HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 21 April 1983

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

PETITION: VICTOR HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 403 residents of the Victor Harbor area praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the proposed development at Victor Harbor by Port Victor Developments Pty Ltd was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question, I inform the House that, in the absence of the Deputy Premier, questions normally directed to him will be taken by the Minister of Local Government.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Government take action to remove from the Public Service employment application forms the declaration that the applicant will join a union after appointment? In reply to my question yesterday about the Public Service Board memorandum to permanent heads requiring them to inform unions of the names of public servants who are non-union members, the Premier said that the Government did not have a policy of compulsory unionism.

However, my office has been contacted by many people who have applied for Public Service positions expressing the view that the practices the Government is now following are intimidating to them. As a result of the Government's so-called preference to unionist policy, the standard Public Service application form now requires an applicant to sign the following declaration:

> I undertake to join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment and remain a member of an appropriate union whilst employed in the Government.

No reference is made on the form to opportunities to declare a conscientious objection to joining a union. Applicants for Public Service positions who have contacted my office have expressed the fear that they will not get the job unless they have signed the declaration. In other words, they view the declaration as compelling them to join a union.

The Premier has said that that is not the object of the Government's policy; rather, he says, the Government merely wants to encourage people to join a union. If this is the case, the Government can demonstrate its good faith by removing the declaration on union membership which applicants for Public Service positions are required to sign, as their union status must now be revealed to the relevant union by the permanent head of the department. As the Premier has refused to withdraw the instruction to permanent heads to provide this information to unions, I ask him to take action to withdraw the union membership declaration on the application forms as this will remove the compulsion which applicants feel at present to agree to join a union.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: When we consider all the issues confronting this State, including the major economic problems in certain areas, I am amazed that the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a coffee shop. I shall see that Standing Orders are upheld.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —continues to persist with this subject. It is even more extraordinary when we consider that the present Opposition, when in Government, did more to lower the morale, effectiveness and general tone of what was one of the best Public Services in Australia than any previous Government did. It is disgraceful now to hear Opposition members supposedly taking up the cudgels on behalf of a Public Service they virtually brought to its knees when in Government. One of our problems since coming to Government is to rekindle the enthusiasm, competence and expertise of our public sector because the loss of morale and the agitation that occurred during the term of the previous Government was such that it was severely jeopardising the efficient delivery of public services in this State, and I remind members that it is upon that efficient delivery that our economic viability depends. The short answer to the Leader's question (whether or not I shall order the withdrawal of the declaration required of applicants for positions in the Public Service) is 'No', and he knows that the answer is 'No'.

From 1965 to 1968 and again from 1970 to 1979, the policy of the Government was preference to unionists in the form that has been talked about, or in some variation of that form, which has operated in the Public Service very successfully indeed. Since 1973 the provision about which the Leader has made such great play over the past 24 hours and about which he has had major press headlines (about which he must feel very satisfied) has been in force, and I suggest that he has persisted with this subject merely to obscure the unsatisfactory financial and economic position we have inherited. He has tried to throw a smoke screen over our economic position in this way, but from 1973 to 1980 that policy on preference to unionists was in force. What was the result of it? I suggest that the result was an effective, efficient and trouble-free Public Service.

The industrial record in South Australia of the public sector was the envy of all other States. When we contrast what happened between 1979 and 1982 with the previous satisfactory position, we realise that for the first time in the 100-year history of the South Australian Public Service we had strikes and for the first time we had constant rolling agitation and disputation brought about by the confrontationist policies of the previous Government. I simply put this to the House: do we want to return to that situation or do we rather want to use our public sector productively? I believe that the policies that operated from 1965, with some interruption, for about 15 years are the policies that need to be restored. As to the scurrilous suggestion of pay-offs let me refer the Leader to the front page of today's *Advertiser* and then he can tell us whether there is a pay-off.

RACECOURSE CONCESSIONS

Mrs APPLEBY: As a member of the Parliamentary Labor Party's Committee on Community Welfare, I ask the Minister of Recreation and Sport what has been the reaction to the recent introduction of a pensioner concession on admission charges to metropolitan racecourses. I believe that this concession is specifically aimed at a section of the population (namely, the elderly) who should be encouraged to retain an active interest in life. Racing is an ideal pastime for the aged because it promotes social contact, friendly company, and mental stimulation. I certainly hope that the pensioner concession meets with the success it deserves.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I thank the honourable member for the question. My information from the South Australian

Jockey Club is that the pensioner concession has been well received and that the club has declared the move a success. The concession applied from 9 April and again last Saturday. The attendance at the first meeting was encouraging, despite the inclement weather. I have received a similar report about last Saturday's meeting, at which attendances by pensioners showed a definite increase.

Mr Becker: By how many?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am sure that numbers will increase when pensioners become more aware of the concession applying. I might point out for the benefit of the House, and particularly the member for Hanson, that the requirement for obtaining a concession is a simple one: all that the pensioners have to do is to produce their medical benefits card at the entrance gate and they will be admitted to the derby enclosure on normal metropolitan race days for a reduced fee. I understand from the South Australian Jockey Club that a different concession rate will apply on carnival race days.

I also point out that the provision of this pensioner concession was an essential element of this Government's platform prior to the election. As the member for Brighton has so rightly pointed out, the concession will assist many people to continue their interest in racing during their retirement. I have passed on my congratulations to the South Australian Jockey Club for taking this decision, which brings it into line with the South Australian Trotting Control Board and, indeed, the Greyhound Racing Control Board.

PILOT PROCESSING PLANT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier ensure that there is no delay in the Government's consideration of the final environmental impact statement prepared for the Roxby Downs project? In the House yesterday, in answer to a question, the Minister of Mines and Energy conceded that some outstanding matters still had to be resolved.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: That is a fine choice of words.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister congratulated me on my choice of words—that there were some problems still outstanding which had to be resolved between the Roxby Downs joint venturers and the Kokatha Aboriginal community before the construction and operation of the pilot processing plant can proceed—a plant which will cost $20 000 000. The member for Mount Gambier outlined some of the escalating claims which have occurred in relation to this matter.

I understand that, at a meeting last night involving the Aboriginal community, the companies and the Government, representatives of the Kokatha people asked the Government to defer its decision on this final e.i.s. I also understand that until the e.i.s. is approved the companies will definitely not start work on the pilot plant. The Aboriginal community, of course, has every right to put forward views about the need to protect sites and the select committee inquiry (which I chaired and of which the Minister of Mines and Energy and the now Minister for Environment and Planning are members), ensured that that process would allow it to do so. The companies have also spoken of existing obligations and laws in preparing the e.i.s. I require from the Government an assurance that nothing will be done in any way which will delay the project.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has that assurance. I reiterate to the House that the situation is as was outlined by the Deputy Leader, in that a meeting was held on the second floor of this building last evening, attended by some 45 or 50 members identifying themselves with Kokatha, certain advisers of that community, representatives of the company, four Government Ministers, and certain public servants. There was an extremely good mood associated with the meeting and I believe people went away feeling that the matter had been very properly aired. There is a problem in relation to being able to get together all necessary anthropological material in the time frame which is accepted by the Government for the assessment of all materials arising out of the e.i.s. and any other information that becomes available as a result of that work. The Government is quite confident that it can satisfy the company's requirements in this matter. The Ministers present at the meeting will be putting certain propositions to our colleagues during the next couple of weeks to ensure that that happens.

