government has implemented a fuel freight equalisation scheme which ensures that no outlet any where in Australia has a fuel freight disadvantage of more than 2c per litre. This means that, if fuel for country usage and metropolitan usage is purchased at the same cost, the cost to the user should be no more than 2c a litre different at any location in Australia. As many country outlets are retailing at prices considerably greater than 2c a litre more (in some cases a difference of more than 10c a litre, or more than 45c a gallon), country users believe that they are directly subsidising metropolitan discounting.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can assure the honourable member that the Government shares his concern about the situation he has described. I will ask my colleague to provide a report for him on this matter.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether he or the newly-appointed Director of Fisheries have at any time held discussions with the South Australian branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council, or representatives of the scale fishing industry, about the proposed amendment to the Fisheries Act currently before the House? The Minister has continually assured the industry that, before any changes are made to that industry by legislation or regulation, it would be consulted. The same assurance was given by the new Director, Mr. Richard Stevens, in *Australian Fisheries* of May 1980. Mr. Stevens was quoted as saying that his primary task would be to ensure the development of the fishing industry in South Australia, in line with Government policy. He was quoted as saying:

> A necessary part of that task will be the fostering of communication between the Government and the commercial and recreational fishermen.

The amendments to the Act are sweeping and fundamental. Evidence that I have suggests that no consultations were entered into, as guaranteed by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: I am placed in something of a predicament by a rather unusual request. I call upon the Chief Secretary to answer the question. If there is any doubt in any person's mind it shall be taken from the floor of the House by way of message to the honourable Chief Secretary.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Bill is on the Notice Paper, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What he is asking you is if there was any consultation.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Am I in order in answering this question, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: It is my belief the question is in order: it is not asking a question specifically relative to the contents of the Bill but one relative to matters leading up to the presentation of the Bill.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have had countless discussions with SAFIC about this matter, as the member for Stuart well knows. At this point, the President and the Executive Officer of SAFIC are enjoying a well-earned rest from the representations they have been making to me and the department about this vexed question, which has been before the Cabinet since last December. I have had plenty of discussions with them about this. The new Director, Mr. Richard Stevens, has not been able to discuss this matter with them because he started in his position only this week. The industry wants this Bill, and now it has it. The member for Stuart can have his say later on this afternoon.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Attorney-General to review the legislation regarding the Classification of Publications Act to ensure that adult book shops are effectively prohibited from posting at

request publications to minors, and in due course will he report to the House what action the Government intends to take to close any loopholes that have been discovered in the current legislation and say whether penalties will be increased in an effort to restrict the distribution of pornography through the post?

Earlier this year it was brought to my attention that a minor received through the post a book described by senior police officers as extremely offensive and one of the worst types of pornography that he had seen. Upon investigation, it was revealed that the book had been posted from the interstate head office of the North Adelaide Whisper shop. Concern has been expressed by parents that so-called sex book shops may be able to bypass the law by using their interstate offices, or at least impede investigation and subsequent prosecution. Thereby any person may, as a joke or for some other depraved reason, order a publication and have it sent, as in this instance, to a young girl in her early teens.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government is concerned about the operation of the Classification of Publications Act and I know that the Attorney-General is considering this matter at present. I will be happy to obtain a report from him, and present it in due course.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr. PETERSON: Does the Minister of Marine accept responsibility for the accuracy of statements in publications produced by his department, and is it his policy that such publications should be used to ridicule and belittle the genuine concern of South Australian citizens? In the latest edition of the South Australian *Ports and Shipping Journal*, which is published by the Department of Marine and Harbors, under the authority of the Minister of Marine, an article appeared that was written under the byline of Cerberus and headed "Live sheep exports—pulling the wool over somebody's eyes", in which blatant untruths are reported as facts. It was stated that proposals were submitted for wharf clean top loading assembly points to be prepared; this is not true. The submission to the Port Adelaide council contained no reference to sealing what, at that stage, were referred to as sheep-holding pens. Likewise, references in the article to rail diversion were not even discussed until after the residents in the area had reacted.

The supercilious references to residents' reactions are an insult, and I quote an example: "Enter the odd village flap merchant, loud of opinion, short on facts, strong on panic," and further "Let commonsense prevail over windbaggery and nonsense." Does that mean that people living in this State have no right to express concern about a matter that deeply concerns them without being labelled "flap merchants" and "windbags" in publications funded by them? The residents of the area affected by this proposal have invested a lot of money to establish their houses and they have a democratic right to express their unrest about any plan that may seriously affect their lifestyle. To be treated this way by Cerberus, whoever he may be, is the ultimate insult. On behalf of the residents of my district, I demand an apology and a retraction of the statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chief Secretary has been called upon to answer the question from the member for Semaphore and not the demand for the apology at the end thereof.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: We will give the member for Semaphore his just dues. The publication to which he refers is registered with Australia Post as a periodical and in its own right has its own editor. I have not seen the article referred to by the honourable member, and I cannot take responsibility for it. I have had a long and courteous discussion with the honourable member about this matter and none of the phrases he has mentioned today were used in that discussion. That has been the tenor of my approach to the people at North Haven and will continue to be the tenor of my approach. I will get a copy of this publication to which the honourable member refers.

Mr. Peterson: You can have mine.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is a fragmented copy. I will get a copy of the publication about which the honourable member speaks and bring down a report.

BUILDING APPROVALS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether the trends in relation to South Australian housing approvals as detailed by the Leader of the Opposition last evening are accurate? The Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying during the Supplementary Estimates debate last evening:

> Private housing approvals, a forward activity indicator, are down by about one-quarter of the levels applying at the middle of last year. There was some slight increase in March but the average over a three-month period indicates that building approvals are far from healthy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for the opportunity which he has given me to correct the misleading and rather mischievous assertion made by the Leader during last evening's debate. The Leader of the Opposition adopted a rather cheap device, I guess in seeking to promote his campaign to denigrate South Australia's confidence and progress. The device that the Leader used was quite simply that he compared the building approval figures for the first three months of this year with the same figures for the months of June, July and August of last year. He contrasted a period of low seasonal activity with a period of high activity, and in fact with the three months of highest activity for 1979, and obviously if he does that, he will get the answer he is looking for. It is a cheap trick and it is not really worthy of him. All he has to do is to ask his colleague, the member for Ascot Park, who as recently as yesterday told the House that the only valid statistical comparison was one which examined year on year, and so eliminates differences due to seasonal patterns, and the honourable member was very vocal about that yesterday. So let me follow the advice of the member for Ascot Park, and apply an annual measure to South Australian building approvals for the March quarter this year.

The facts are that in the March quarter, private housing approvals showed an annual increase of 58 in number and $4 850 000 in value. Approval given for the construction of Government dwellings showed an annual increase of 241 per cent in number and 179 per cent in value. The combined approvals for both private and public sector housing rose by 21 per cent in dwelling figures and by 26 per cent in dollar values. Similarly, the value of approvals for alterations and additions to dwellings increased annually by 24 per cent and the value of approvals for all types of non-dwelling construction rose by $8 000 000 or 16·7 per cent. Altogether, the total value of all building approvals (including housing, non-housing construction and alterations) in the March quarter this year was 21·6 per cent higher than in the corresponding quarter last year.

Mr. Bannon: I said quite clearly there had been an improvement in March. I made it quite clear.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, but that is not the way the Leader interpreted it.

Mr. Bannon: I said it was encouraging.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is not the way in which the Leader of the Opposition interpreted his figures for the benefit of the House. They were deliberately designed to mislead. I repeat that the figure was 21·6 per cent higher than in the corresponding quarter of last year. In real terms, which I notice is a term recently adopted by the Opposition, the annual growth rate in all building approvals for the March quarter was a solid 11 per cent. If we want to do some comparisons, there was no annual growth whatever for the previous year, as recorded in the March quarter 1979, and in real terms the value of building improvements during that year of Labor's administration declined by a massive 12·6 per cent.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Premier explain to the House how he was able to conclude yesterday that the South Australian "share of the total nation's unemployment as at April 1979 was 10·1 per cent (on A.B.S. figures) and in April 1980 it was 8·8 per cent", and that "our share of the nation's total unemployment has fallen during that period", when South Australia's unemployment, according to the A.B.S., has risen from 41 400 in April 1979 to 45 900 in April 1980, while national unemployment fell from 416 800 to 404 700 over the same period?

Will the Premier now set the record straight by acknowledging that he may have misled the House yesterday and that the Tonkin Government is in fact presiding over a rising South Australian unemployment trend?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday. Commonwealth Employment Service figures, which I have already quoted, show that, from October, 11·1 per cent has gone down to March, 10·4 per cent. The figures are quite clear from the A.B.S.—from April 1979, 10·1 per cent, to 8·8 per cent in 1980. The honourable member should do some calculations.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES VOLUNTEERS

Mr. OSWALD: I direct my question to the Chief Secretary, whose policy document of August 1979 promised widespread use of volunteers in the area of correctional services. Can the Chief Secretary say whether any progress has been made in this direction?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The policy put to the people of this State by the Premier last August did refer to the use of volunteers and to a study in depth in the correctional services area. On coming to office, we found that there were in this State 2 284 persons on probation or parole in 1976. In the three-year period ending February 1979 there were 3 177, an increase of some 39 per cent. Prison populations have continued to increase. In February 1977 the daily average was 670, and in February 1978 there was a 729 daily average, in 1979 it was 785 and in 1980 it was 832.

Probation and parole officers currently carry a load of 60 people per officer. In some cases in the country officers are handling up to 90 cases. The Mitchell Committee recommended an average of 45. Cabinet recently approved a sum of $28 400 for the 1980-81 year to expand the volunteer programme within the Department of Correctional Services. This is to be an ongoing programme, and an undertaking has been given to maintain its development over the next three years. It is anticipated that volunteers will be engaged in field work, community work orders, and prison visitation, as well as the court information centre and the drop-in centre. These practices in South Australia will be in line with initiatives discussed at the recent conference of Ministers in charge of prisons, probation and parole in regard to community based support programmes for persons returning to the community from imprisonment. It is hoped that the use of volunteers will assist with those heavy work loads which are now being borne by the professional probation and parole officers.

COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS

Mr. O'NEILL: Does the Minister of Mines believe that the concern he expressed in his answer to the member for Newland yesterday concerning the hazards of coal-fired power stations are serious enough to warrant the Government's placing strict controls on the operations of the new Northern Power Station? Does his concern mean that the Government is considering the replacement of coal as a fuel for future power stations? Does the Minister's answer yesterday mean that the Government will not now develop the coal deposits that have been discovered in this State?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I answered that question yesterday and indicated to the House that there were potential hazards in relation to any energy conversion. The Opposition has mounted a strong attack (it is certainly not an effective attack, but one that they would perceive as a strong attack) on the Government's decision to supply uranium in due course to approved customer countries, and it has used the weapon of fear in an attempt to intimidate the public of South Australia. Most of the material the Opposition has brought forward has either been based on false premise or it has been deliberately misleading material. I will not give a recital of events since the election where false material has been put to the House by the Opposition in relation to this whole question.

Yesterday I was simply pointing out to members opposite that pollution results from all energy conversion and that there are dangers in all energy conversion. I was not suggesting that the levels of the pollutants emitted from coal-fired stations were above acceptable health levels, but I was pointing out that the level of emission from a nuclear-fired station was far below that from a traditional coal-fired station. That is, and has been for many years, readily accepted by the general public.

Mr. Bannon: You spoke of tens of thousands of premature deaths.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I could point to evidence equally acceptable (and I can give plenty of literature to members opposite) which would indicate that there have been premature deaths proven, as a result of coal mining, from lung disease and so on. Hazards are involved in many industrial areas in this modern age, and it is our attempt to minimise them. Every time one walks across the road and gets in a motor car one is at risk, but we do not ban motor-cars.

I think the Hon. J. D. Anthony in Canberra said that, if we did not generate electricity and provide power in this modern society, the option would be to go back to live in the trees. That would be the logical consequence of some of the policies of our opponents. What I am saying is that risks are associated with modern life, some of which seem to be readily acceptable by the public and others of which

seem to be exaggerated out of all proportion. The point I was making was that the history of the nuclear industry, in relation to the generation of electricity, is the safest yet known to man.

PIGGERIES

Mr. LEWIS: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what provisions exist for the Department of Water Resources, or any other governmental agency, to ensure that adequate safeguards are taken to protect the environmental circumstances in which huge intensive piggeries are planned to be established in South Australia?

The environmental safeguards to which I refer are those particularly relating to effluent disposal and its impact on underground water supplies, surface run-off, smell, and other hazards such as diseases that may adversely affect people, livestock, or native fauna in that neighbourhood. Since late last year one such piggery has been established near Desert Camp, in the South-East, between Keith and Kingston and, despite attempts by local residents, I am told, who were seeking to ascertain the exact extent of the ultimate development and number of sows to be housed in that piggery, accurate information has not been forthcoming. The Department of Agriculture has been given misleading information as to when pigs were first moved into the area, I understand.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept that any honourable member on either side should comment. The explanation of questions is permitted to introduce factual information, but not comment such as the honourable member has introduced.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you for that advice, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, their concern is to know whether or not such huge piggeries as will produce effluent equivalent to that coming from towns the size of Whyalla, for instance, will be permitted to be developed without some form of control in relation to the matters to which I have referred.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: As the honourable member has expressed his concern about this matter to me recently, I have prepared a detailed statement for him relating to this matter. During my visit to the South-East last week, concern was expressed regarding the disposal of effluent from the piggery at Padthaway, south of Keith. The establishment of this piggery and associated waste disposal have been the subject of investigations by the Engineering and Water Supply Department over the past 12 months. Prior to the purchase of the property, approval in principle for the proposed piggery was sought from that department, having regard to the possibility of groundwater pollution arising from the disposal of wastes. Following investigations by that department, a method of waste disposal, involving controlled irrigation, was developed.