CROSS-CODE BETTING

Mr MAYES: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport considered the extension of cross-code betting, and will he advise what effects the extension of cross-code betting may have on the racing industry? The matter has been of interest to people in the racing industry for many years. I have been informed that the view was reached between the South Australian Trotting Club and the South Australian Greyhound Racing Board that there should be agreement. However, on several occasions only has there been cross-code betting at these functions. Can the Minister investigate this matter?

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Before I answer the real content of the question, I shall provide to the members of the House some of the background details in regard to this issue. The problem has been with us for some time. The previous Government did not take any action to resolve the matter.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I might point out to members of the House, and particularly for the edification of the member for Alexandra, who I know is an ardent supporter of racing in South Australia, the history of the situation. Back in 1979 a conference was held between the three codes, that is, the South Australian Jockey Club, the trotting control people, and the Greyhound Racing Control Board. At that meeting it was agreed that the codes would not seek to extend cross-code betting beyond the courses where it had traditionally occurred, namely, at trotting meetings at Franklin Harbor, Kimba and Whyalla, for greyhound racing at Barmera, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, and at Whyalla from 12 August 1981.

In 1980 the South Australian Trotting Control Board and the South Australian Greyhound Racing Control Board agreed in principle to cross-code betting between their respective codes. However, since then on only approximately seven occasions have cross-code betting services been provided between those codes. The control of cross-code betting relates to a number of factors—bookmakers and on-course totalisator.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Betting Control Board issues instructions to bookmakers, including specific directions about the meetings at which they are permitted to bet. With on-course totalisators, clubs await direction from their controlling authority when cross-code betting is involved. As I have said, successive Ministers have advised the codes that every effort should be made (which I believe is a correct procedure) to reach consensus between themselves before approaches are made to the Minister.

Therefore, in accordance with the Government's policy, I have now established a racing industry advisory committee to enable those codes to advise the Government in relation to industry matters. I point out that a meeting has been held. I believe it is important that changes in cross-code betting be examined very carefully, because there could be implications in regard to the codes concerned.

I am also advised that in Victoria and New South Wales cross-code betting has been operating for some time. The experiences of those States ought to be taken into consideration in regard to any extension of cross-code betting in South Australia. I am optimistic for the future of racing in South Australia, and that optimism is substantiated by current trends in betting turnover both on and off the course. I believe that all codes should now give consideration to a fresh look, perhaps including that cross-code betting in South Australia.

I say that being aware that there would be certainly some disadvantages associated with the extension of cross-code betting, but perhaps those disadvantages would have to be carefully considered and weighed up against such a decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Perhaps I have not identified any disadvantages except to say again, for the information of the member for Alexandra, that I would prefer, as would the previous Minister have preferred, that the racing codes themselves agree willingly to the extension of cross-code betting.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Can the Minister of Education say whether Cabinet, he, the Director-General of Education, or any other person has given the instruction that the names of teachers or ancillary staff employed by the Education Department who are not presently union members be supplied to the appropriate unions?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have explained on a number of occasions the situation in the Education Department. We have an instruction that has gone out to new applicants in the school assistant area and in the teacher area which relates to members of the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The honourable member would have heard the response of the Premier to the question by the Leader of the Opposition on the instruction that went out from the Public Service Board about the names of people who are not members of unions.

Members who come within the canvass of the South Australian Institute of Teachers are not referred to in that memorandum. Members who could be members of the Public Service Association, of course, are canvassed in that, and accordingly they would be the ones affected by that directive.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Premier assure the House that South Australia's steel industry has been given the highest priority by the Government, and can he explain what steps have been taken to maintain a viable steel industry in this State?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter that the honourable member raises is of great concern in his electorate and the city of Whyalla, but it also very much affects the State as a whole. I confirm that my Government has been working very closely with the Federal Government in preparing a development plan for the Australian steel industry in which, of course, we play a major part. The Steel Advisory Council, which is a Federal body reporting to the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator Button, is currently considering the draft I.A.C. report on the iron and steel industry. This report was released on 21 March. At the time of its release I criticised the majority of the recommendations in the report because it advocated only a five-year protection term for the steel industry. I argued that what was needed was a longer term plan, and at that time the Federal Minister indicated support for that argument. The Steel Advisory Council is composed of members from the Federal Government, the Federal Opposition, unions, employers, importers, and users. At its last meeting, which was the first since the change of Federal Government, it established three working parties, two of which involved this State Government. One was aimed at improving Australia's international competitiveness. The second related to assistance package options, including their impact on up-stream and down-stream industries. That one, of course, is crucial in the question of the future of Whyalla, B.H.P., and the steel industry.

Officials from the Department of State Development will be participating actively in these working parties, and I have great confidence in their abilities in this area. In addition, at the national economic summit last week I made specific representations on behalf of the steel industry. I argued for a more specific and practical approach to our steel industry. I argued that the I.A.C. should take greater account of social and economic costs and, most importantly in the case of Whyalla, regional considerations as well. Members would have noticed that the summit communique contained some positive statements regarding protection and industry policy, and the concept of maintaining and increasing employment in our manufacturing sector is embodied in that document.

Of course, we also had the Prime Minister's statement of 22 March, when he confirmed his campaign pledge that a viable steel industry was necessary and would be maintained in Australia. Senator Button has set up a special section in his own department to investigate the steel industry. I have taken every opportunity to speak repeatedly with the Federal Government about the Whyalla steel industry, but of course, ultimately, as I think Senator Button was reported as saying today, the decision depends on him.

I think that the way he put it was that there are many views on not only the steel industry but other types of manufacturing upon which ultimately the Government must decide. In the case of Whyalla I believe (and I am sure that the honourable member would confirm) that it is a competitive and efficient operation. It has not been run down, like interstate plants.

Over the past five years or so a major amount of capital expenditure has taken place there and it should be well placed, provided that breathing space is given, to operate on an internationally competitive market. Indeed, until quite recently it was exporting certain product from there. Certainly, we are caught up in a world-wide situation, and the steel industry has suffered from declining production, retrenchments, and falling profits, but it is vital to this State's future.

As far as Whyalla is concerned it employs something like 5 per cent of the work force directly but, more importantly, about 87 per cent of the residents of the city are indirectly dependent on that industry. Therefore, I am glad that the Federal Government is responding to the representations being made to it, and we will continue to argue the case very rigorously, not only for a steel industry but for Whyalla in particular.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: My question is subsequent to the question asked this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. Will the Premier say whether the Government's preference to unionists policy extends to employees of private companies undertaking contract work for the Government, and also advocates for either part-time work or casual positions within Government departments or statutory authorities? The Labor Party's policy platform on this matter is rather open ended. Clause 2 (6) of the industrial relations policy states that the State Labor Government would provide preference to unionists. There is no reference in that policy to the degree of compulsion with which a Labor Government would seek to impose this policy. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether the Government has made it a condition that all private companies undertaking Government contract work must also or only employ union members on such work, and whether people applying for either part-time or casual employment with either Government departments or statutory authorities are also required to undertake to join a union, even though as casual employees they may be working for only one week.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have that information to hand. I will consult with my colleague, the Minister for Labour, and see what the policy is.

AUSTRALIAN TOURIST COMMISSION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Tourism inform the House whether there has been any beneficial result to the South Australian tourist industry from the operations of the Australian Tourist Commission Asian branch? Recent press reports suggest that the Australian Tourist Commission Asian branch has completed the first year of operations and that results have been very successful. With a direct air link to South Australia from Singapore, Adelaide should become an important stopover for the growing markets of Singapore, Malaysia and surrounding areas. The Australian Tourist Commission has stated that its next target for tourist promotion would be our near neighbour, Indonesia. Is there any likelihood that Adelaide will receive an influx of Indonesian tourists from any possible promotion from this year?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the honourable member would know, the Australian Tourist Commission is a Federal body. However, South Australia has a significant input into that body through the presence of the Deputy Chairman, Mr Inns, who is Director of Tourism in South Australia. The Australian Tourist Commission, which established its office in Singapore in December 1981, is responsible for countries such as Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Thailand and the Philippines which is the fastest growing area for tourism in Australia. Figures taken out for the two years to December 1981 (the latest figures available) show that the number of visitors to Australia from South-East Asia grew by 39.6 per cent, and over the same period the number of visitors to South Australia from South-East Asia grew by 47.1 per cent. These are the most recent figures available as a result of the inquiries, for it is too early to assess the precise impact that the Australian Tourist Commission Singapore office has made on visitations to Australia and South Australia.

However, the officers conducted two well-organised and comprehensive promotional campaigns throughout the area in which the South Australian Department of Tourism has participated. The A.T.C. predicts that tourism from South-East Asia to Australia will increase by about 14 per cent a year over the next three years. I agree that, with direct air links to South Australia from Singapore, South Australia's market position in South-East Asia will be enhanced, and the Department of Tourism will be giving increased attention to this area. Indonesia is included within the tourism area of the South-East Asian office of the A.T.C., so naturally that country will receive attention as part of the activities of that office. However, I do not see any immediate likelihood of a significant influx of Indonesian tourists to Australia, given that only 15 000 of them visited our shores during 1981.

UNIONISM

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier now confirm that persons applying for part-time or casual positions in the Government service have to join the appropriate union? In answer to an earlier question the Premier indicated that he was unsure of any such Cabinet instruction. An applicant for a part-time position with the Department of Technical and Further Education has provided me with a copy of the application form, which includes the following requirement (stamped on the back of the form):

> Should this application be successful I hereby undertake to join an appropriate union within reasonable time after my appointment.

The applicant has also informed me that, because she refuses to sign this declaration, she does not expect her application to be successful. Because of the confusion, I now ask the Premier to fully explain how the Government's policy is being applied.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already said that this is in the purview of the Minister of Labour, who is unfortunately not here to answer the question. Therefore, I do not have the precise details required by the Opposition, but it appears to me that the Leader has the information, or certainly aspects of it, in his hand.

I certainly undertake, as I did a moment ago, to get the information and supply it. I do not see what the problem is. Let me just repeat: this really is an extraordinary issue to be pursued, because I think I have made our Government's position quite clear and the fact that that position has operated historically and extremely successfully, and I would suggest, incidentally, that if one looks at the practice of most of the large employers in this country it will be seen that they go far beyond what this Government is doing because they insist on closed shops. A question was asked a moment ago about outside contracts.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: It's only pressure from unions that has caused those employers to be forced into that situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is juvenilian. A question was asked a moment ago about private contracts, that is, those private companies outside the Government doing work. I will get the precise information requested, but I would make the point that many of these companies operate a tight closed shop for reasons of industrial policy which are soundly based. If the Opposition wants to throw open the whole question of conciliation and arbitration and to look to the practices of the media (where there has been much publicity), I would point out that a closed shop is run in the printing industry and in respect of the Australian Journalists Association, with the active support of the proprietors. That is regarded as an acceptable industrial practice. In what sense is the Government, as a major employer, departing from proper employment practice that is accepted and has been accepted in this country for some time?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The logic of what is being urged on the Government is to go further than we have gone, and perhaps we should examine that aspect. Our policy is not underhand and has been clearly set out. As the matter referred to is apparently set out in circulars possessed by the Opposition which are not before me at present, I will obtain the information requested.

680 BUS SERVICE

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the 680 bus route presently leaving Trott Park and terminating at Flinders University is to be rerouted? If it is, will the Minister say when and where this rerouting will take place? The residents of Trott Park, Sheidow Park and Hallett Cove have, since 1980, requested that the State Transport Authority reroute the 680 bus service into the Hallett Cove railway station instead of the Brighton railway station, thus providing access to the nearest station for the residents of Trott Park and Sheidow Park and providing a bus service into Hallett Cove, which presently has no such service.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I have had this matter investigated and can inform the honourable member that the rerouting of bus 680 will take place within the next few weeks to suit the needs of people in that area. I am happy to undertake to let the honourable member know within a few weeks the exact commencement date of the rerouted bus service.

HONEYMOON COMPENSATION

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say how much the Honeymoon partners are seeking in compensation as a result of the Government's decision to refuse approval of a production licence for that project and whether the Beverly partners have indicated to the Minister that they intend to make a similar claim? I seek this information because such compensation claims have the potential to cost South Australian taxpayers a significant sum. It has also been put to me that the Government's decision has already cost Treasury royalty losses of about $32 000 000. I therefore believe that taxpayers, through this House, have a right to be informed of the possible cost to them of the Government's decision on the Honeymoon and Beverley projects.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am tempted to deal first with the more absurd content of the honourable member's question regarding royalty losses, according to him of $32 000 000, in respect of a production that would take place over some years, for which the market scene was unclear, and for which presumably the economics of the operations were still in a developing stage. The honourable member seems to have been able to do all the arithmetic concerned and come up with a figure that has been plucked out of thin air. As to the amount being claimed in compensation by the proponents concerned in the Honeymoon venture, certain sums are specified both by quantity and in the generality. That is the answer which I believe I should give the honourable member at this stage. The honourable member was at some pains to point out that there is possibly some involvement of State funds if compensation were to be considered and paid in the circumstances he has outlined.

I think he would also understand that at this stage he would not receive any further commitment from me on that matter. I have asked the Attorney-General to examine the claims that have been put forward, and I believe that the honourable member would understand that that is a responsible step. I have already informed the honourable member that the claims are couched both in general terms and in certain amounts. I do not believe that I would be serving the best interests of the proponents in bandying around in this House the amounts concerned. I will undertake, if the honourable member wishes, to indicate privately to him the amounts involved. This is a very important—

Mr Ashenden: They should be public knowledge.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If they are public knowledge, why is the honourable member asking me what the amounts are?

Mr Ashenden: I said, "they should be public knowledge."

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That is a different connotation that the honourable member is now trying to put on the matter. He has not even got his act together on his own side. I want to state clearly that there are rights in these matters which are not the playthings of members of Parliament, who may be wishing to score some political capital.

Mr Ashenden: No, to protect the taxpayer.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Todd to order.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The companies have a right to approach the Government in this matter, and they have exercised that right. They also have a right to expect that the matter will be treated responsibly and not just bandied about for political purposes. I do not intend to give a public answer in the way that the honourable member has tried to obtain. I will, however, as I said, if he wishes to see me privately later, endeavour to give him the information he seeks, on the basis that it remains confidential to him.