The constituent of this waste most likely to impair the quality of the groundwater is nitrogen. However, nitrogen is readily absorbed by plants and, provided that the total quantity dispersed over pasture is within agronomic limits, the effect on groundwater is likely to be minimal. In this regard, the Department of Agriculture has advised that, when the piggery is in full production, the nitrogen loading will be only approximately 25 per cent of the maximum recommended rate. The method of disposal and the rate of application of the wastes will be specified as conditions of a water quality order which will be issued under section 62 of the Water Resources Act. It is considered that, provided the wastes are distributed as required by the order, groundwater quality downstream of the site will not be impaired.

The company will also be required to construct three observation wells to monitor the quality of the groundwater. Bore water outside of the property will also be monitored regularly. The Government is very conscious of the need to protect the quality of groundwater resources throughout the State, and the member for Mallee may be assured that all necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the use of water in the vicinity of this piggery is not affected.

The matter of odour would come under the Minister of Local Government, and the matter of disease would come under the auspices of the Minister of Health.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Premier say what administrative or legislative action the Government has taken, or is considering taking, to help local service station proprietors who are being put out of business by selective discounting of petrol by the major oil companies? The operations of major oil companies that were disadvantaging service stations in South Australia late last year brought about the joint statement from the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Consumer Affairs who warned the companies to solve the problem. The Ministers stated on 16 January, more than five months ago, that if the companies did not stop unfairly squeezing service stations the Government would have to consider administrative or legislative action. As nothing has changed since 16 January, can we hear about the threatened Government action?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter is still the subject of intensive discussion with the oil companies and the retailers. A number of developments have occurred; they range from the wide implications of marketing policies generally to the rather specific question which has arisen recently in relation to Amoco service stations. These developments are a matter of grave concern to the Government; they are being kept closely under observation by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Acting Minister of Industrial Affairs. I am not able, at this stage, to make any further comment about this matter until negotiations and discussions have been completed.

RURAL ECONOMY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what is the future outlook of the rural economy in this State? When replying to the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday in this Chamber, the Premier briefly referred to the rural economy. Will the Minister now expand on the Premier's statement and inform the House of the future outlook of and the impact that the rural sector has on this State's economy?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I recall the reply given by the Premier to the Leader on Tuesday of this week, when the Premier briefly touched on the state of our rural economy, among other references to the healthy state of our economy in South Australia. I am delighted that the member for Hanson has asked this question, as it is with pride that I am able to expand somewhat on the Premier's brief reference this week. For example, the state of the rural economy generally in Australia can be described as most buoyant. That picture is reflected from border to border throughout South Australia.

The gross value of agricultural products throughout

1979-80 is expected to be higher than the record value of our produce of last year. Indeed, from calculations recently made on this subject it has been found that the average income per farm is estimated at a record $29 520. Prices received for rural commodities are expected to average 18 per cent higher than in the previous year. World wheat prices have remained high, and coarse grain prices are expected to be even higher than they were last year.

Wine grape prices are, on average, higher than last year, and in South Australia there is no significant surplus of grapes compared with the surplus of 40 000 tonnes of last year. Domestic prices for citrus and apples are expected to be higher, as are export prices for dried fruit. The average auction price for wool is expected to be 17 per cent higher than the price last year. Average saleyard prices for cattle for the year are expected to be 35 per cent higher than those ruling in 1978-79. In the dairy industry, average returns for whole milk are estimated to be up some 16 per cent.

Field crop production in the 1979-80 season was a record in terms of produce harvested; 2 350 000 tonnes of wheat were harvested, compared with the previous record of 2 263 000 tonnes in the 1968-69 season. The other major crop, barley, returned a harvest of 1 605 000 tonnes, compared with the previous record of 1 420 000 tonnes. The value of these crops to this State will be about $483 000 000, when all sales are made. Minor crop sowings also increased in 1979-80, and added about $40 000 000 to the State economy.

After reference to those specific details, one can safely and proudly report that the state of the rural economy in South Australia is buoyant, notwithstanding several shocks that have been experienced by, in some cases, large areas of the State's rural sector. First, on 14 November, vicious hailstorms resulted in State Loan funds being extended to the affected primary producers at a cost of $2 030 000. The Department for Community Welfare played its part in assisting those producers who were affected. A mice plague is currently being experienced over thousands of square miles of South Australia; primary producers have generally faced up to this problem and attacked it responsibly. I commend, with pride, the responsible actions of those involved.

I could continue forever because South Australia is in such a delightful situation in regard to its rural industry, notwithstanding fires, hailstorms, and the plague of mice. In addition, there has been the biggest locust invasion that South Australia has ever experienced and the rural sector, with the co-operation of the State Government, has nipped the problem of the locust plague in the bud; it was cleaned up in a flash, with little expense to the State.

Mr. Abbott: What happened about the millipedes?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Even the millipedes; I could go on forever. I am excited to report the buoyant situation that applies in South Australia. Our primary producers are to be commended for their attitude and their application in capitalising not only on benefits of the third really good season in a row but also on the current co-operation and understanding that exists between the Government and the rural sector generally.

ATOMIC TESTS

Mr. ABBOTT: Following the decision by the Federal Government not to conduct an inquiry into the current health of Australian personnel who were involved in atomic tests in South Australia in the 1950's, can the Minister of Health say whether the South Australian Government intends to conduct its own inquiry into the health of South Australians who worked at Maralinga and at Emu Field during the testing and of Aborigines who have been contaminated? The *Advertiser* extra team found that up to 53 Maralinga workers died or were ill, many of them suffering from cancer. It was reported that up to 30 Aborigines might have died after being enveloped in a rolling black mist from the Emu Field atomic tests. A complete epidemiological study of all those South Australians effected and an examination of safety precautions prevailing at the time would help establish whether workers and Aborigines died as a result of radiation contamination and would assist South Australians effected in compensation claims on the Federal Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is no intention at this stage to conduct an inquiry into the health of those Europeans employed at Maralinga, although I have had communication with the Federal Minister of Health on this matter. I understand that it is the subject of an inter-departmental committee investigation at the moment; those Federal departments which would have jurisdiction in that area include the Department of Defence and the Department of Health.

As for the Aboriginal health, immediately following the report in the *Advertiser* that Aborigines had been enveloped in a cloud and that there were reports of possible disease and injury resulting from that event, I asked the Health Commission to conduct an immediate inquiry. The inquiry has taken two forms. The first step was for the Health Commission to investigate immediately the health records of all Aborigines in that area. Those health records go back only to 1972, but those that have been examined (and they have all been thoroughly examined) indicate that there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest any disease or genetic abnormalities which could possibly have resulted from exposure to radiation. That is not to say that those health records provide a complete picture. Therefore, the Health Commission is presently planning a physical study of the health of all Aborigines in the area.

However, I should point out that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish properly whether tests conducted in the early 1950's have had deleterious effects. There are a multitude of reasons for this. The first is that it is claimed authoritatively that there were no Aborigines in that area. Even if there had been, those Aborigines may well have moved to other areas by now. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to trace them and it would be equally difficult to attribute disease that may have developed in Aborigines in the area to the events of the early 1950's.

Nevertheless, I would like to assure the honourable member that I have instructed the Health Commission that I regard this as a matter of importance, that I think all responsible and reasonable measures should be taken to determine what disease, if any, could have been produced as a result of those tests. However, the principal point at issue as far as I am concerned is that whatever the cause, any disease, illness or genetic abnormality in the Aboriginal community should be assessed, diagnosed and treated, and that will be done.

SAMCOR

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Agriculture confirm whether Mr. Malcolm Kinnaird has officially tendered his resignation as Chairman and a member of the Samcor board and, if so, what plans does the Minister

have to fill that position and for the on-going role of the board?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am able to confirm that on 8 February 1980 Mr. Malcolm Kinnaird wrote to me tendering his resignation. Mr. Kinnaird gave notice of his resignation because of growing pressures from his business. Regrettably, he has suffered a period of ill health in the interim; happily, I am able to report favourably on his recovery. However, notwithstanding that, I can report also that co-operation and assistance have been received from Mr. Kinnaird by my department and me recently, and this has been much appreciated.

The other part of the question regarding the replacement of Mr. Kinnaird is extremely important because I wrote to the Premier on 3 April this year requesting from him the seconded services of one of his senior officers. I have recently received from the Premier agreement to replace Mr. Kinnaird on the board, both in the capacity of a member and as Chairman of that board, by an officer of very high repute in this State. That person is the Director-General of the Premier's Department, Mr. Graham Inns, and, having sought his services, it is therefore obvious that I have considered the importance of this position and I am delighted to say that approval has been given by Cabinet for me to have his services, at least for a short period.

During the next few months it is vital for the Government to spare no effort in restructuring Samcor into a soundly based financial position. An urgent need exists to determine some clear objectives for Samcor and to place it on a sound business footing. The passage of the meat hygiene legislation makes this task more urgent and pressing. There is no question that for a great many reasons Samcor is in a critical financial state. While we were in Opposition we were highly critical of the Government and of its role and activity in that particular direction, and we promised the public that on coming into office we would seek urgently to correct that situation.

In the coming months Samcor needs a widely experienced person to act as Chairman to map and restructure its operations, and I believe that one of the few persons available to do that task is the existing Deputy Chairman of the Samcor board, Mr. Graham Inns. During the period of his appointment to this job, I will need the person to act as a Chairman in a full-time capacity. I am delighted, as I say, not only because of the agreement for me to have his services but also because of the particular jobs that I have outlined for him. He will undertake the following tasks:

(a) Effect a financial restructuring of the corporation.

(b) Develop and put into effect a corporate plan for the future role of Samcor, taking into account the recently enacted meat hygiene legislation.

(c) Arrange for the disposal of land surplus to the requirements of Samcor.

(d) Propose a new corporate structure for the corporation's future administration.

(e) Restructure the Port Lincoln works.

I appreciate that this is a formidable task but it is one that we undertook to take on. I believe that I know what is required in order to achieve results and still provide the committed services to the consuming public and the producers of this State and, at the same time, reduce the millstone the State has suffered for too many years from the losses surrounding this service works.

With the co-operation of this senior and experienced officer, the implementation of our policy and the administrative practices that are to be undertaken, we have high hopes that we will soon substantially reduce that loss.

SHACKS

Mr. CRAFTER: Is the Minister of Lands prepared to stand by the statement he made to the House yesterday that there has been no alteration or amendment to the Government's policy on shacks? My understanding of the Minister's answer yesterday in reply to a question from the member for Hanson was that he was referring to the policy outlined on 5 November last year and not to the policy which was espoused prior to the general election last year and which was welcomed, I think, by the shack owning community in South Australia, particularly the statement that all non-acceptable shacks could remain for the life of the present owner or surviving spouse. In pursuance of that policy on 27 November, after the date referred to yesterday by the Minister, the Minister wrote to all councils, including Willunga council, saying:

> Those councils exercising direct tenure control of shack sites are expected to apply the new policy in a responsible manner, failing which control will be resumed by the Government.

It now appears from the statements made by the Minister yesterday that the Government has gone back on that unequivocal statement that control would be resumed by the Government.

Can the Minister say that that is not a change in policy? Further, what effect have representations made by the Minister of Agriculture (the member for Alexandra) had on this decision, in particular representations made to the Minister of Agriculture by the Willunga council on 5 May 1980 and following dates?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I reiterate that there has been no change in that policy; the policy announced on 5 November was as a result of a policy document discussed at length with the South Australian Shackowners Association and approved by Cabinet. The document has not been altered in any way. As I stated yesterday, a footnote has been included in it that in no way alters its content. It merely clarifies the position for the benefit of persons who are not in the habit of interpreting documents. The honourable member refers to clause 5 of that policy, which states:

> As at present—

they are the first three words—

> local government will be expected to apply this policy in those areas where councils exercise tenure control.

The first three words are critical; "as at present" refers to the existing policies of the previous Government, which were being operated on by the Lands Department as at 5 November 1979. The previous policy, approved by the then Government, stipulated that tenure would be provided on the basis that, as from 1975, under the policies of the previous Government, 10-year miscellaneous leases would operate on non-acceptable sites and 20-year miscellaneous leases on acceptable sites.

I come back to the point about clause 5, "as at present". That was the policy as at 1975. That previous Government policy in no way rescinded the Willunga council decision. In actual fact, had that policy been forced on the council at that time, it would have required the previous Government to enforce that policy on the shackowners with five years retrospectivity. This was not done. In fact, our policy clearly states "as at present", referring to the policy operating at that time under the previous Government; until such time as the incoming Government announced a new policy to operate as from 5 November, the previous Government's policy stood. That is the precise reference in this policy document. The honourable member should be able to follow that through step by step.

There was no retrospectivity in relation to the previous Government's policy. This policy takes over as from 5 November 1979 from the existing policy of the then Labor Government.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

> That, for the remainder of the session, Government business take precedence over all other business, except questions.

Motion seconded.

The SPEAKER: The question is—

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Not quite so fast, Mr. Speaker. I have a few comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. The honourable member has been here long enough to know that it is necessary to call for a seconder. It is not uncommon to mouth the motion which will eventually be put before seeing another member. The honourable member for Mitcham's position was quite understood by the Chairman, and no reference need be made to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir; I apologise for having reflected on you as Speaker, but I want to say something about this motion, and indeed I oppose it most strongly, in due course I have an amendment to move to it. I oppose the motion on two grounds. First, because this has been an unnaturally short session, secondly, because of the expressed intention of the Government, expressed by the so-called Deputy Premier yesterday, that private members' business remaining on the Notice Paper—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham has no right to term the honourable Deputy Premier as "the so-called Deputy Premier". He is being patently and blatantly offensive. I believe that he should not make a practice of this.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I draw all members' attention to the statement I made to this House on Tuesday 1 April, wherein I indicated that when words that were offensive to a member of the House were drawn to the attention of the Speaker or where the Speaker, of his own volition, drew attention to words, they would be called upon to be withdrawn. I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to withdraw the words which have caused offence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I withdraw. I have just twigged to it; everybody is pretty tired today. I had not thought of that.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My word! I am happy to be able to tell the House, in answer to the interjections that I got up this morning before the House got up. I got up at 5.40.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the notice of motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well; after those few little pleasantries—

Mr. Lewis: The seven dwarfs!