If there is something wrong with that attitude, I can only say that I believe that I have adopted a proper and correct attitude in this matter, an approach having been made in such a way, that is, an approach in writing to the Government, not per the columns of the newspapers. The other question asked by the honourable member was about the situation concerning Beverley. At this stage I have not received any approach in that area from the proponents concerned with Beverley.

ROXBY DOWNS WATER

Mr WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Water Resources provide any information concerning the supply of water to the proposed uranium mine at Roxby Downs? The *Advertiser* recently carried a news item headed 'Problems if Roxby Downs gets Murray water', and stating in part:

> Mr Hullick, Chairman of the Save the Murray campaign, said yesterday the uranium mine would need a massive water supply. A decision had to be made on whether to pipe water from the Murray River or obtain it from underground supplies, but not enough was known about the underground sources. 'A pipeline looks like being the obvious choice'—

That was what Mr Hullick said.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The comments referred to by the member for Price and attributed, I believe, to the Chairman of the Save the Murray campaign, Mr Hullick, certainly need some clarification. Section 13 of the Olympic Dam project indenture Act details agreement between the South Australian Government and the joint venturers concerning the provision of water. It is limited to mine and town water requirements up to a level of production of, I think, 150 000 tonnes per annum.

Two main sources of water are identified: first, underground water; and, secondly, by an E. & W.S. Department

supply at Port Augusta. In respect of the underground resource, which is believed to be the more economic source for both potable and non-potable uses, it is expected that a well field could be established up to 100 kilometres to the north of Olympic Dam in the Great Artesian Basin.

The indenture requires that the Minister of Water Resources issue a special water licence for this purpose. The Minister would retain the power to regulate the withdrawal of water if there is evidence of the resource being harmed. The Minister also has power to require that the effects of withdrawal are monitored and reported. It is anticipated that adequate supplies will be available but confirmation of this will be the emphasis of the required on-going monitoring. The wellfield pipeline to Olymic Dam and water treatment facilities at Olympic Dam to produce potable water would be constructed and operated by the joint venturers.

The joint venturers' rights to an allocation of water at Port Augusta from the E. & W.S. Department are limited to 9 000 kilolitres a day. These rights will lapse in 1993 if not taken up, thus allowing the E. & W.S. to meet the needs of other development in the Iron Triangle area without unnecessary investment in augmentation works.

In summary, the source of water for this project is now anticipated to be the Great Artesian Basin. Development of this source can be monitored and protected adequately under the terms of the indenture. In the less likely option, the joint venturers may take up to 9 000 kilolitres a day from the E. & W.S. Department system at Port Augusta. The impact on water available for other development in the Iron Triangle is such that all projected likely development may be supplied in addition to this 9 000 kilolitres a day without augmentation of existing systems up to 1993 when this provision will lapse. This water would be drawn from the Murray River at Morgan, being sufficient only for the potable needs of the proposed Olympic Dam township. The effect on total supplies in the Murray River would be very minimal in that it represents at most 1.2 per cent of the minimum annual South Australian entitlement for Murray River water. This quantity is available within the planned provision for increased urban water requirements in the State.

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE MINUTES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier propose at the next Premiers' Conference that all minutes of proceedings be made public? There has been a longstanding convention that proceedings at Premiers' Conferences are confidential. In answer to a question in the House on Tuesday, the Premier breached the convention by quoting selectively from the minutes of the Premiers' Conference held last June, at a time when he was not Premier. Will the Premier raise this matter at the next Premiers' Conference with a view to moving that the minutes be made public so as to avoid any potential selective quoting or misrepresentation of proceedings?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it is a good idea for these things to become public. It certainly is a suggestion worth taking up. However, I point out that these transcripts for a number of years now have been made public on a regular basis. They are usually published at length in the *National Times*. I think that if the honourable member refers to that publication he will find that copious extracts of those transcripts are published.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Is this a serious question?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Extremely serious, after the denial of opportunity on Tuesday.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was attempting to treat it as a serious question, despite the carry-on from members opposite, an attempt to make the proceedings of this House an absolute joke—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: May I make the serious statement that, first, I agree with the honourable member. His question concerned whether these things should be made public. I suggest that they are, yes. The second point, I believe, is a very valid one. These transcripts have in fact been published at some length in the national newspapers for the past 10 years perhaps, so these documents and any quotations are fairly freely available. That is a fact of life and is another reason which would support the honourable member's contention.

ENTERTAINMENT PERMITS

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform me what action he or his department has taken when associations have been issued with a permit up to a certain time and those associations have extended far beyond that time? As he is probably aware, many members of this House have had many complaints about functions that have been held and that have extended far past the permitted time. Can the Minister inform me what action has been taken when these people apply for a further permit?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have some knowledge of this matter and I hasten to assure members that it is a rock group rather than the Noarlunga City Concert Band that has been complained of. The specific answer to the honourable member's question is, of course, that such rock groups jeopardise their chances of getting further exemptions under the appropriate legislation. The matter to which the honourable member is referring, I imagine, is a rock concert that was held at the Underdale campus of the South Australian College—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I take a point of order. Question on Notice No. 72 refers specifically to the concert at the Underdale C.A.E. campus. If the Minister is not going to answer the question then he should say so. It has been on notice long enough now, so how about the Minister answering the question before he answers something put up by the member for Peake? He should play the game!

The SPEAKER: Order! The decision on the point of order is quite straightforward and that is that if the Minister refrains from answering the Question on Notice and specifically answers the question that was asked by the member for Peake, then he will be in order. Therefore, the point of order is partially over.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is quite clear that I am not able to give the House quite as much information as I otherwise would have done. It is not possible for me to refer to that specific instance so I will merely answer generally to what was a generally put question.

The situation where an exemption has been given and subsequently breached is that it does place at risk further exemptions being granted. I think perhaps I am in order in explaining to the House the situation as it relates to rock concerts or open-air performances at Memorial Drive, because there has been an agreement with the City of Adelaide that up to seven exemptions will be made available in any one calendar year. It is unusual for seven applications

to occur in a given year and in fact I was prepared to consent to nine but the City of Adelaide considered that seven was the appropriate number.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Following the Minister of Education's reply to the question asked by the member for Torrens, does the Minister deny that names of teachers employed by the Education Department who do not currently belong to a union have been and are being forwarded to the South Australian Institute of Teachers at the direction of the Government?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thought that I answered that before. The Leader of the Opposition the other day read out a directive that has gone to heads of departments and refers to the appropriate unions involved. Nowhere in that list of unions was the South Australian Institute of Teachers referred to with regard to those who are presently in the employ of the Government. So the directive from the Government that was consequential on a Cabinet decision does not apply.

AROONA DAM

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate whether recent rains have been of any assistance in boosting the holdings of the Aroona dam, which supplies water to Leigh Creek? In March this year I was in Leigh Creek and it was then brought to my attention by a large number of people to whom I spoke that they were very concerned about the future of potable water supplies for Leigh Creek in light of the very long drought that was then in existence.

Since then I have taken a particular interest in this matter because I believe (as many other members who have been to Leigh Creek would no doubt agree) that the town of New Leigh Creek—or Leigh Creek South, as it is more properly known—is an excellent example of town planning and development in an arid area. Quite obviously the matter of drinking water in such a place is of great importance, not only to the citizens of that town but also to the people of South Australia.

The question is basically prompted by the fact that the Aroona dam, or its catchment area at least, missed out on the earlier rains that occurred which caused flooding in parts of the Barossa Valley and other districts in South Australia, and also by my knowledge that the drought has caused quite serious problems in relation to silting of that dam. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he can enlighten the House, and therefore the people of South Australia, as to whether the problems of water supplies to Leigh Creek have been relieved in the past few weeks?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I can say that there has been a considerable augmentation of the holdings of the Aroona dam. Good rains over Easter resulted in more than doubling its holdings. The Electricity Trust has told me that good falls in the catchment area were responsible for an inflow of 1 571 megalitres, which lifted the water level by about three metres. The Aroona Dam is now holding a total of 3 100 megalitres, which is enough on its own to meet Leigh Creek's water needs until mid-1984 without having to resort to supplementary supplies from the reverse osmosis plant which was installed in that area.

I was in the area recently and had the opportunity to inspect Leigh Creek as well as the associated reverse osmosis plant which, I believe, from memory, has a capacity of some 700 000 litres a day. The answer to the honourable member's question is that there has been a considerable improvement in relation to the water supply which will have effect right through until mid-1984.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What new initiatives has the Minister of Water Resources taken to reduce salinity in the Murray River, other than those already announced by the previous Liberal Government? In asking this question I am not referring to those decisions which were announced by the previous Government, such as the preparation and presentation of the permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem, the lock 2, lock 3 ground water interception investigation scheme for which the consultancy was left to Coffey and Partners, or the Lake Victoria, Frenchman's Creek Inlet to Lake Victoria for the provision of a groyne-type construction, to possibly create a better dilution of the salt content of Lake Victoria, or the Rufus River ground water interception scheme, or the Lake Albert study or the completion of the Noora scheme. What I am seeking is what new initiatives has the Government undertaken or implemented since coming into office?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I appreciate the question from the member for Chaffey. It is true that many schemes are under construction and the honourable member has named some which were initiatives not, as he suggested, of his Party when in Government but of the previous Labor Government.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I said—

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If the honourable member will be patient I will explain the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Of course, many of the initiatives started by the previous Government and indeed by the member for Chaffey when he was Minister need to be completed. However, before we take any further action we need to complete those schemes; it is a matter of capital investment. I might point out, for the edification of the honourable member, that next Tuesday I will meet with the Federal Minister for Water Resources, Senator Peter Walsh, to determine the allocation of funds in relation to many matters, including Murray River salinity control. The member would appreciate that capital funds are needed from a Federal source to assist in many projects, such as water filtration and Murray River salinity control.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If the member will be patient I will explain it to him. We need to complete the projects that are currently in hand and I will advise him soon of further initiatives that we will be taking as a Government.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OIL AND GAS (CAPITAL RECONSTRUCTION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 3 May at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 3.4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish an authority to be known as the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia; to prescribe its functions and powers; to repeal the Public Examinations Board Act, 1968; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government is substantively reintroducing the Public Examinations Authority of South Australia Bill, 1982, as the newly-named Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia Bill. This Bill has been introduced to give effect to changes to the South Australian system of accreditation of students in the final year of secondary school, and the Government supports the basic arguments put forward by the previous Minister. Honourable members are referred to *Hansard* of 7 October 1982, pages 1297-1299, to note the second reading explanation given on that occasion.

The need for changes to the examination system was highlighted in the reports of the Committee of Inquiry into Year 12 Examinations in South Australia (the Jones Report) and in the Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia (the Keeves Report). Concern was expressed about the apparent dominance of the universities over the curricula of schools at upper secondary level, the limited range of subjects and their academic orientation, the low retention rate as many opted out of upper secondary education because of perceived lack of relevance of courses, and the inappropriate use being made of the Matriculation certificate in selecting students for employment. The further arguments already presented need not be reiterated here, although there is a need to explain the modifications made to the former Bill in this newly-drafted Bill.

The name change has been made to further distance the new Bill from the Public Examinations Board Act of 1968. As the method of assessing courses may go beyond the conventional three-hour examination, it has been seen fitting to rename the assessment board to reflect this change in emphasis. The Senior Secondary Assessment Board will of course be empowered to develop or approve assessment methods which may or may not include examinations. It will also have the power to vary the length of subjects and the period over which the subjects are studied so that the needs of students currently not staying on at school can be answered with more flexibility.

As the scope of the curricula to be accredited has broadened beyond the narrow purpose of university selection to cater for students entering all tertiary institutions, including the Department of Technical and Further Education, to provide public certification of student achievement, and to assist employers to select students, the representation on the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia has been broadened.

The Bill proposes to increase the membership from the 25 formerly proposed to 29 members to include a nomination of the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity and of the Roseworthy Agricultural College, as well as a second nomination by both the S.A. Commission for Catholic schools and the Independent Schools Board of S.A. This is, however, a decrease from the 32 currently in the Public Examinations Board Act, 1968.

A clause in the Bill in its first form which caused difficulty was clause 17, which gave significant power to the universities to control course content and which subjects should be studied for Matriculation. Discussions have been held by me with the universities, the S.A. Institute of Technology, the S.A. College of Advanced Education, the Education Department, and the Department of Technical and Further Education in an attempt to alleviate these fears. While this clause has been deleted in the Bill before the House, any concern that this may cause a fall of standards has been answered by adding a sunset clause, which ensures that the Act must be reviewed after four years.

As Minister of Technology as well as of Education, I have as a prime aim the realisation of the intellectual powers of the youth of the community. Indeed, I see the increased technical skills and development of intellect-based industries as having a major part to play in our economic recovery, and I do not see this legislation as inhibiting this end.

Measures have also been taken to assuage fears that students will be disadvantaged if they are doing courses already approved by the former board or by the Director-General of Education before the proclamation of the Bill, and so such subjects to be studied in 1983, 1984, or 1985 shall, in relation to those academic years, still be deemed to be a syllabus prepared or approved by the board. Thus the status of the present secondary school certificate subjects and the certificates of agriculture of Urrbrae Agricultural High School, and Cleve and Lucindale Area Schools is not challenged in that time. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Bill. Clause 4 provides definitions required in the interpretation of the Bill. Clause 5 repeals the Public Examinations Board Act, 1968. Clause 6 is a transitional provision transferring property and liabilities of the former board to the new board. Clause 7 establishes the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia as a body corporate. Clause 8 provides for the membership of the board, the appointment of members, their term of office and other related matters.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of a Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the board. Clause 10 provides for matters relating to procedures at meetings of the board. Clause 11 is a savings clause that protects members of the board in the performance of their duties. Clause 12 provides for delegation by the board to members, employees and committees established by the board and to persons appointed by it to assess students. Clause 13 requires disclosure by members of the board of any contractual interest that conflicts with that of the board.

Clause 14 will enable allowances and expenses to be paid to members of the board when necessary. Clause 15 sets out the functions of the board. Clause 16 sets out the powers of the board. Clause 17 provides for the establishment of committees and sub-committees. A committee may delegate

functions and powers to a sub-committee that it has established. Committees and sub-committees may be constituted by persons who are not members of the board.