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What did he say? I have come to know that the member for Mallee is one of the least perspicacious members in the House, but I would like to hear what he said then.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the member for Mallee or any other member interjecting is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may come back to the motion, Sir—

The SPEAKER: That is what the Chair requires.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With respect, Sir. I oppose the motion on two grounds: first because this has been an unnaturally short session; secondly, because of the intent expressed yesterday by the Government that no time be given for the votes to be taken on the remaining items of private members' business. Of course, particularly I am concerned about one Bill, the Prostitution Bill. I make no secret about that. Let me tell the House this: if we get up tomorrow week and this motion, as is obvious, is a prelude to getting up and it has been announced that that is when Parliament will have got up, the House will have sat in this session for only 35 days.

An honourable member: You have not been here 35 hours.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The House will have sat for 35 days only. The best comparable session is that after the 1977 election, when we had a Government which had already been in office for seven years and therefore was not bursting with new ideas. During that session we sat for 45 days, another 10 days, almost a quarter as long again as we will have sat for this session.

If I can just make this point to the Government, I suggest that it is time that it got on with its programme. I have got here all the policies that were churned out before the last election. Surely there is enough here for the Government to put some business before the House. But, if members think back, there has been no Bill, with perhaps the exception of the breathalyser legislation, the compulsory random test, which has been of any political significance at all in this session. Yet, here we have a full programme. It is eight months since the Government took office and it has not bothered to bring in any of it. Let me give just one slight example. This was specific enough for instructions to be given to the Parliamentary draftsman. The matter has already been raised in this House before. One of the policies was that the Public Accounts Committee would be reconstituted and strengthened and given additional clerical and research support; it would comprise six members, three from each side of the House, with an independent Chairman.

All they had to do was give that to the Parliamentary draftsman and the Bill to amend the Public Accounts Committee Act could have been in. Of course, that has not been done. We know why it has not been done—because the member for Hanson was left out of Cabinet and he was given the job, and a car to go with it as a sop and if that policy had been carried out he would have been out of his job and away from his car. That is just a specific instance of what the Government could have done. There is plenty in its policy, if it really had any desire to legislate, to get on with during this session and not bring it to an end as quickly as it is being brought to an end.

If it does not like to innovate (and, of course, any conservative Government does not like to innovate) as I have said repeatedly, at least it could have gone through the Statute Book back for the last 10 years and cleaned up the messes left by the former Government. It is negative to argue about what are the messes and what are not, of

course, but at least that would be a public service that the Government could carry out if it does not want to break new ground. Instead, we are closing down because the Government does not have any ideas or because Government members are lazy, or both. This looks as though it is going to be a Parliament which sits for fewer days than any Parliament has sat since the Parliament of 1962-65—the last Parliament during which Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and we were on a knife-edge. That is one of my objections. I believe that Parliament should sit for longer.

I remind members that, quite apart from legislation, Parliament has other functions, one of which is to protect the rights of individuals and to debate matters of controversy in the community. Question Time, for example, is one of the most important functions of Parliament. When Parliament is not sitting, it is impossible to get at the Government publicly to question it on what it is doing. That is one of my points.

I now come to something more specific—the matter of regulations and by-laws. We are said to have the right, as a Parliament, to disallow regulations and by-laws, but that is a hollow right when Parliament is not sitting. Let me give one example. On Tuesday, the Minister of Transport laid on the table of the House a regulation regarding Burnside traffic regulations. Both I and the member for Unley have given notice of motion for disallowance, and we gave that notice of motion at the first opportunity, which was yesterday. If this motion passes it will be impossible for that regulation to be debated, much less disallowed. Now that, of itself, shows how hollow this procedure is.

This is a good reason why Parliament should sit longer, and I can tell you, Sir (and I certainly am not going to debate the merits of that), that it is a matter of burning controversy in the Premier's electorate. Passions are high. There has been—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has given an assurance to the House that he is not going to debate the matter. I respectfully suggest to him that by proceeding in the manner in which he is now proceeding he is getting perilously close to entering into debate on the matter. It has been noted by the House that it is a matter which is on the Notice Paper which would be permitted debate if the motion and/or the amendment before the House were considered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right; I will not go any further. Emotions are high; there has been talk of political pressure, and so on. This motion means that Parliament will not have an opportunity to debate that matter for many months now, by which time (speaking from the time the regulation was made) all the closures will have gone. If members opposite have any regard at all for the workings of Parliament, the purposes of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and the power which Parliament has to disallow regulations, they will take note of what I have said. That is only one item of private members' business which it will be physically impossible to deal with if this motion goes through.

I think that is sufficient on the general question of shortness of the session. I turn now to the matter concerning the announcement that we heard yesterday from the Deputy Premier (and I give him his proper title because, after all, I think he gets paid more for being Deputy Premier) that private members' business would not be voted on at the end of this session. The reason is perfectly obvious. The Government wants to avoid a vote, particularly on the Prostitution Bill. There is no doubt about that. It had enough speakers lined up yesterday to ensure that, even if there had been five hours for debate, the matter would not come to a vote.

As a rule, in the last 10 years there has been an opportunity for private members' business to be disposed of before the end of the session, and I have had some work done on this, going back to 1970-71. I must tell the member for Hartley that his record is not exactly unblemished in this matter, but in six out of nine sessions an opportunity was given for private members' business to be voted on before the session was brought to an end. So it is not correct, as the Deputy Premier said yesterday, I think, that this was not the norm. It was done in the 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972, and 1973-74 sessions. It was not done in 1974-75 or 1975-76; it was done in 1976-77 and 1977-78; and it was not done in 1978-79. But, as a rule, in six out of the last nine sessions of Parliament that opportunity has been given and in my view it ought to be given on this occasion.

Although I oppose the motion, I know that my opinion, even if I am supported by everyone on this side of the House (which I hope I shall be), will be in vain, because the members on the Government side will vote, as usual, like sheep. For that reason, I propose an amendment to the motion which at least would allow a vote to be taken on private members' business. I shall now read the amendment which I propose to be added at the end of the motion, Sir, copies of which have already been sent up to you. It is as follows:

> Provided that, before the proposed last sitting day, a vote be taken on all items of private members' business remaining on the Notice Paper, but without further debate.

Mr. BANNON: (Leader of the Opposition): I endorse the remarks made by the member for Mitcham. I think he has made some very pertinent points, and a very reasonable plea to the Government on this occasion, concerning the following of a practice that has been reasonably well established to at least enable a vote to be taken on those matters of private members' business that are still outstanding.

The member for Mitcham referred to the number of sitting days. While one grants the problems of a Government newly installed in power, as the honourable member pointed out, there was a vast wad of policies that that Government had proposed during the election campaign to present to the Parliament. Obviously it is a three-year programme, but nonetheless it has been quite remarkable to see how little has been accomplished except in one or two of the revenue measures that were proposed by the Government in the course of this first session. Not only have we had short sittings but also we have had truncated sittings. Very often the Government has abandoned its settled programme.

It can be remembered that last year the programme was abruptly terminated part way through the middle of a sitting week—a quite unprecedented situation. This was because the Government no longer wanted to face the Parliament. In fact, it was explained to us by the Premier; I remember his answering a question on television about this matter and saying "Quite frankly, we were tired."

Mr. Gunn: He said "exhausted".

Mr. BANNON: I thank the member for Eyre for the precise wording. He said, "Quite frankly, we were exhausted". One can understand that last year, with the financial measures and the new Budget and so on, this could well be the case. One would have thought, though, that coming back in the new year there would have been ample time for some of the legislative measures resulting in some substantial matters being put before this House be prepared. That just has not happened however.

It was interesting that, after a brief sitting some months ago, we resumed on this occasion for a two-weeks sitting.

Again, one would have thought that those intervening weeks would have given the Government an opportunity to finalise legislation. On the contrary, on looking at the Notice Paper, which is very thin indeed, we find that the only purpose for which we have been called together is to pass Supply, Appropriation, and other measures. That is an extraordinary way of managing Government business. On the Notice Paper are a number of matters, such as the West Lakes Development Act Amendment Bill, the controversial matter of Football Park lights, and the Shop Trading Hours Act Amendment Bill, a major piece of legislation introduced by the Government which got into enormous trouble and, apparently, it is to stay on the Notice Paper and be discharged.

If one ignores one or two matters like that, there is absolutely nothing of any real substance apart from the Fisheries Act, which is to be debated today, and which perhaps has some substance. The extraordinary conduct of the business consisted of our meeting on Tuesday, with the House folding at 5.30 p.m.—no further business to be done; nothing in the pipeline; and nothing to be debated. We have tried to accommodate the Government on occasions over this, but there was no proposition or legislation to be put before us. Then we had the ridiculous spectacle of, having terminated at 5.30 p.m. on Tuesday, sitting throughout Wednesday night and terminating at 5.45 a.m., because of the way in which Government business had been organised.

I do not think that that work load and the number of sitting days justify a motion of this kind. There is no need to eradicate another private members' day; there should be an opportunity next week for us to have one. Failing that, if the Government is going to insist that we do not have that opportunity for private members' day, at the very least it could agree to the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham and allow votes to be taken. Many of these matters have stood on the Notice Paper for a long time, and there has been adequate debate on a number of them. It has been the practice to have such votes in the past and, if the Government is not prepared, despite the thinness of its work load and its order paper, to allow more time for debate, it should at least allow time for votes to be taken. We support the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham in this debate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): I, too, support the amendment. I think that sufficient has been said about the current state of the sittings of the House and the length of time it has sat, so I will not canvass that matter. As the member for Mitcham has pointed out, it was generally the practice that the previous Government did allow a vote at the end of the session in Government time on those private members' issues that had reached the stage where a vote could sensibly be taken. It is apparent that one would not want, or expect, to have a vote on a motion or Bill that had not been debated in any way but, where the second reading debate on a Bill had taken place, votes were allowed. Where a motion had been moved, and spoken to either in Opposition or in support, it was reasonable to allow a vote to be taken. As the mover of the amendment has said, on six out of nine occasions that was permitted to happen. It could well have been the reason why votes were not taken on those other occasions or that the matters outstanding on the Notice Paper were considered to be of insufficient importance to be voted on.

I will go into the mechanics of this issue, because it is important. Let us look at the Government time this measure has occupied. If memory serves me correctly in the manner in which we conducted the votes, I do not think that it took longer than 15 to 20 minutes.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Half an hour.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Even half an hour at any one time for the votes to be taken and the matters disposed of; that is not a long time. It is strictly controlled by agreement that there will be no debate; the question will be put and voted on. I can also recall (as no doubt can the Deputy Premier) that there are many occasions towards the end of the session when there is ample time for anything to happen, because we are possibly sitting in the House waiting for measures to be returned from the Upper House; we sit here doing absolutely nothing. I say to the Deputy Premier that this end of session will be no different from any other, and there will be time available, without eroding anything that the Government wants to do in this session. I cannot, therefore, see any reason for opposing the amendment.

The only thing I can think of is that the Government might be afraid of the contentious prostitution legislation. The Deputy Premier knows as well as I do that it is not resolving that question, but, if the vote is taken, it allows the Bill to be revived at that stage in the following session. That would satisfy the fears of the Government members who have spoken on the measure and have said that there has not been sufficient time for debate, and the measure would be brought back in Committee in the following session.

What it means to the member for Mitcham is that he will have to go through that whole process again, to the stage he has now reached, in private members' time and, if we are going to sit no longer than we have sat in this session, he will finish up at the end of the next session exactly where he is now. No member wants that. The issue ought to be faced up to and resolved. I say that quite seriously. Surely it is not the Government's intention to prevent a private member from having the measure he has introduced in the House stopped in that way, unless the Government itself has some intentions of introducing a measure on this question. Perhaps the Deputy Premier can enlighten us as to whether or not that is the case.

I am also interested in knowing whether he can tell me when the next session is to commence. I believe it is to be on 31 July, but I am interested in knowing whether he can tell us when it is likely to happen. I see no difficulties or problems regarding this matter being contentious. I believe that it is a reasonable request to put to the Deputy Premier, and I hope that he will accept the amendment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): There are three sorts of fate which befall legislation that comes before the House—it can be carried, defeated, or end up as what, I believe, is known as one of the slaughtered innocents, which is a term taken from the book of Exodus and the second chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. They start to see the light of day; they are not developed any further, because no further debate is possible. It is interesting that, when we look at Government business and private members' business (although from time to time there are slaughtered innocents, Government business, by and large), the slaughtered innocents are found amongst those measures which are introduced by private members. This seems to be a great shame. I wonder what the Government is afraid of. There are those matters in private members' business where a vote could easily be taken, even though in some cases a spokesman from the Government benches has not spoken on the matter. I refer, for example, to the adjourned debate on the motion moved by the member for Mitcham:

> That, in the opinion of the House a system of proportional representation should be introduced for the election of its members, as contemplated in the Constitution.

Although my colleague the member for Ascot Park has spoken on this matter, he has not as yet concluded his remarks. He has said enough to make clear what his attitude is to the measure and, indeed, what generally is the attitude of the Labor Party to it. It is true that if we proceed to take a vote on this matter there will not have been an opportunity for a Government member to have spoken on it. I wonder whether, in a matter like this, it matters all that much. Surely this matter has been debated any number of times in this Chamber. Surely the Government will not be put in a false position on this matter if it should have to vote where it has not actually made its position clear in this debate, because the Government's attitude on proportional representation—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the honourable member for Baudin to the instruction I gave to the honourable member for Mitcham. I am quite prepared to have the motion identified, as the honourable member for Mitcham identified the one relative to Rose Park, but I am not prepared to accept any debate on the content of the motion so identified. I ask the honourable member not to debate the issues, which are notices on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Thank you for your direction, Mr. Speaker. I was not in any way attempting to canvass the merits or otherwise of that electoral system. I simply want to make the point that the Liberal Party's attitude on the substance of that matter is well known, and it would not be putting itself in a false position by going to a vote where members opposite had not restated that position in this debate. I wonder why it is not possible for us to get a vote on Orders of the Day: Other Business, No. 14, the adjourned debate on the motion of the member for Mitchell about the report of the Select Committee on the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill.

The member for Eyre, who surely is the Government member who is most intimately involved in this matter, has spoken at length on it. The member for Flinders had the adjournment, but it is not clear to me from the Notice Paper whether he has begun his remarks. This matter has also been extensively canvassed in the press and the Government's attitude is well known. It would not be placing itself in a false position were it would go to a vote, unless it lacks confidence in one of its members, namely, the member for Eyre, or if it cannot subscribe to the point of view that that member has put before this House.

Yesterday we saw a reasonable number of Government back-benchers adding their weight to what had already been said from the Government side relating to Orders of the Day: Other Business, No. 8, the Prostitution Bill introduced by the member for Mitcham. It seems to me that there has been a sufficient canvassing of that matter that we could at least get it into Committee. It is well known, of course, that there are members in this Chamber who are probably committed to getting the Bill that far, but reserving their right as to what happens from then on. My colleague, the former Premier, has made clear the advantages to the legislative process of being able, at least, to dispose of the second reading part of the debate.

I underline what has been said about the brevity of this session and the rather scant regard that has been given to private members' rights by people who, to a good measure, have spent 10 years here being private members. One would have thought that they would have transferred to the Government benches filled with a desire to preserve the rights of private members arising out of the experience that they had had as private members in this place.

The premature ending of this session will, of course, mean that not only will legislation in large measure be slaughtered innocents but, further, that Questions on Notice will largely figure among the slaughtered innocents. Who really believes now, for example, that I will get an answer to my Question on Notice No. 589?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Baudin is now going well beyond the motion being debated. That motion specifically relates to Notices of Motion and Bills which have been debated. There is no reference whatsoever to questions or Question Time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I rather imagined I was, Sir, and I congratulate you on your vigilance. It is important that we get a vote on those matters where there has been a reasonable canvass of the merits of the matters which have been put before the House. There has been a tradition that this should happen. The honourable member for Mitcham, in the statistics he quoted, made it clear that it has not invariably happened since 1970, but for the most part that has been the practice of this House.

It is for the Deputy Premier, as Leader of this House, to explain. The onus of proof on him is to explain why, in the very first Parliamentary session in which his side is in Government, we in fact should fall into the category of one of those sessions where this facility is not available to private members. Why should the Government start off on this wrong footing? Why should those people who have been private members in this place for so long, who complained regularly about the way private members' rights were being trampled on, now have left all that rhetoric behind? It may have been that, from time to time in the past, they had legitimate claim for grievance. Why, indeed, do they change their colours when, suddenly, they are transposed to the Government benches? I appeal to the House, and to the Leader of the House, to give a great deal of sympathetic consideration to the amendment which has been moved by the member for Mitcham. If, indeed, it cannot bring itself to support this amendment (and I am blowed if I know why), then let it consider a further possibility, that it will at least agree to a vote on those matters where there has been at least one Government speaker enter the debate on a matter which has been introduced by a non-Government member.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have been subjected to a recital which comes as no surprise to me. I thought by far the most cogent utterance came from the former Premier, the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, who unfortunately has been dispatched to the wilderness by his Party. I will deal with his remarks first. He made the point that, where the second reading debate has been concluded, there is a case for votes being taken on the last sitting day. I think the Premier made it perfectly clear yesterday, and I have made it perfectly clear on a number of occasions, that today was to be the last day of private members' business. It is not a strong precedent to quote, when on at least three occasions—and I would like to check the member for Mitcham's statistics, because without any undue reflection on him I will check that out—

Mr. Millhouse: I'll give you my workings, if you like.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: All right. That mind works in strange and wonderful ways, and I have found that it is quite useful to check. On at least three occasions what we were currently proposing has occurred, so that in itself was a precedent. The member for Hartley knows perfectly well that the second reading debate in relation to the Prostitution Bill has not been completed. In my judgment, a Bill of that nature assumes somewhat more importance than a notice of motion, which simply indicates an intent. If in fact that Bill passes, then it becomes law.

Not every member in this House has had the

opportunity to express his view in this debate; therefore, the second reading debate is not complete. The conditions that must obtain (according to the words of the member for Hartley) have not in this case occurred. The Government is not prepared, as the Premier stated earlier, to allow the matter to proceed to a vote if any honourable member is to be precluded from voicing his view on what I believe is one of the most controversial and important matters to come before this House in many years.

Mr. Millhouse: That's why you're gagging the debate—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: One could always be accused of gagging a debate when private members' business comes to a conclusion. This Government has applied the guillotine only once in its term of office, and that was during the Budget debate, to which a considerably longer period was devoted than we enjoyed at any time when in Opposition during a Budget debate. This occurred last year when there was a pressing necessity for the debate to be concluded, so let us not talk about gags.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will deal with the speakers in the reverse order to which they have spoken on this motion. By far the best and most cogent contribution came from the former Premier. The second reading debate was not concluded and it was made perfectly clear that, unless that occurred, we would not be prepared to proceed to a vote on the Bill. The member for Baudin waxed rather poetic in his opening remarks and aired some of his Biblical knowledge. In effect, he reiterated points made by the member for Hartley, and also mentioned what was going to happen to Questions on Notice. This Government has processed, in a shorter time, more Questions on Notice than has any previous Government; this has been done with greater despatch and speed than has been employed by any other Government in the 10 years I have been here.

When in Opposition, we were supplied with a stock answer—"Too many hours are required to provide this answer; the effort is not warranted", and no answer would be received. A considerable time was spent at the end of last week's Cabinet meeting in ensuring that the Notice Paper was cleared of questions. This Government has no charge to answer in relation to the answering of Questions on Notice. Whenever the session ends, there will be hundreds of Opposition questions on the Notice Paper which will absorb hundreds of hours of effort. It appears that the Opposition's only object is to create work for the Government and the Public Service.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier must resume his seat. I have already indicated during the debate on this matter that the question before the Chair relates to Notices on Motion and such business, and not to questions. While I recognise the general comment that the honourable Deputy Premier has made, to be consistent I ask him to make no further reference to question time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to answer the point made by the member for Baudin. I now refer to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who made several complaints, some of which were a regurgitation of matters that had been discussed previously. The election was held in the latter part of September, and the Government had to put through a Budget. We know that traditionally sittings in the early parts of the year are not long, and that sittings in June are rare. I made perfectly clear that the purpose of this sitting in June was to pass the Supplementary Estimates—that was its main purpose. The Government decided to pass these Supplementary Estimates at a late stage in the financial year, and for very good reasons.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When are we going to sit again?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am quite happy to provide that information. Remind me later, if I have not done so.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not do it now?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because I am despatching the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He does not take much despatching; I can understand the mirth. It was made perfectly clear that these sittings have followed a normal pattern. I am now accused of not arranging the sittings of the House to suit the Opposition's convenience. It has been an extremely difficult task for me, as Leader of this House, to gauge in any way, in relation to the Opposition, how long it will take to deal with a Bill. Some Bills that pass the Upper House with minimal or no debate, have generated on the other side of this House a debate lasting hours. I can cite an example. At about 4 o'clock one morning we were taken by the member for Salisbury through about 100 circuits of a country slaughterhouse, wiped down the carcases about 100 times and inspected the offal about a dozen times. That was a classic filibuster. The Opposition kept us here until, I think, 5 a.m. on that occasion. On another morning on which we sat to about that hour it took the House from 1 a.m. until 4.30 a.m. to discuss whether a dog should be called an Alsatian or a German Shepherd. That Bill passed the Upper House in 10 minutes.

When I am arranging the week's programme, what, to me, may appear to be a Bill of no great consequence can suddenly, for some unexplained reason, become a major issue in the minds of our political opponents. If four Bills are put down for the day's sitting, debate may last 40 minutes or 16 hours, if one considers the track record of the Opposition. As is my habit, I rang the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and read to him the week's programme. He made no complaint, and the programme was therefore proceeded with.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It was changed within 24 hours.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rang the Deputy Leader that morning. This happened to me frequently with the Hon. Hugh Hudson, and on occasions with the Hon. J. D. Corcoran. Changes have to be made at the last minute to accommodate matters that have to be passed because of the time constraints on the operation of either legislative or regulatory measures. This has happened on a couple of occasions since I have been Leader of the House. I rang the Hon. Mr. Wright and asked, "Is this okay, Jack?" and he said, "No worries".

The Leader's other complaint related to the fact that the Government, he claims, has not kept all of its promises . A 15-page document headed "Broken promises" details the promises of the Labor Party that it did not implement over 10 years. How long have we been in Government? About eight months! We have passed some of the most significant legislation to affect the taxpayers of this State and it has been widely acclaimed by those taxpayers. I refer to that dramatic taxation relief which the Opposition said was not possible and which the Leader of the Opposition obviously did not understand. Because some income is coming in this year from succession duties, he believes that we have not abolished this tax. That is how ill-informed the Leader of the Opposition is; he did not even understand that estates are not wound up the day after a person dies. Some of these dramatic taxation concessions were enacted by the Government at the earliest opportunity, yet, the

Opposition says that we have dealt with nothing of substance. What utter, confounded humbug!

The matter affecting West Lakes was also mentioned. It was made perfectly clear that, while the matter was before the courts, the Government had no intention of pursuing that legislation, so do not let members opposite start talking that sort of nonsense. We have been perfectly frank and open with Opposition members in relation to the legislation before the House, but it has been an impossible task to judge what to them will be important and what will be unimportant.

I rather thought the passing of the Supplementary Estimates was important. There was no amendment to that, but the rest of the night and this morning were taken over by a series of petty whinges over a period of countless hours. We have nothing to apologise for in relation to the operations of this House since I have been Leader of the House.

How am I to know that the question of whether a dog will be called an Alsatian or a German Shepherd is a matter that is going to take this House four hours to resolve? How am I to know that the interior of a country slaughter house and the way carcasses are washed down, offal is done and so on are important matters that will take up three hours of the time of the House? I know that the Opposition members hold me in high regard, but they are giving me an impossible task if I am supposed to gauge that sort of time scale.

The remarks of the member for Mitcham were peculiarly hollow. We have seen more of the member for Mitcham this week than we have seen for the whole of the session. The member for Mitcham calls us hypocrites. He goes to the press and the media and blasts us for the way we behave in the House. He says that he has been in the House for umpteen years and has missed only 10 or 15 days. We have been here long enough to observe his behaviour.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to come back to the purport of the motion before the House, and not extend it beyond reasonable limits.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing with the hypocrisy of the member for Mitcham in moving this amendment. The fact is that he comes in here at 2 o'clock, is marked present and disappears to the courts.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I take a point of order, following the hint you gave to the Deputy Premier a few minutes ago. He is not sticking to the subject matter of the motion or the amendment, but is simply villifying me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order, because I do not really think the honourable member has asked for a withdrawal of words which were hurtful to him. I point out to the honourable member for Mitcham that the honourable Deputy Premier did link up the remarks he was making to the amendment which the honourable member had introduced. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The device on Thursdays is to leave the court and get here about 5 o'clock when the grievance debate starts so that he can be marked present on Thursdays. The member for Mitcham would not have spent 10 per cent of his time (and that would be generous) this session in the House, and yet he castigates us for not being here for longer periods. We know he can earn a lot more money outside this place than he can earn in it. This is hypocrisy at its worst.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must admit I cannot say that what the Deputy Premier is saying is hurtful to me, but I do take the point of order that it is absolutely irrelevant to the subject matter of either the amendment or the motion itself.

The SPEAKER: Again, I am not going to accept the point of order. I merely indicated to the honourable member for Mitcham the parameters within which I was moving. I did ask the honourable Deputy Premier to come to the point. I have been more than tolerant. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to now address himself to the motion and/or the amendment which is before the Chair.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am simply indicating the fact that there is a lot of time in this House available to the honourable member of which he does not avail himself, simply because he is not here, and he uses this cheap device of coming in for five or 10 minutes, being marked present and leaving, so that the statistics indicate that he has been in regular attendance. That is a completely abusive use of the privileges of this Chamber. If other members acted in this fashion, the House would not operate. If other members of the House showed such irresponsibility towards the operation of this House as does the member for Mitcham, the place would not function. Where was he in the small hours of this morning? He disappears.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe the point has been made. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to come back to the motion or the amendment, and not to continue to canvass the area that he is presently canvassing.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think he has got the point; I hope so. He is fairly obtuse, and he has a thick hide. I simply make the point that it is completely hypocritical for the honourable member to suggest that there is no time available, when he deliberately does not avail himself of the time when the House is sitting. If we extended the sitting, he would not be here. The fact is that the matter which is preoccupying him is the question of the Prostitution Bill, and that is the only reason we have seen him this week, because there might be a headline in it. We know perfectly well that he jumps on the band waggon of anything controversial to keep his name before the public. I can list cases, but I will not. The only reason we have seen the member for Mitcham in this place this week, when he could be in court earning a fat fee—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the honourable Deputy Premier on three occasions not to canvass material which is not strictly pertinent to either the motion or the amendment. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier not to continue in that way or I will have to ask him not to speak.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I accept that, of course, Mr. Speaker, but I am trying to make a major point in this rebuttal about the sheer hypocrisy of the member for Mitcham in having the gall to move this amendment.

The fact is that the second reading debate on the Prostitution Bill has not been concluded. I have often heard the member for Mitcham stand up in this place and talk about the undoubted rights and privileges of members, but he is perfectly happy to deny members that opportunity in this debate. The simple fact is that the debate has not been concluded. Some members in this place have not yet had the opportunity to speak. I know that he introduced his Bill at the earliest opportunity (for reasons I will not canvass), but it happened to be late in the sitting. It so happens that in the normal course of events one would not have expected this debate to be concluded. That is the position we have reached.