Clause 18 provides for employees of the board. Clause 19 provides for the keeping and auditing of accounts. Clause 20 requires an annual report to be delivered to the Minister and to be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Clause 21 provides for proceedings to be disposed of summarily. Clause 22 is a financial provision. Clause 23 provides for the making of regulations. Clause 24 provides for the expiry of the Act.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) 1983

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act, 1976-1983. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains provisions designed to enable the introduction by the Totalisator Agency Board of self-service totalisator ticket-issuing machines in South Australia at selected sites for a trial period of up to six months. The self-tote terminal is a self-service ticket issuing machine. It offers a simple method of operation, which is essential for public acceptance, and has been produced after an extensive research and development programme. The machine will be designed for selling only, and all winning tickets will be 'cashed in' at T.A.B. agencies.

In the first instance, the introduction of the machines would be on a trial basis for up to six months. After that period a review of effectiveness and profitability would be undertaken and a report submitted. If the T.A.B. then wished to introduce machines on a wider scale, the proposal would then be placed before Cabinet. If the terminals are introduced on a permanent basis, every location at which they operate will need the separate approval of the Minister.

The major objectives of the introduction of the terminals are to provide additional urgently needed funds to the industry and to give the public a more accessible T.A.B. service. The Government would also benefit directly through sharing any increased T.A.B. surplus with the racing industry. Another significant potential benefit of this scheme is the opportunity it provides for reduction in illegal S.P. betting. Any reduction of illegal betting must bring financial benefits to the racing codes and to the Government.

The locations will be selected where T.A.B. facilities are currently not available. Since the T.A.B. will require a person or persons to be responsible for the terminals in each of the locations selected, which will be under constant supervision, the problem of illegal under-age betting is not likely to occur. It is the opinion of the T.A.B. that the terminals would not have a detrimental effect on employment within T.A.B. In fact, if the trial proves to be successful and a network of these terminals is installed throughout the State, there is a possibility that extra staff will need to be employed to maintain them. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definition section of the principal Act by inserting a definition of 'automatic totalisator betting machine'. This term is defined to mean a machine that is capable of automatically issuing a totalisator betting ticket upon the insertion in the machine of money or a token, card or disc.

Clause 3 amends section 51 of the principal Act which sets out the functions and powers of the T.A.B. The clause adds to the existing power of the board to establish offices, branches and agencies for off-course totalisator betting the power to provide automatic totalisator betting machines for the conduct of off-course totalisator betting. Clause 4 amends section 61 of the principal Act which requires Ministerial approval for the establishment of branches, offices or agencies of the board for the conduct of off-course totalisator betting. The clause adds to this provision a requirement that the Minister's approval must be obtained before an automatic totalisator betting machine is installed in any premises. Under the clause, the Minister is, in determining whether or not to give his approval, to have regard to the proximity of the premises to places of public worship, schools and other educational institutions and such other matters as he considers relevant.

Clause 5 amends section 62 of the principal Act which provides in subsection (1) that the board shall not accept an off-course totalisator bet other than a bet that is made by the deposit of the amount of the bet at an office, branch or agency of the board or a bet made by letter, telegram or telephone message to an office, branch or agency of the board by a person who has established and maintained in accordance with the rules of the board an account that is sufficiently in credit to meet the amount of the bet. The clause adds to this provision as a further authorised method of making an off-course totalisator bet the insertion in an automatic totalisator betting machine of cash for the amount of the bet, or the insertion of a token purchased from the board for the amount of the bet, or the insertion in the machine of a card or disc issued by the board to a person who has established and maintained in accordance with the rules of the board an account that is sufficiently in credit to meet the amount of the bet.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 797).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the Bill which, as it has emerged after being amended in another place, is substantially the same as the Bill which, as Minister of Health, I intended to introduce. There was a detailed, wide-ranging debate on the Bill in another place, and several members participated in it. I do not know that I can add much to the extraordinarily great breadth and depth of the matters covered in that debate. However, I wish to set on record the way in which the consultation process was undertaken on this Bill and also to refer to some of its provisions.

I noted that, in his second reading speech in another place, the Hon. John Burdett referred to Part II of the Bill, saying that the matters relating to donations from living children of non-regenerative tissue which this Bill prohibits are a departure from the model Bill of the Australia Law Reform Commission. Mr Burdett said that he understood that this departure occurred largely because of disquiet on the part of people to whom the draft Bill was circulated by the previous Government. I make clear that the draft Bill circulated for discussion contained this prohibition. What was included as a result of consultation with interested people was a further protection for children in respect of

the transplantation of regenerative tissue: the establishment of a Ministerial committee to act as a monitor to determine whether that transplantation should take place. In other words, the previous Government's Bill prohibited the transplantation of non-regenerative tissue between children, and the consultation persuaded me that further protection for children in terms of regenerative tissue was a good idea.

I also place on record my gratitude to those people who had input into the Bill, including representatives of churches, the Royal College of Pathologists, the renal units of the principal teaching hospitals (the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital), and the Australian Medical Association. As has been said, the Bill follows substantially the recommendations of the Australian Law Reform Commission, but it pursues a more conservative line in two respects: first, in respect of children, as I have outlined; and secondly, in respect of the dignity and integrity of the deceased body. In that regard I consider that the additional precautions that are included in the Bill as a result of the consultations which the previous Government had with interested parties and as a result of amendments moved by the Hon. John Burdett (namely, to protect the dead body by reference to the senior available next-of-kin for permission for anatomical examination) go as far as one can go in legislation to ensure that society's approach to and respect for the bodies of deceased persons are as caring as we can make them.

I do not think I can put it more plainly than that. It came through to me strongly, in my discussions with representatives of the churches and of other interested organisations, that the law must ensure that in practice there is the same respect for the integrity of the individual when he or she is dead as when that person is living. As I believe that the Bill embodies that principle, I support it. I should like to pay a tribute to the pathologists and the individual renal surgeons who had an input into discussions on this Bill and who followed carefully the dicussions of the Law Reform Commission. I was very much impressed by the ethical approach taken by those people, especially bearing in mind that they had what could be described in subjective terms as a vested interest in the body or the tissue they wish to deal with. Notwithstanding that vested professional interest, the interests of the whole person were always paramount in the minds of those people, and that came through clearly in our discussions.

I know that pathologists are very keen indeed to retain the possibility that, where next-of-kin are not available, a designated officer can still authorise a post-mortem in a hospital. This power is very important for several reasons which I will outline. It can be important for educational purposes, if a body becomes available which would be useful for specific educational purpose. It can also be extremely important for what I would call not strictly educational but informative purposes, in the general sense, for the benefit of the family of the deceased, for the body of medical knowledge as a whole, for the enlightenment of relatives and for the clarification of diagnosis of the disease or trauma which caused death.

The motivation of pathologists in wanting to retain certain powers of access to a dead body is, as far as I can interpret it, motivated certainly by the desire for knowledge, but that desire for knowledge is linked very strongly indeed to the good that can come of that knowledge, the use to which it can be put for the benefit of humanity, whether it is humanity at large in terms of new scientific information that is uncovered, or for the comfort that that knowledge might be to the bereaved. I am thinking particularly, for example, of circumstances such as a cot death, where the parents would need and should have the reassurance of the pathologist that it was not neglect on their part that caused the death. That kind of information should always be able to be obtained by a post-mortem examination, if necessary.

The Minister's assurance that the code of practice, which is at present adopted for transplantation procedures and which was drawn up by the National Health and Medical Research Council, will remain a code of practice and that there is no intention at this stage to regulate it. The medical profession feels very strongly about this, and I agree that where some kind of clinical discretion is involved it is far better to have a code of practice than to have a set of regulations which do not permit the exercise of discretion.

In all, I think it must be a very satisfying day for the medical profession in South Australia when this Bill passes the House and ultimately receives assent. It has been a long and sometimes painstaking road for the people who have worked in its preparation and who have consulted with succeeding Ministers over its development. It will certainly clarify for the medical profession the manner in which transplantation and anatomical examination can be carried out. In that regard it will contribute a great deal to the well-being of individuals and to the relationship between the medical profession and society at large. When the law is clarified, the profession can confidently pursue the correct course, and society at large can be confident that the correct course and the legal course is being pursued. I support the Bill, and I commend all those who have been involved in its preparation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I thank the Opposition for its support, through its spokesperson, of this Bill, and I would agree with the member for Coles when she said that there was a comprehensive, wide-ranging debate in the Legislative Council. I also agree with her that, when one House of Parliament studies and researches a Bill to the extent that that House did, no good purpose is served by repeating that debate. As the member for Coles has informed the House, an amendment to clause 29 was moved by the Hon. Mr Burdett and that amendment was accepted by the Government.

It would also be appropriate for me to pay a tribute to the member for Coles, in her former role as Minister of Health, and the work that she did in helping to bring this measure before the House. It is, as she has pointed out, a measure that the medical profession would welcome and a measure from which the South Australian community would benefit considerably. The legislation has involved a number of people, including Ministers, and I think it is appropriate that the role of the member for Coles be acknowledged.

I will refer to the Minister of Health the honourable member's comments on the code of practice, including her comment on whether or not the Government intends to bring in regulations. I expect that the situation as she explains it would be the view of the Government but, nevertheless, I think it appropriate that her views be conveyed to the appropriate Minister. Once again, I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill, in the preparation of which it played a large part.

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

DEATH (DEFINITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 797.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill, which relates to the previous Bill and, indeed, could have been made part of the previous Bill, were it not for the fact that this measure has application

to other pieces of legislation. Therefore, it is appropriate that it should stand on its own.

The record of the debate on this Bill in the Legislative Council is enlightening for those who wish to know more about the subject. I commend to members of the House the speech made by the Hon. Dr Ritson, which appears on pages 575 and 576 of *Hansard*. It makes interesting reading, and highlights some of the human, technical and legal aspects of the definition of death which require clarification. One example that perhaps members will readily understand concerns the situation that could have occurred when the previous Government abolished death duties. That abolition was to commence at midnight on 1 January 1980. As far as I am aware, no succession duty difficulties arose at that time because of the lack of a satisfactory legal definition of death, but it could have been the case that the heart of a person who, to all intents and purposes was dead at five to 12, was kept operating artificially until five past 12 in order to ensure that the inheritors of that person's estate obtained the benefit of the abolition of death duties. So, great things can hang on small words.

Although it is a very short Bill, indeed, medically, scientifically, socially and legally it is a very important Bill that marks a step forward in terms of legislation catching up with scientific development and reflecting such development in a manner that enables the community at large to operate effectively and confidently in the knowledge that the law takes account of the situation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I am pleased with the Opposition's support of the Bill. I agree with the member for Coles that it would be advisable for members of Parliament to read the Legislative Council debates. The debates on these measures do credit to that Chamber and show that the South Australian Parliament can rise to great heights indeed. As to the Machiavellian example to which the honourable member referred, of course, all things are possible, and I am sure that that was the spirit in which she related it. I am pleased that these two important matters have the support of members of this House as they had in the other Chamber.

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

LAW COURTS (MAINTENANCE OF ORDER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March. Page 706.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): As members of the House will recall, this legislation was drafted while the Hon. K.T. Griffin was Attorney-General in the former Government. In 1980 or early 1981 the Director-General of the Law Department prepared a report recommending a change involving the replacement, with civilians, of police orderlies working in law courts. The then Attorney-General decided to fund the training of civilians who would replace those police officers, with the intention of deploying them throughout the law courts on a part-time basis. Some 29 part-time civilians were to replace the 16 full-time police officers on court duty. The best part of this legislation, I suppose, is that it will free those police officers who were required for court duty on a full-time basis when in fact they had been trained for much more onerous duties in the general field of police work. It was a waste of training to have them in desk jobs instead of being out on normal police duty. That is one of the better aspects of this legislation.

We now find that the present Government has recognised the value of the decision made by the former Attorney-General. One of the problems associated with the legislation was whether civilian orderlies working in the courts would have the power or authority to exercise necessary control, as it was appreciated that occasionally there may be some difficulties in courts and, further, whether they would have the power to arrest if a more acute problem occurred in a court.

Despite that matter, some civilian orderlies were appointed to courts as early as August 1982. It was intended that legislation be brought before the House to rectify any problems that existed. However, the election intervened and, as a result, this legislation has been brought before the House several months late. But, of course, new section 9 in the Bill confers upon those civilian orderlies the necessary power and enables them to make arrests should that be necessary. The Opposition supports the Bill and is particularly pleased that the police officers carrying out these duties will now be free to return to active police duty.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. As the member for Mount Gambier has said, this matter has been in the pipeline for a considerable period. The initial discussions and plans for these provisions date back many years. It is pleasing to note that at last police officers will be released from these court duties which will enable them to do the work for which they were trained. Indeed, that is most important for the security of the community. I foreshadow that I will be moving two minor amendments to clause 11, both of which are intended to provide that the immunity afforded to a court orderly shall include a situation where the orderly acts in a purported exercise of his duties. The clause is presently limited to an actual exercise of duty, which is contrary to usual practice. The proposal for amendment arose after the Bill was introduced. The amendments enhance the protection which may be afforded to persons acting in good faith as orderlies under the provisions of the Act. This is a matter to which the member for Mount Gambier referred, and the amendment will ensure security for the orderlies.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Insertion of new Part III.'

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Minister that it has been brought to my attention that there are only 10 clauses that are printed; however, there is another part to clause 10 and the amendment that the Minister has placed before the Chair would be an amendment to clause 10.

Mr BAKER: Mr Chairman, I take a point of order. Can I have clarification of that? I have a copy here which shows clauses 10 to 13.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold that point of order. I point out that if members study the Bill they will find that there are only 10 clauses as such. The numbers that appear after clause 10 are in fact a part of that clause.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Sir, for clarifying that for me and for other members. I move:

Page 3, line 45—Leave out 'performing' and insert 'the performance or purported performance of'.

Page 4, line 4—Leave out 'in the course of performing those duties' and insert 'by him in good faith and in the course of the performance or purported performance of duties assigned to him by or under this Part'.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 April. Page 970.)

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Last evening, when I was debating this Bill, I had reached the point of making it quite clear that I did not object at all to the aims of the Bill but that I certainly believe that the manner in which the Government is going about achieving those aims is, in some directions, quite heavy-handed. I particularly stressed my concern at the very great powers that were being given to the Minister under this Bill. If it is the Government's genuine aim to achieve consensus and to create a committee that would be able to advise the Minister then a number of changes should be made to this Bill, and certainly I will be supporting amendments which I know are in train.

My greatest concern is the fact that it is the Minister who will appoint all members to the committee. I think that that is quite wrong. If the Minister wishes to receive good advice he should trust the unions to nominate four people and also the employers to nominate four people to this committee. In that way, there will be the balance that the Government is seeking. Both the union movement and the employers would be well represented but the present Bill bestows all power on the Minister. The Minister will be able to pick and choose. It will be the Minister's committee and, therefore, there must be very real concern that the Minister is only going to hear what that committee thinks the Minister wants to hear and if the committee does not do that then those members are not going to be on the committee for very long.