I simply repeat in closing that the only cogent point was made by the member for Hartley, whose contribution was the only one I took as being genuine (the rest was simply play-acting, as one would expect). The point is that the second reading debate has not been concluded. The

Government made perfectly clear that, on a matter of this importance, that debate should be concluded, and for that reason no vote will be taken until the debate is concluded. I oppose the amendment and support the motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse (teller), O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. L. M. F. Arnold, Duncan, and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Allison, D. C. Brown, and Mathwin.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse (teller), O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allison, D. C. Brown, and Mathwin. Noes—Messrs. L. M. F. Arnold, Duncan, and McRae.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: COBDOGLA

The Hon. PETER ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That section 389, hundred of Cobdogla, Cobdogla Irrigation Area (area 12·18 ha) dedicated as a Travelling Stock Camping Reserve, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 6 October 1977, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1976: and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The Travelling Stock Camping Reserve was dedicated as such on 15 February 1973 and has not been placed under the control of any governing body. The proposal has been instigated by the Department for the Environment for the inclusion of section 389 in the proposed Lock Luna Game Reserve. The Pastoral Board has considered the resumption and has no objection, as the land is required for a project of public benefit. In view of the purpose for which the land is required, I ask members to support the motion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June. Page 2165.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In moving the second reading of this Bill the Minister said:

The object of this short Bill is to remove current restrictions on the surrender of leases issued under the Crown Lands Act for the purpose of granting a perpetual lease or an agreement to purchase, or the fee simple of the land, so that the Government's freeholding policy, particularly in regard to shacks located in areas classified as acceptable, may be implemented.

The policy in relation to shacks erected on waterfront Crown lands is that holders of miscellaneous leases over sites classified as acceptable may, subject to the availability of satisfactory access, secure the freehold of their sites.

The reference to shack policy there, I think, at least indicates that that particular aspect of shack policy referred to deserves some small examination. The Opposition intends to support this Bill, certainly at the second reading stage. In the case of shack site policy generally, as indicated on a number of occasions in this House during August last year (to be exact, I think it was 27 August 1979, when I was the Minister who had the responsibility for that area), I issued a press statement which stated that Cabinet had approved a new State-wide policy on shacks situated on waterfront public land—one of the categories we are now considering in this Bill. I shall quote from the section of that press release which applies to the category known as shacks on acceptable sites. It is as follows:

Mr. Payne said that in the case of areas already defined acceptable, or those which may be redefined, consideration will be given to a more permanent form of tenure.

Subsequent to the election, the Liberal Party issued a policy not dissimilar with respect to that category of shacks, that is, those located on waterfront lands in acceptable areas. This policy, which was issued under the signature of the Minister, the Hon. P. B. Arnold, states in part:

For shacks in areas already defined as acceptable or included as a result of the review referred to in the preceding paragraph, consideration will be given to offering a more secure tenure to the shack owner on appropriate terms.

It can be seen that there was only a very small progression from the section of the policy of the former Government that I have just outlined in quoting from the press statement. So obviously, with respect to those classes of shacks, there is no real difference between the policy of the previous Government and the policy proposed to be followed by the present Government. The heart of the policy in both cases is to provide for more secure tenure to the shack owner on appropriate terms. That is the nitty gritty of the matter.

I believe that I can say with certainty that, in order for this to be done, the former Government would have had to introduce amendments similar to those that we now have before us proposing to make changes to the Crown Lands Act as specified. The Government, through the Minister, has further indicated in the explanation the following:

The Act, as it now stands, precludes the surrender of a lease for a grant in fee simple—

which I am told means for a grant in respect of title—

where the land concerned has not been held under lease for at least six years.

If we examine the relevant section in the parent Act we find that it provides:

No lessee shall be entitled to purchase any land under this section until after the expiration of six years from the time when that land was originally leased to him or to his predecessor in title, or unless the Minister is satisfied . . .

I will stop there, because we are concered with the six-year requirement, and that is all that is relevant to the present discussion. The Bill provides in clause 3 *(b)* that

subsection (4) be struck out. That was the subsection I have just quoted. Obviously, that amendment will achieve the Government's objective, that is, the Government wishes, as the Opposition sees it, to make it possible that the requirement that the land be held on a lease basis for at least six years should not apply.

Clause 3 of the Bill strikes out from section 212(1) the proviso thereto. The words "proviso thereto" are somewhat misleading. I have consulted with the draftsman and also with a colleague on my side with legal qualifications, and I now understand that the effect on section 212 in the principal Act would be to remove the following words:

> Provided that this section shall apply only to any lease of land which *(a)* is solely used for pastoral or agricultural purposes, or both, or *(b)* in the opinion of the Minister will not be required for subdivision or for public purposes.

Clause 2 refers to section 210 of the principal Act, which relates to lessees and which provides:

> Any lessee under any Crown lease granted under any of the Crown Lands Acts may apply in writing to surrender his lease for a perpetual lease or an agreement under Part V.

The Bill provides for an amendment to that section by striking out the proviso thereto.

Reference is also made in the second reading explanation to our proposed removal of the six-year leasehold requirement. That was an historical provision to ensure the satisfactory development of the State's agricultural lands, and it has no relevance to current circumstances and land management policies. I believe that that would suggest that obviously those words and that class of a section or requirement in an Act had been in existence for a very long period because of the known agricultural life history of our State and the fact that there has been a period of very many years during which most land management policies followed in this State were concerned with the changing of the existing nature of land, its development and its progression into primary production land.

Having referred to the 1929 volume of Statutes in the Chamber, I believe that my surmise was correct. The wording does appear, although it has since been struck out, the entire Act having been consolidated on more than one occasion. It is refreshing to find more than a modicum of information in the second reading explanation that seems to relate directly to the matter before us. Having been given sufficient information, one is able to follow logically and sensibly what is proposed. I have possibly one or two niggling type questions which, I believe, could best be answered in Committee. At this stage, I indicate my qualified support for the second reading.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): As the honourable member has stated, the majority of Crown leases in South Australia under the Crown Lands Act are more than six years of age and, as such, under the Act they are entitled to be freeholded. The majority of the leases not qualified in the six-year period were issued by the previous Government, from 1976 onward, for shack purposes in acceptable areas. Since they do not qualify for the six-year period at this stage, to enable us to proceed with the policy of providing permanent tenure, the majority of the leases we are considering come into the category of not less than six years, and were created by the previous Government for acceptable shack areas. By removing the provisions as contained in the Bill, it will enable the issue of secure tenure to be given to shack owners in acceptable areas.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Power for lessee to purchase leased land."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I need to refer to the second reading explanation to indicate to the Minister my needs in this category. The explanation states:

> Clause 3 removes the same restrictions from the section of the Act that provides for the surrender of Crown leases for a grant of fee simple.

I can follow that, and the remainder of the explanation. Earlier, the explanation states:

> These limitations have played their part in the satisfactory development of agricultural lands, and are now inhibiting the implementation of land tenure policies that are consistent with current land management strategies.

Is that merely a reference to the necessary lease and title juggling associated with the various categories and classes of shack lease, or does the provision apply across the board to all lease arrangements?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It applies across the board to all leases under the Crown Lands Act, but the majority of the instances where this provision will be used are certainly in relation to the shack leases created in more recent times. The majority of the leases in South Australia are of considerable age and, therefore, have passed beyond that six-year period.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the Minister for the information he has given and I accept it.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

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

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June. Page 2165.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I inform the House and the Minister that the Opposition will not be opposing this Bill. We support the principle embodied in the Bill and will be supporting it through the second reading stage. It is our intention, at the appropriate time, to improve the Bill so that it better serves the interests of the industry and, I believe, the department as a whole. I find myself in a difficult position because of the stringency of time. I had hoped to be able to introduce into this House today a series of amendments. I will not canvass what those amendments are because you would quite correctly bring that to my attention, Mr. Speaker.

It was my hope that I could do that and that we could discuss this matter in the Chamber where the Minister of Fisheries resides. The alternative will be that these matters will need to be introduced in the other place, where the Minister will be represented by one of his colleagues. I do not think that is fair to the Minister, or to the House, but I cannot blame either the Minister of Fisheries, or the Leader of the House, for these circumstances. Unfortunately, because of factors beyond my control, we have not been able to contact people within the fishing industry to ascertain from them whether or not this Bill meets with their approval. When I mention members of the fishing industry I refer to the President and Secretary of the Australian Fishing Industry Council here in South Australia. They are entitled to their holidays, as is everybody else; it is just somewhat inconvenient that it should have occurred at this time. I am not suggesting that the Minister was careful to introduce the Bill into the House for debate when the officers of AFIC were not available for the Opposition to speak to them.

However, we were able to speak to members of the scale fishing industry. Whilst they expressed some concern about the import of this Bill, in general terms they agreed with it. I will get to those points a little later. I turn to a question I asked in the House today about consultation between the Minister, his department, and the fishing industry. I asked the Minister whether he or his Director had at any time discussed this Bill with the fishing industry. The Minister assured me that, although the Director had had no time, because of his recent appointment, he, the Minister, had discussed this matter at length with the industry.

That was not the information revealed by our inquiries. We know that the Minister is an honourable gentleman and we are not suggesting that he would deliberately say this was not the case if he had not thought it was. Unfortunately, the industry is surprised that this Bill, drawn as it is, is in this House today for debate. I know that the Minister wishes to get the Bill through this House today and into the other place so that an early passage of the Bill through Parliament can be achieved because of the problem the department is running up against time with the issue of licence renewal due for the coming year. I have no direct evidence of this, but I would not be surprised if the reason why renewals have not been forwarded to fishermen in the scale industry in South Australia is because this Bill has not passed this House and become law.

I ask the Minister whether there is this direct relationship between the non-issue of renewals of licences and the passage of this Bill before the House, because if there is I think it is a matter of concern to the fishermen; they ought to know what it is that is in this Bill that has an effect on their current renewal. That is an important issue, and one that I hope the Minister will give consideration to when he answers my comments in this debate. The Bill is designed to make sweeping and fundamental changes to the scale fishing industry in South Australia. They are changes that we, as an Opposition, accept, are fairly well overdue. It was put to me today that, when we are talking about managed fisheries, perhaps the scale fishery ought to have been the first industry in South Australia to be in that category. When one realises that the scale fishing industry is the historic fishery in South Australia, the other fishing industries coming in in later days, one can understand that point of view. Nevertheless, we have before us a Bill that seeks at last to give the scale fishing industry the protection that it so rightly deserves.

Of course, a managed industry raises many questions of its own, and I hope that the Minister will be able to answer those questions. In many other fisheries in South Australia, authorities are able to be sold. I ask the Minister whether he expects that representations are to be made to him, as I am sure they will be, that the authorities obtained for the scale fishing industry can be disposed of in that way.

In asking that question, I think it is only fair for me to put to the House what the Opposition feels about this issue. We are opposed at this time to the sale of scale fish authorities, which will be created as a result of this Bill being passed by Parliament. One of the major reasons why we are opposed to it is that the scale fishing industry is over-fished to the extent that fishermen of all classes (that is, full-time professionals, part-time professionals and amateurs) feel that some action needs to be taken. If we enable the authorities to be sold, we ensure for ever that all these authorities stay within the fishing industry. If the only way they can be quitted is for the Government to take part in a buy-back programme, there will be enormous consequences to the State's Treasury. If we seriously believe that the industry has too many licences, that there will be too many authorities, then we cannot, at this early stage, accept the proposition that licences ought to be sold.

My view is quite clear on this issue (and I stress that this is my view); I would not, and never have, approved of the sale of any fishing licence. I believe that access to the fisheries should be open to all and should not be subject to a person's financial backing. If we go into a managed fishery and the changes to the Act are made, as this Bill hopes to make them, I ask the Minister what he intends to do with those people who currently fish, say, for rock lobster and also have a scale fishing licence and require both of those licences to be able to maintain a viable fishing practice. Not all rock lobster authorities in South Australia are lucrative, as we know. There has been a crisis within that industry, and many people have authorities to catch other species of fish. I think the Minister ought to tell us what he proposes should happen to these individual licences.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister should advise the House and the industry what he and his department intend to do with those scale fishing operations that are tied in with other fishing, such as rock lobster fishing. There may not be many; he would know better than I. Some would require the viability of both of these fishing activities. The Bill proposes to give restricted access to the scale fishing industry, consequential on its being a managed industry. It will prevent the holder of an A class fishing licence (such as prawn, rock lobster, tuna or abalone fishermen) from fishing for scale fish when his speciality in fish is not available. This has not been fair to scale fishermen over the years; they have not had the opportunity to fish in restricted areas, and it is only fair that they be given protection.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: I shall be happy to listen to the member for Eyre, who will no doubt speak on this matter because I am sure that he wants to protect the fishermen in his district. Yet I suspect that he will not speak at all. That is a pity. If that is why he wants to help me make my speech I assure him that this will be the only occasion during my contribution on which I will notice his presence in the House.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Stuart to take no notice of interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. It is wise advice, particularly in this case. Regarding the restricted access to the scale fishing licence, I am concerned about what can be done about an existing anomaly that has a consequential effect on scale fishing activities. Prawn fishermen may catch great quantities of scale fish. I have discussed this matter with prawn fishermen and they admit that this fact is so. It is an inevitable part of their fishing activity. At present, they are unable to sell scale fish. It would be unrealistic to expect them to throw the fish back into the sea. They could not eat all of them, because some trawlers catch more fish than do licensed scale fishermen.

I suggested to the previous Minister, and I put to this Minister, that a system should be evolved whereby fish can be put on the market through legitimate scale fishermen and not as part of the prawn fishing industry. Scale fishermen should be able to take advantage of any scale fish caught which in normal circumstances they have the right to catch but which at present are being caught by prawn fishermen and sold by them illegally. This matter should not be swept under the carpet; we all know that it goes on, and it occurs to the detriment of an industry that is under great pressure—the scale fishing industry. Will the Minister consider this matter seriously because, even though access to the industry is prevented by other fisheries, this anomaly remains?

The Bill also conveys to the Director of Fisheries increased power. I am concerned about this area. Because the Bill proposes to provide further powers for the Director, it is reasonable that the Director has expertise to be able to make the decisions that will be so vital to the industry.

As the Minister knows, the Fisheries Department in South Australia is probably the most difficult department to administer. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think the fishermen themselves are probably the most difficult people in any industry in South Australia to organise. I do not think there is any doubt about that; I think fishermen would agree with me. They are an independent breed; they like to be able to do things their own way and they do not really feel easy under the restrictions that are inevitably placed on them by Governments which have a responsibility to preserve the fish stocks in the State. They accept that the Government has that responsibility and they like to see the Government exercise that responsibility, but they do not feel easy in the straitjacket that they sometimes think the industry places on them.

This is a very important fact and I wonder, in view of that, why the Government felt it necessary to make the appointment it did. Let me preface my remarks by saying that if I am wrong and the Director proves to be the success the Government obviously expects him to be, I shall be happy, because it would bring no joy to me to see the fishing industry in a greater mess because of an inappropriate appointment. If the Government believes that the Director can live up to its expectations, I hope that he is able to do so.

However, the Director has absolutely no qualifications at all to be appointed to this important position. We are giving him wide powers, and it is reasonable that we should look at his expertise. I suspect that his expertise in the fishing industry amounts to some 18 months as Executive Director for the Australian Fishing Industry Council of South Australia. During that period, he acted in a quite partisan way in favour of some sections of the fishing industry as against the others. I wonder how he will be able to assure the sections with which he was offside during that period that now, as a Director, he will take an even-handed approach to the whole industry.

I heard somebody mumble something about a "fair go". What I am saying is quite true, and I am sure that the Director himself, if he were able to be party to this debate, would accept that what I am saying is historically true. It seems to me that perhaps the Government was impressed with the short time that he was private secretary, I think, to a Federal Minister or two, and that of course raises the possibility that this, dare I say it, is a job for the boys.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: I point out to those members on the back bench who so readily jump to the defence of their Minister that this is far from a waste of time. The ability of the Director is a vital component of this measure before the House. If the member for Rocky River does not believe that, I would ask him to read the Bill, to read the Minister's second reading explanation and to have some appreciation of the responsibilities of Directors of Government departments. Directors of Government departments are not office boys.

Mr. Lewis: The man's been in the job but a week. Give him a go.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am talking about the qualifications and the background that equip the Director to do the job he is now charged with doing in South Australia. I am not criticising his performance, because he has only been there a week, but I am criticising the Government's appointment at this stage. I have said that I am prepared to accept that, if my criticisms are invalid and he does the job, which I hope he does do very well, I will withdraw what I have said. I shall be happy to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. KENEALLY: I would think that the qualification for any person to be a Director of any Government department is proven: ability in management and expertise in the area over which he will have influence, especially in the case of the fishing industry. One does not get someone from the mining industry and put them in the fishing industry. The Deputy Premier might do that because he thinks that everybody in the mining industry is a great conservationist, concerned to retain for South Australia, the Commonwealth—

An honourable member: What about Mrs. Chatterton?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am not too sure that that interjection has relevance at all to this Bill. I am speaking about a very senior appointment made in South Australia. I do not know what they are speaking about. Of course there is a suggestion of jobs for the boys. I ask the Government to prove that that is not the case. What other qualifications does the Director have, except 18 months on the Australian Fishing Industry Council as an executive officer, (not a research officer), and time with a number of Federal Government Ministers?

Under this Bill, the Director will have power to require licence-holders to be on their boats during fishing operations. The Opposition does not oppose this provision but it will raise a number of questions. In the Minister's second reading explanation, referring to the amendments to section 32 which would require a licensee to be on his boat, the Minister says:

> In effect, this will restrict each licensee to the use of one fishing unit at any one time.

This might mean something to the Minister and to the Director of his department, but it does not mean a great deal at this stage to the Opposition, nor does it clarify the position for fishermen within the industry. If the Minister or Director seek to require a licensee to be on board his or

her boat during fishing operations, he must define what a fishing unit is. I wonder why the department applies this requirement only to scale fishing. There is one industry that I can point to, without any trouble at all, for which I would be delighted to bring in this measure, and that is the prawn industry. If prawn industry authority holders were required to be present on their boats during fishing operations, a great many problems currently existing in that industry might be overcome.

I hope that the Minister will use this measure when it becomes law, as it undoubtedly will, as a basis to require other fisheries within South Australia to adopt a similar policy, that is, the requirement for a licensee to be on his or her boat during fishing operations. That requirement should apply right across the board.

Mr. Blacker: Rubbish!

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Flinders can tell us why he believes that his scale fishermen need to be on their boats during their fishing operations, but not some of the licensees of larger fishing units in this State. As the Minister knows, to compare the average scale fishing unit in South Australia with a prawn fishing unit is going from the ridiculous to the sublime. There is no comparison. I could speak on this subject for hours, and I am quite willing to do so whenever the Minister will allow me. It is important that this matter of a fishing unit be clarified for the benefit of honourable members. I hope that the Minister can do that. I believe that the powers it is proposed to reside in the Director, as a result of this Bill, ought to be considerably modified.

The best way to modify this power so that the Minister or Parliament and not the Director is making the decisions could come as a result of some of the proposals that I will now put to the House. The amendments to the law that are sought by the Minister would place even greater power in the Director and would allow him to make changes as he saw fit. The changes which have been suggested are not too Draconian and, with some explanation, they are changes that we may be happy to accept.

Of course, the extended power gives the Director authority to discriminate from one licence as against another. If a fisherman is so discriminated against he has no grounds on which to appeal, because this will be a decision that the Director will make on his own discretion. There is a need for the fisherman to understand why his fishing activity has been affected: he will need to know the grounds on which he can appeal. We propose that these grounds should be provided. There is a rather revolutionary way—I suppose the word "revolutionary" is a terrible word for the Government and will probably get it offside from the start—to achieve this. We have a system within one Government department in South Australia, that is, the Planning Department, involving development plans, and this system works very well.

We are suggesting that the department should consider establishing in each fishery a plan to determine the basic guidelines by which that fishery ought to operate, and that this plan should be drawn up by the Minister in consultation with the industry and then be presented to the public for comment. The amendments that would be included in any change that we would wish to make would ensure that consultation between the Government and all groups interested in a particular fishery should take place. This management plan would give fishermen within that particular industry, people outside the industry, and people in the local areas who have a concern for the viability of the industry the opportunity to give their input to the management plan.

When the plan progresses through the public discussion stage it comes back to the Minister for decision and is then placed before Parliament for approval, so that everyone with an interest in the industry will have had an opportunity to participate in the development of the management plans.

If we are to have a planned industry we must have a management plan. I know that the Minister and his new Director will be working towards that. I do not believe that they should work towards that situation in isolation, but these matters are of importance to many citizens of South Australia, and their involvement should be sought. In due course the Minister will have an opportunity to accept or disagree with my point of view. Unfortunately, he is not going to have the opportunity in this Chamber, and it looks as though it will happen in another place.

The establishment of these management plans will assist the Director in making some of the tough decisions that he will need to make in fisheries management. If he has a plan that is quite clearly laid out to support the decisions that he would then make, there is no possibility that he can be charged with discriminatory practice against one fisherman as against another, or one section of the fishing industry as against another. This device will give protection (putting them in order) to the fishermen, to the community, to the Government and through the Government, to the Fisheries Department.

I think that, if the Minister will consider the points I am making, he will see that this suggestion would have great benefits to him in his administrative responsibility. Of course, while these plans are being determined, the Director would need to have interim powers to control the industry, similar to the procedure that exists in the State Planning Office for development plans that it draws up.

During the time this matter is being debated, I do not believe the Director should be able to impose restrictions on fishermen that do not currently exist. There is time enough to impose restrictions if such restrictions are approved by all and sundry. I believe that interim powers should be given to the Director under the strictest control of the Minister, but that these powers should not reflect the Bill before us. If that were the case the fisherman could not claim that his existing rights were being denied him. Any move to do that without the full support of all would, I am sure, bring opposition from the fishing industry.

I am particularly concerned about the scale fishing industry. During the Committee debate I would like to ask the Minister about some of the very important decisions that his Government proposes to take. I draw this to his attention now so that he can be alerted to the questions that I will ask about such things as the recently circulated plans to declare the Upper Spencer Gulf an aquatic reserve, in an area that I suppose carries the bulk of the fishing industry within my electorate. The proposed aquatic reserve comprises the area around Mambray Creek and Yatala Harbour, etc. We have the strange situation where in the middle of this aquatic reserve is an area that has been declared open for fishermen. We all know that is a joke and that they will not be able to go in there. That is where the petro-chemical plant is expected to have its wharf, and where it is also expected that the vessels that service the petro-chemical plant will tie up. Of course, the overwhelming part of that area where the fishermen will be able to use their nets is a mud flat at low tide, anyway. It looks pretty impressive on the map but it does not look so lucrative if you are a fisherman looking at it at low tide, because the water is some two miles away. I would like to ask the Minister questions such as that.

Another matter of great importance and of great debate (and I must say that I have contributed to that debate over the years) concerns the statement that the Minister made

about the A class fishermen licence and the B class licence in South Australia. The Minister says that full-time A class should have greater access to the industry than those people who use fishing merely to supplement their income. Everyone agrees that that should be so. However, I have repeatedly made the point, and I make it again today, that not only people who work for a wage supplement their income by fishing. There are a number of A class fishing activities in South Australia where the A class fisherman supplements his income by other than his fishing activities. There is no doubt about it. This particular discrimination against the B class fishing licence which I have resisted as strongly as I can over the years will force out of the industry workers who also fish.

It will not force out of the industry people who have large invested capital that is returning greater amounts than a worker's wage. If we are serious about this, we ought to have a look at all the alternative activities that return to a fisherman more than a certain figure. I leave that for the department to determine. They will not do this because of the enormous difficulty. I do not suggest that a fisherman who has been successful in his industry ought not be able to invest that money elsewhere; of course he should. If, by investing that money elsewhere, he is able to involve himself in a development that returns him handsomely on that investment, good luck to him; he would be foolish not to do so. On the other hand, I would not suggest that those people should be actively trying to force out of the industry people who draw a wage that in some instances is much less than the alternative income of the A class fishermen. That does not suggest that there are not members within the fishing industry with a full A class licence who are not in difficulties.

One of the problems in ascertaining the degree of the difficulties they have is the paucity of the information provided to the department as to the fishing returns. Nobody can say for sure what an A class fisherman catches in Australia or what a B class fisherman catches, because they do not tell the department. Whilst that information is denied the department cannot come down with figures that clearly indicate the viability of fishermen within that industry.

It is in their own best interest, if they want to maintain that their industry is in difficulties (which I accept), for them to be able to provide positive proof through their returns to the Fisheries Department indicating exactly what they have caught and the value of what they have caught so that the department and the Government can make decisions based on the knowledge of what the real position is in the industry. That information has never been available, and I know that when the Director was working for AFIC he was not supporting the viewpoint that I am making. We have to work through AFIC. AFIC would be surprised at my saying this, because over the years it has not regarded me as its favourite member of Parliament. That body believes that I have been somewhat of a thorn in its side, as do some members of the Fisheries Department and some Ministers.

If we are to make changes, licences under this Bill that affect the fishing activities of A class and B class licences, it is important for the Minister to tell us here and now what those changes are likely to be and whether they will affect the renewals of licences that are being currently held up. I want to know whether there is a nexus between those two positions—the renewal of the licences being held up and the possible changes that could be made to fishing licences under this proposal. I ask the Minister to indicate clearly whether that is the case, because, if it is, the Opposition ought to know what those changes are to be so that we can debate them.

I have no doubt that this measure has been brought before us with the aim of improving the viability of fishermen within the industry, an aim with which we all agree. I have not always agreed with the manner in which the Government has sought to achieve this and, as I am a chap of rather independent views on matters such as this, I expect that that will remain the case. Nevertheless, I do except that a real attempt is being made to overcome what has been a sore within the fishing industry.

I believe that the proposals I have canvassed will add strength to the Bill and will give greater protection to the people in the industry, clearer guidelines to the Director, and clearer authority to the Minister. Without those guidelines, I am not prepared to accept the Bill. I will wait for the Minister to allay the fears I have. I will not delay the Bill at the second reading. However, I will ask questions in Committee and, as is always the nature of our Parliamentary system, the measure will no doubt be back in the House before it is ultimately approved, so the matters I have canvassed will be given an opportunity to be accepted in another place. I will not delay the debate any longer. There will be other opportunities for me to speak. I support the Bill at the second reading and look forward to hearing the Minister's replies to the points I have raised.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity of making a contribution to this debate, because I want to canvass a number of matters. Regarding the contribution of the member for Stuart, I understand that he referred to an obnoxious article that was deliberately brought up in the House to reflect on the appointment of the new Director.

Mr. Keneally: What article?

Mr. GUNN: That written by Lynn Chatterton, I think. I make clear to the House that it was this Government's policy at the most recent election to separate the Department of Fisheries from the Department of Agriculture and, when that action was taken, it was essential to appoint a new Director. The Labor Party was in office for 10 years, had a series of Ministers and the opportunity to put the department in order, but it failed on every count. The Labor Party had Ministers who did not know what they were doing. Its most recent Minister was under the complete control of his wife (Mrs. Chatterton), who not only was making decisions but also was firing the bullets. She was the one who caused dissension in the industry, and she was not liked. The administration was poor, and left much to be desired.

Wherever one went and talked to fishermen in the State there was concern at the way in which the department was being administered. However, this Government has taken firm, positive steps to lay the groundwork for the department in order. It is important that the stage be set so that we can get good relations between the industry and the department (something that has not existed for a long time). I have been concerned for many years at the lack of confidence the fishermen themselves have had regarding certain departmental decisions.

Although I have in my district a large number of fishermen, the number is fewer now. I lost part of my coastline and some of my fishermen. I believe that more tuna is brought in over the jetty at Streaky Bay than comes in at Port Lincoln. I have constituents who are involved in abalone, lobster, and prawn fishing, together with a large number involved in scale fishing. Recently, I attended a meeting at Streaky Bay, where I have attended a couple of meetings in recent times. During the 10 years I have been a member I have tried to involve myself closely with the

fishing industry and to attend as many meetings as I possibly could.

A number of interesting matters were brought to my attention at the last meeting I attended at Streaky Bay. Basically, they were that people currently operate on employee licences. These people own their own boats, have their own equipment, and, to all intents and purposes, are fishermen in their own right. However, because of the restrictive nature of the licensing procedures, these people have, for various reasons, been denied the opportunity to obtain an A-class fishing licence. In this respect, certain criteria were used.

With one or two exceptions, all these people in my district have appeared before the Harniman committee, and many of them have gone into great detail as to why they should be granted licences. With one exception, every time that I have been before that committee the applicants have been unsuccessful, even though on many occasions the evidence that has been put forward has clearly indicated that they should have had a licence.

Further, it would be wrong, unfair and unjust if these people, most of whom have been advised by the Department of Fisheries about the way in which they can obtain a licence, were not granted a licence. They are told that they have the expertise and know what they are doing. They are told, "You have another fisherman who has an employee's licence, so you are entitled, with his concurrence, to use that person's licence if you buy a boat." A number of these people have come into the industry since 1977, and it would be a miscarriage of justice if they were denied this right. Of course, they have been denied it all along because, we are told by the department, the resource is under pressure. Of course it is under pressure, and this has happened for a number of reasons.

There has been an explosion of effort by amateur fishermen. People are too frightened to say something about this matter, but I know that there are large numbers of these people. Let us look at the matter realistically. If, on a nice summer's afternoon, one goes to any port in South Australia, one will see a tremendous effort being made by amateur fishermen. Neither I nor the industry would deny anyone the right to catch a feed of fish; that is a person's right. However, I take strong exception when these people, some of whom have the most sophisticated equipment, sell portions of their catch, to the detriment of the industry. Most of it would be sold for cash. This is a matter on which the Department of Fisheries has been far less diligent than it should have been. This practice should be brought to an end.

Some of these genuine fishermen, whose fathers were the first fishermen in the industry, are being denied the right to obtain a licence. This is deplorable, and I should like to receive from the Minister an absolute assurance that these people will not be turfed out of the industry. The Minister will have a considerable amount for which to answer to me. I realise that I have been fairly difficult in the past in relation to this matter. However, I warn the Minister that I will be even more difficult in future; I am sick and tired of seeing people fooled around by the bureaucracy in the Department of Fisheries. I make no apology for saying that.

Ever since I have been a member of Parliament, I have been plagued by complaints about the operations of the Department of Fisheries. The Government has taken a positive step in appointing the new Director, who knows the industry, who has been involved in representing it and who, I am sure, can immediately improve the public relations aspect. This was a popular appointment and, I believe, a step in the right direction.

I should like to refer to one or two other aspects of this matter that have been brought to my attention, one of which is the taking of razor fish. Since 1971, there has been a bag limit of 50 on the number of razor fish that any person can catch each day. However, a number of fishermen live 30, 40 or 50 miles from where they catch the razor fish, and it is not economic for them to travel from, say, Venus Bay or wherever they live to Streaky Bay, so they have been taking two, three or four days' supply at once.

No-one has taken much notice of that. The District Council of Streaky Bay and the fishing industry are completely opposed to the commercialisation of razor fishing. I strongly support that view. They do not want, as certain people in the department believe, to keep the razor fish for a few locals around Streaky Bay and deny them to everyone else; that is not the point at all. There have been people coming in to commercially exploit that resource and it is, in my view, undersirable and should be stopped. In the policing of that provision, the genuine fisherman should not be impeded in his normal operation, as has taken place.

Recently, we had a bright spark of an inspector arrive on the scene and I think he thought he had caught Ronald Biggs or some other notorious criminal. He charged one of my fishermen who had caught more than 50 razor fish. He could have caught every fisherman if he wanted to. That gentleman would not do anything when the fishermen were complaining about illegal netting taking place. The fellows concerned were a bit too rough and tough, but the poor, innocent fellow who was catching fish and had a few razor fish, which every other fisherman would admit he was doing, got lumbered.

Unfortunately, this was not the local inspector (who was adopting a commonsense approach to the matter), but a character from Port Lincoln. His other great moment in history was when he arrived in Streaky Bay and arrested some of the locals, including pensioners, for having a few craypots out to catch a few blue crabs, something they had been doing for a long time. While such decisions are being made, no wonder the department is not getting on with the industry and is having bad public relations with it. It is high time this nonsense was tidied up once and for all.

I turn now to transferability. It has been the policy of this Party, and a view I have supported for a long time, that transferability should be permitted, and for good reasons. People who have put a lifetime into the industry ought to have a right to get out with some dignity. That has not been possible. In fact, they have to have some form of superannuation, and it is not unreasonable to allow them to get out with dignity. We do not want a trade in licences, and that can be prevented. Why should those people who have spent a lifetime in the industry not transfer their licences to their sons who want to join them, or to some person outside the family who has the expertise, experience and equipment to enter the industry?

I have been disturbed, as have the fishermen in Streaky Bay and the buyers who have spoken to me about this, by number of people leaving the industry. They are concerned that no new people are coming into the industry. The few new people are those operating as employees who have no security of tenure and are in a quite invidious situation. We have taken the first step in licensing abalone fishermen, we are going to allow transferability between families, which is a good idea, and I believe that we should allow transferability to people outside the immediate family so that people who wish to leave the industry can do so.

It is essential that this takes place as a matter of urgency. Much concern has been expressed about illegal fishing. I

believe that we have to take positive action in this regard. I consider that inspectors should do everything possible to apprehend people who are fishing without licences or authorities to prevent them from selling fish. This could be achieved by making it an offence for any person to sell fish, or to buy fish, unless he issues a receipt with the licence number written on it. The matter can be easily rectified in that way. I believe that, if this measure is implemented with common sense, then some improvements will take place. The matter relating to my fishermen will be covered in the Bill under the amendments to section 32, covered in clause 4. This provision will allow the Minister and the Director to ensure that these people are not unduly discriminated against.

One other matters that we hear from time to time much about is the reduction in the resource and that we must do everything possible to protect the scale fishery. I support that view and the concept of a managed fishery. I believe there is a need to consider, when the figures are being examined, the effort that the amateurs and part-time fishermen are putting into it. I believe that some B-class fishermen must decide whether they want to be full-time professional A-class fishermen or want to remain in their chosen trade.

Until now, some have transferred out of the industry, but there are still many in it. This matter has been causing much concern to the member for Stuart and others, but I understand that many of these people are in full-time employment and are covered by awards. I believe that this matter has been tidied up. It would be improper to cut them off from a given date without giving them a reasonable opportunity to get out of the industry. However, if the situation in the scale fishery is as bad as I have been told it is, something must be done and these people must make the decision to which I have referred.

I believe that, when the amendments are properly understood, they will be supported. I look forward to the visit of the Minister of Fisheries to the West Coast. Several requests have been made by constituents in Thevenard and Streaky Bay that the Minister visit the area, and I look forward to when he fits this into his tight schedule. I believe that the visit can do much to alleviate concern about how the department has been administered that has been expressed over a long period.

In relation to other fisheries, I am concerned that a number of people do fish for cray. They are operating in only a small way, but in the off season they are involved in the scale fishery. They have been doing this for a long time. I think it would be unfair if those people were chopped out. In the areas they are fishing, they have to get a reasonable income on their capital and maintain a home. In my view, they are entitled to maintain dual involvement.

The same thing applies to people who are taking shark. I think it would be unfair and improper to chop them out, because they have been doing this for a long time. I would be very concerned if they were prevented from continuing to earn a reasonable livelihood, because their costs are increasing and there are other problems.

In relation to the provisions giving the Minister power in regard to licensees having to be on their boat, I ask whether this applies to the prawn industry. I would be pleased if the Minister would clarify the matter, because I see problems. It is necessary to have considerable back-up facilities to keep a prawn boat operating. This matter should be clearly explained.

Mr. Keneally: There are a number of prawn authorities where the owner of the authority always is on the boat.

Mr. GUNN: I am fully aware of that; I could name some people who do this. I believe that my knowledge of the prawn industry is reasonable, and I know some people involved quite well. Some people put in only a minimal effort, and have been doing so for a long time. The industry is not as buoyant as it has been. According to some people to whom I have talked—

Mr. Keneally: Chris Corigliano?

Mr. GUNN: Certainly not Mr. Corigliano. I have little time for him. He is a very devious character. When I was questioned by certain fishermen regarding the effects of some people on the department, he tried to have two bob each way. I know full well the devious nature of Mr. Corigliano, and I make no apology for saying that. He has been operating for a number of years. I refer to another person, who I believe is still the President of the Prawn Boat Owners Association and who stated that the industry is not nearly as bouyant as it was.

I conclude my remarks by seeking information from the Minister. Will these people, about whom I have expressed concern, be given the opportunity to continue? Some of them are supported by the local fishing industry. One of the problems associated with the industry, particulary the scale fishery in Upper Eyre Peninsula, is the fact that the fishermen have to travel a long way to Adelaide to attend meetings, and it is not often possible for them to contribute to discussions (and I am not being critical of AFIC). I am pleased that I have had the opportunity to make these remarks, because I believe that it is essential that traditional fishermen be protected and given tenure of security over their licence so that they can have peace of mind. When fishermen leave the industry, they should be able to transfer their licence so that they can leave with dignity. I support the second reading.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the second reading. Before I make further comment, I believe that a number of issues raised by the member for Stuart need to be discussed. I take it that the member for Stuart, being the first speaker on the Opposition side, is the spokesman for the Opposition and, to that extent, the shadow Minister of Fisheries. He obviously put some work into his speech. However, he was wrong about a number of issues.

First, I refer to his reflection on the new Director, and his suggestion that the appointment was a job for the boys. I understand that there were 10 or 12 applications for that position, and therefore the position was won on merit—either that or it is a reflection on the calibre of other applicants for the position. I have had the opportunity to work with the new Director in his former role as Executive Officer of AFIC, and on those few occasions I was pleased about how he took up the cause in his then position.

He then became Secretary to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, and I had dealings with him on a couple of similar occasions. I have great respect for him. I believe that he will carry out his new task in the same admirable manner. One of the arguments on which the member for Stuart based his debate was the obligation of the licence holder to remain on board his vessel. One could probably argue about this all day, because the fishing industry encompasses a broad spectrum. On the one hand, there are fishermen who are licensed to fish with a 16 ft. dory and two handlines who can make admirable livings if they happen to be in the right fishing industry. If they are catching whiting in an appropriate whiting area, they can make a good living using the simple equipment I have mentioned. However, it would be ridiculous to suggest

that a fisherman using that same 16 ft. dinghy and mere hand tools could trawl for prawns.

The obvious flaw in the argument of the member for Stuart is that he believes that because a commodity comes out of the sea—and this is how he is encompassing the whole industry—it is fishing, and therefore it should all be encompassed under the same licensing system. The obvious implication is that he knows of some A-class licence holders in the managed fisheries who do not work on their vessels. That is probably a fair comment, because there are some who do not work on their vessels. The honourable member was very careful not to name those fishermen, but in most cases those fishermen who have been brought to my attention in that situation are managing the shore-based side of the fishing operation.

Mr. Keneally: I was referring to prawning, not the scale fishing industry.

Mr. BLACKER: I accept that we are referring to the prawn industry and that many licence holders do not actually operate the fishing vessels. I repeat that most of those licence holders are carrying out the shore-based side of the operation. The average prawn trawling operation has a four-man team, three men on board the vessel and one man on the shore who manages the shore-based operation. That is not always the case, but it is often so. If that licence holder is still part of that fishing operation he has every entitlement to act in that way, otherwise he works on the vessel and engages another person to carry out that shore-based duty. It is the team that counts—that distinction needs to be made.

If we adopt the approach of the honourable member for Stuart that all licence holders should be on board the vessel, the future development in off-shore fisheries will be strangled. South Australian fishermen would never be able to participate in deep-sea trawling, long-lining, squid jigging or krill; they are all aspects of the fishing industry that as yet are unexplored. South Australian fishermen cannot participate in these areas of the fishing industry if the licence holder is obliged to be on board his vessel. That is a human impossibility, because it would then require millions of dollars to operate that licence in the fishing industry. The whole spectrum of the fishing industry, particularly since we have become more seriously involved in it through the 200-mile off-shore limit, has become big business. The little dinghy with the hand equipment no longer applies. The spectrum is so wide that a completely different approach is required for each area of the fishing industry. I further suggest that it is not possible to have an overall management programme for the managed fisheries, because it would be necessary to separate and itemise every individual fishing operation, and treat each individual fishing operation as a separate identity, and manage that on the peculiarities of each of those projects.

Mr. Keneally: That is a responsibility we are giving to the Director.

Mr. BLACKER: I accept the point made by the honourable member that this Bill gives that sort of responsibility to the Director, and I add a word of caution, because I believe that the responsibility that has been given to the Director is too wide. If the Director, whoever he or she may be, should choose to abuse the obligations that this Bill gives, then we could wreck a fishing industry or we could advantage some to the complete disadvantage of others. In other words, it would be complete chaos.

I view with some trepidation the wide sweeping powers that are given to the Director in this case. I will be seeking from the Minister assurances that such sweeping powers will not be handed over willy-nilly to a director or to any officer without oversight and direct involvement, if possible, by the Minister.

This measure has come before us because of the blatant abuse and depletion of many of our scale fishery resources. On the Sunday prior to 1 April, I visited Coffin Bay. On 1 April the netting season opens in Coffin Bay or Port Douglas Bay. I am a regular visitor to Coffin Bay, and on that Sunday, which was just three days before the opening of the netting season, there were dozens of boats and fishermen in the bay waiting for the netting season to open. The majority of those boats I had never seen in my life, although I have been a regular visitor to Coffin Bay for at least 35 years. I had never seen those fishermen or their vessels previously, yet they were well equipped net vessels, in many cases two vessels with net drums on them. Obviously, they were there to reap the cream of the scale fishing industry in Coffin Bay.

Within a fortnight of the opening of the netting season, not only had the fish disappeared but the majority of that influx of fishermen had disappeared. I believe that some of them come from Yorke Peninsula and some from as far afield as the area of the member for Stuart. I am not being unduly critical in this comment, because I know that that is the way the system is, and fishermen are allowed to do that. It could even be the other way, that many of the fishermen from my area could go into the area of the member for Stuart.

Mr. Keneally: They might have been on holiday.

Mr. BLACKER: The honourable member is being rather charitable to some of his fishermen if that is the way he likes to put it. The overall effect of that influx was that Coffin Bay was raped of its fish resource.

Mr. Millhouse: Good Lord, that is a strong word to use.

Mr. BLACKER: It is a strong word to use, but one should look at the resulting implications. I know, and the Minister of Fisheries will back me up, because at least one Minister and probably others have visited Coffin Bay since 1 April, and even after the first fortnight after the opening of the season, that the scale fishing industry at Coffin Bay has been seriously affected because there was no way in which the Government, the Director or the Minister could control or apply restrictions to the manner in which the resource was handled.

We could probably go around the State coastline and find similar examples, but the Bill's purpose is to enable the Director to use common sense and apply such restrictions as are necessary to preserve these resources. The Bill gives much wider and more flexible powers, but the implication is that it prevents the holder of a managed fishery authority, as its presently stands, from reverting back and reaping the cream of the scale fishing industry.

I have already quoted the Coffin Bay example, and I think it is fair to say that many (not all) of the privileged authority holders who held authorities in the rock-lobster area were among those who cashed in on the initial fortnight of net fishing in the Coffin Bay and Port Douglas areas.

This Bill enables the Director to say, "No, you cannot do that", but it is also wide enough for him to allow a rock-lobster authority holder, for instance, who, traditionally, for the whole of his life, has turned to shark fishing during the winter months, to continue to do so. Should that fishery require management, the Director also has power to be able to do something about that.

As I have already mentioned, my fear is of the extremely wide-sweeping powers given to one man under this Bill. I have confidence that the present incumbent of that position will be able to handle that in a most admirable manner, but I cannot be confident that the incumbent of the position will always be the Director of Fisheries. Accordingly, we must always protect ourselves from a change of administration that may take place. To

that end, I trust that the Minister will see fit to exercise close control over any actions taken by his Director.

As I understand the Act, the only avenue available to a disgruntled licence holder is through section 34 of the Fisheries Act particularly relating to subsections (3), (4), (5), and (6), which enable the Minister to exercise a power of review and to appoint a competent person to review the Director's decisions. As we all know, this has been a very cumbersome way of at least giving a person a second chance. I think we would all have to say that, in the last three years, it has been a negative avenue available to fishermen, because very few have ever succeeded. However, because it is written into the Act, the actual process has had to be carried out.

I believe that the fisheries reviews and the fisheries appeals under Mr. Harniman have been a very costly exercise to the State Government. When we consider the wording of the Act is such that the Director has almost absolute say, I think one questions the wisdom of the Government in carrying on as it has done. Nevertheless, this enables further management (and I think this is the word that we are after) of our present resources to prevent over-exploitation and to enable fishermen to get a fair share and a reasonable living from fishing.

I mentioned earlier when commenting on some remarks from the member for Stuart that, if we adopt his proposal, that all licence holders should be on board their vessels, we are going to totally restrict fisheries development in our off-shore areas. To me, this is a very necessary development for the future of South Australia. I believe that, within our off-shore areas, we hold the ability to be able to provide many thousand of jobs. I realise that that is a wide-sweeping statement but we just do not know the potential, and I do not think we can comprehend the job opportunities that exist in our southern waters.

I do not think that krill has even been thought of by many South Australians, but evidently it is down near the Antarctic in many thousands of tonnes. Also, 860 to 870 tonnes of squid was caught off Port Lincoln during this last season. That may not be enough to be an economic venture, but it was the very first season and, as such, future development could prove that we have a major processing outlet that could be available.

If the Australian fishing industry or the South Australian fishermen processors' bunkering facilities and stevedoring facilities could be used, thousands and thousands of jobs would be created. For that reason, I cannot agree with the member for Stuart when he says that all licence holders should be on board the vessel. However, we get back to the basic reason for implementation of this Bill, which is, in the first instance, to try to do something for the sake of the scale fishing industry. To that extent, we are dealing with fishermen with small assets, relatively small boats, generally one-man or two-man operations. This Bill would provide protection in that situation.

What oversight will the Minister be implementing in the control of this measure? I am concerned that the powers given to the Director are very wide-sweeping, and I am equally concerned that this puts him in a most invidious position when disputes arise. It makes him the arbitrator between one fishing group and another, and he then becomes a self-appointed arbitrator between two fishermen within the same area. He then has to decide whether the area can substantiate or maintain four or five fishermen operating in that area. The powers being granted to him in this relatively small Bill are enormous. I do not believe that any Bill of four clauses presented to this Parliament has given any person such wide-sweeping powers.

Finally, I ask the Minister to give the assurance that I am looking for that close oversight will be maintained or, if there is some provision so that amendments can be made to ensure that the position cannot be abused, I would welcome his advice.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill and the Government's endeavors to attempt to rationalise the over fishing of a reducing natural resource, an industry within this State. In doing so, I commend the Minister and the Government for at least taking some initiative in regard to protecting that resource for future years. He and the Government have at least been prepared to grasp the nettle, but the former Administration was not. Whilst there are some aspects that I would like to see the Government take further steps on, at least it is taking steps in the right direction to protect this resource.

In doing so, I think that one of the first criteria that this House ought to look at is the protection of the livelihood of the individuals involved in the industry itself, particularly those whose principal income is derived from the fishing industry, and principally those whose major capital investment is in the fishing industry to derive their living. It is those people who I believe initially should receive first consideration and every consideration. The Government, in this legislation, has taken initial steps (and I stress that they are initial steps) to achieve that end for the protection of the industry and the protection of those who derive their principal and only income from the capital invested. Because of the time of the evening, I do not propose to further debate the Bill other than to support it with those few remarks.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Minister of Fisheries): I thank the honourable members who have spoken and, indeed, the member for Stuart for the Opposition's contribution to the debate. The Bill is the result of an investigation that was set in train by the previous Minister. Now, the honourable member waxes eloquent about some of the evil things that could happen as a result of the Director being given outlandish powers. If one casts one's mind back to the previous debate we had on this matter, one will remember that there is little difference now from the powers vested in the Director at that time.

I refer to the joint consultative committee that was set up by the previous Minister; it did an excellent job. It was based on the Jones scale-fishing report and, undoubtedly, scale fishing is in bad shape. The resource is run down and, irrespective of who is in power, there is a duty to see that this important resource is maintained. Cabinet considered the consultative committee's report for a long time. This has not been an easy matter to come to grips with. The report was the subject of a Cabinet subcommittee, which frustrated the industry and AFIC because of the length of time we deliberated. The subcommittee consisted of the Hon. Mr. Chapman, the Hon. Mr. Arnold and me. Arising from the discussions of that committee (as the fishing industry and the Opposition know), we did not accept all of the consultative committee's report, although we have gone a long way indeed in accepting the recommendations.

We came to office expressing the view that the resource is the most important aspect in a fishing industry because, if there is not resource, there is no industry. We have concentrated on the resource. Since the decision has been taken, many amateurs, as well as class A and class B fishermen, are unhappy about the present situation. I assure the member for Stuart that we were unable to have the Bill in the House in February and March. So complex and delicate have the issues been that we find ourselves

virtually in mid-year when it is vital that this legislation goes forward.

The honourable member raised certain doubts and fears about the power of the Director, and he was kind enough today to tell me that he wanted to move certain amendments, but time does not permit him to do so. I will not canvass the nature of the amendments, but they will be moved in another place, and the House will have an opportunity to debate them next week. In my second reading explanation (and this probably concerns the member for Flinders), I said that the Bill gives power to the Director to move in certain areas, and reference is made to the fact that all licensed fishermen are currently entitled to legal access to the marine scale fishery by virtue of the licence they have under section 30 of the Act.

With the growing concern in relation to the stocks of scale fish, it is necessary to restrict access to the fishery by persons whose fishing licences carry endorsements that allow access to the tuna, rock lobster, prawn, and abalone fisheries. It is considered that class A licensees who are dependent for their livelihood on the marine scale fishery should be given preferential access to that fishery. After all, that is where these people earn their living. At present, A-class licensees cannot move into the rock lobster or prawn fishery. If they did so, all hell would break loose, and they would find themselves in much trouble. So, this Bill does nothing more than preserve for these people the right to enjoy the products of their fishery.

Regarding the sweeping powers which are provided for in the amendment and which are worrying people, I assure members that no further action will be taken that will have consequences for persons who hold entitlements to the tuna, prawn, rock lobster and abalone fisheries, unless the industry has been consulted. I give the member for Stuart, the Opposition spokesman for this area, that assurance. I said in my second reading explanation that no further action was proposed at present in relation to those fisheries, and that those fisheries which are currently covered by the managed fisheries regulations will continue to be managed under those provisions until there has been an opportunity to seek, if there is need for change, specific consultation with those affected sectors of the industry and the organisational body. I repeat that assurance.

Irrespective of what fears members opposite may have about the Director, I remind them that the Government appointed the Director and, despite what has been said about him this afternoon, the Government runs this show. It did not introduce this legislation until it had considered all of the arguments that had been advanced and a concensus had been achieved. In reaching the stage that has now been reached, there has not been complete agreement amongst Government members; I consider it to be a good thing that that sort of healthy discussion has occurred.

The member for Stuart asked whether I could define a fishing unit. It can be defined generally as a principal vessel with one or more dinghies that are used in the fishing operation only when using nets attached to the main vessel. The honourable member raised some doubts about employee fishermen being on boats. I think he said he agreed with that principle. However, the honourable member wanted me to say whether this principle would be extended to the prawn fishery. I inform the honourable member that we are not interfering with the prawn fishery. As the member for Flinders has said, there is a big investment in this fishery, and it would be totally wrong for us to jump off the springboard. The Director has strong powers, and it would be even worse if the Government decided that this was the time to interfere with the fishery.

This Bill has been introduced because of the report on the scale fisheries, and that is the area we are considering. The consultative committee's report recommended that those employees working continuously in the industry as at the relevant date were entitled to be considered for an A-class fishing licence, and a call will be given at the appropriate time. B-class fishermen also will be given the opportunity to convert to an A-class fishing licence.

Mr. Keneally: And if they all do convert, what increase in effort will occur?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is a bridge we will cross when we get to it. There are employees who have participated in the industry since that date, and there may well be cases of hardship that can be demonstrated to the Government—cases that are beyond the cut-off point —and we will be prepared to consider each case separately and sympathetically. The member for Eyre mentioned people with large investments in this industry who could find themselves cut off without a feather to fly with, and it would be an unjust Government that would ignore their position. There is no doubt that the amount of effort in the scale fishery must be reduced to ensure an adequate income and livelihood for the full-time, A-class fishermen in the industry. I must emphasise that, while the Director has power under the Fisheries Act to grant or refuse an application for a fishing licence, the Minister has the power to review the Director's decision under section 34(4), which provides:

> A person whose application for a licence is refused may by writing delivered to the Minister within one month after receiving notice of the refusal request the Minister to have the Director's decision reviewed and shall state the grounds for the request.

Further, section 34(5) provides:

> The Minister shall thereupon appoint a competent person to review the Director's decision and make a recommendation in respect thereto.

So, contrary to fear expressed in the debate thus far, the Director is not all-powerful. The member for Stuart, pursuing a question he asked in the House earlier this afternoon, asked whether we had discussions with AFIC. I told him that I believed the President of AFIC and the Executive Officer were on holidays. As far as I am concerned, they knew about this Bill and indeed wanted it introduced. The new Director has not had the opportunity to talk to them, but he will be doing so. The honourable member also expressed some fears about the scale fish operations being tied in with rock lobster fishing, etc., but I think I have covered that point; there will not be any interference in these areas unless there is discussion with the industry. I surely do not have to spell that out any more than I have already done.

The member for Stuart expresssed concern about the young man who has been appointed Director of Fisheries. We read the article he referred to about jobs for the boys, or the boy for the job, and that was all very humorous. However, as far as the Government is concerned, this young man is very bright, if that is the matter that members want emphasised. The Government considered 10 applications for the position of Director of Fisheries, and decided that Mr. Stevens had the most appropriate qualifications for the position, despite what the member for Stuart has said. His experience as Executive Officer in the Australian Fishing Industry Council, in which he gained an excellent knowledge of the commercial fishing industry, along with his experience advising three Government Ministers on fisheries matters, is invaluable to the position of Director.

We did not take these matters from the referees. We had long and probing discussions with the people with

whom he has worked since he left this State. They were a loath to lose him. Peter Nixon said to me, "God, you are not going to do that to us, are you?" He said, "Anyway, good luck to Richard Stevens. He is a great guy." That is what the Minister for Primary Industry thought about our bringing this young man to South Australia.

Mr. Stevens has also had extensive administrative experience in both the private and public sectors and the Government considers that his appointment combines the necessary administrative capacity, and knowledge of the fishing industry. The member for Stuart will eat his words as time goes on, because Richard Stevens takes up a very hard task. He has only been working at it for a couple of weeks but he has faced a few hot meetings and he will have to face more.

The task will not be easy. We need the co-operation of the Opposition and of everyone else if the scale fishery is going to go. Our policy is that everyone has a right to take fish. I am speaking of amateurs in that regard. However, professional A-class fishermen in the scale fishery have invested big money and their livelihood and families depend on the fishery. They are entitled to some protection that that fishery offers. I take the point made by the honourable member about the prawn nets taking up the scale fisheries. I know that matter is difficult, because they have to fish in the same waters, but I have taken heed of what the honourable member has said and I will be discussing that matter with the Director. These are not easy problems but they are practical and I appreciate the point made by the honourable member.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: One could go on for a very long time, but this matter will be considered next week in another place. Standing Orders prevent me from saying much about my discussions with the honourable member this afternoon, but the honourable member's opposite number in the Legislative Council will have an opportunity to move his amendments, and we will consider them. I thank members who have contributed to the debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 June at 2 p.m.