I also expressed my concern that, although it states in this Bill that a majority recommendation would be accepted, the Minister was seeking consensus and hopefully all members would provide him with a unanimous decision. However, because of the manner of the selection of the committee I believe that the decisions that will be taken will invariably be angled towards the Minister's own wishes and will therefore not provide the Minister and this Parliament with an accurate feeling from the union movement or the employers. I note that clause 9 provides:

> The proceedings of the council should be conducted on a non-political basis.

I cannot for the life of me understand what is meant by that clause, because it is not defined as to what is meant by 'non-political basis'. Again I raise the point that every one of these members is to be appointed by a political person, which must obviously make that committee political. It cannot be anything else. If the committee was to be truly non-political, then the members would be appointed in the manner I have outlined: four by the unions and four by the employers and accepted as nominated to the Minister and not actually nominated by him. The very manner in which this committee is being formed must make the committee political. This same clause also states:

> No public announcement of a decision or view reached by the council should be made by the council, a member of the council or any other person unless the members of that council are unanimously of the opinion that the announcement should be made.

There could not be a greater form of censorship. In other words, the Minister is out to protect himself and to make sure that if there is any divergence of opinion on this committee then the public is never going to know about it. What it means is that the committee could make a recommendation to the Minister and it may well be that the four union representatives will make one recommendation and the four employer representatives will make another. The Minister will have the casting vote, which will mean that five votes out of the nine will go his way. He could then quite easily publicly state that the recommendation of the committee was unanimous. No member of that committee under this Bill can publicly state that the Minister was not telling the truth.

The Bill prevents any member of that committee making any public statement on any aspect considered by the committee. If members oposite call that democracy, then I am sorry: it is not my idea of democracy. If members opposite call that open government, then it is not the way that I would define open government.

It would appear to me to be a deliberate attempt by the Minister to ensure that only what he wants to become public knowledge will become public knowledge. I cannot see any good reason whatsoever why members of that committee should not be able to state publicly the position they have taken and put to the Minister. That is a clause of the Bill that I will certainly be taking up very strongly in the Committee stages. I hope that it will be deleted because, as I have said, I cannot possibly even think of a more rigorous way in which a Minister can stop people from putting forward relevant, pertinent viewpoints that the public has every right to know. I now come to clause 11, which provides:

> (3) Subsection (2) is subject to the following qualifications:
> *(a)* it does not apply to a legislative proposal embodied in a Bill introduced into Parliament by a member who is not a Minister of the Crown;

In other words, although the Bill states that the Minister will take any legislation to this committee, any private member can introduce legislation without its going to the committee. Let us face it: if the Minister wants to introduce something that is a little politically hot that he does not want the committee to consider, he only has to have one of his back-benchers bring in a private member's Bill and, once again, the committee is completely by-passed.

Therefore, the point made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition last night comes out again. This Bill is providing a toothless tiger. It is mere window dressing so that the Deputy Premier can go to the public and say, 'This is what we are doing: we will bring about consensus; we will bring about negotiation between employers and unions; we will listen to both groups before we bring anything official into Parliament. However, we will not stop our back-benchers from bringing in Bills which might embarrass me if I had to put them to this committee.'

If the Minister is sincere, then I cannot understand why that clause is there. It can be only for one purpose and that is, as I said, to provide the Minister with the back-door method of getting legislation before this Parliament through one of his back-benchers and, therefore, completely by-passing the committee again. The final point I wish to make is in relation to clause 13, about which I spoke earlier. It states:

> This Act shall expire on the third anniversary of its commencement.

I again make the point that I made last night. I believe that sunset legislation in an area like this is good. However, I cannot understand why the Minister wants the legislation to be reviewed after three years. At the most, it should last the life of a Parliament because, whether members opposite like it or not, there could very well be a change in Government. In fact, I would certainly expect there to be a change in Government at the next election and it would mean that the Minister then in charge of this area would be landed with a committee which was personally selected by an outgoing Minister of a totally different political persuasion. Therefore, it would obviously not be a committee in which the incoming Minister would have any confidence.

I guess that that clause would be far less damaging if another amendment were accepted by the Government, namely, that the employer and the union representatives be nominated by the unions and the employer groups. At least under that method the eight members of the committee would not be personally hand-picked and chosen by the Minister. While we have the Minister determining the membership of the committee, all this is doing is forcing on a future Government a committee which has been selected purely at the whim of the then Minister.

Therefore, in conclusion I again make the point that what is nominally the aim of the Government is a good aim. However, I believe that the Government is not sincere in what it is saying are its aims because of the points I have outlined both last night and this afternoon: if the Government were sincere in wanting to get consensus and, if the Government were sincere in wanting to get consultation and genuinely looking for a committee that would advise the Minister and would be able to advise the Minister without fear, then the method of selection of that committee has to change completely.

I would certainly hope that the House will accept amendments that will be brought forward, and there is no doubt that, if they are accepted, the Bill will be vastly improved and will then truly achieve the aims that the Government purports to be putting forward at the moment.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I would like to refer briefly to some of the comments made by the member for Todd. He suggested that there is some sinister plot in the Bill making available to the Minister his right to appoint members to the committee. I would point out to the member for Todd that this Bill is couched in exactly the same terms as other Bills where committees have been formed by representatives of the trade union movement and the various employer organisations.

Mr Ashenden: Such as?

Mr FERGUSON: Be patient and the honourable member might learn something. I had the pleasure of being elected by the Trades and Labor Council to the Trade Union Training Authority (a Federal authority), and the United Trades and Labor Council had to submit my name with the others to the Federal Minister for him to appoint me eventually to that committee.

We are not moving away from any principle whatsoever. If the member for Todd had the opportunity to have a deeper involvement in industrial affairs he would have known that what we were talking about earlier was not a departure from the usual legislation. One cannot blame the Minister involved for couching this legislation in this manner, because the real problem with employer organisations is that they are not united. It would be almost impossible for the Minister to go to the employer organisations (and there are more than six of them) and ask those organisations to provide four representatives.

There will be no problem for the United Trades and Labor Council in providing the numbers, because the United Trades and Labor Council would be able to provide the numbers without any problem at all. The trade union movement in South Australia would be prepared to accept the nominations from the United Trades and Labor Council. However, the problem lies on the other side of the fence and that is why, with any thought at all, one would understand the reasons why the Bill is couched in the terms that it is.

The other thing to which I wish to refer is the ridiculous suggestion that a Minister would deliberately misrepresent to this Parliament the numbers involved on a decision-making committee. I have never heard such a ridiculous suggestion in all my life. Not only that, the council itself would not remain in operation if that particular exercise was undertaken, because it would be my understanding that if any misrepresentations were made by the Minister the organisations involved would withdraw and the council would collapse. Therefore, the Minister would be loath to misrepresent to this Parliament any decision that had been made.

The Government believes that the establishment of the Industrial Relations Advisory Council would improve industrial relations in South Australia. The new council would provide a forum for all points of view to be canvassed on the introduction of industrial legislation. These matters can be discussed in a logical and practical way. The introduction of the Bill honours a promise made by the Government prior to the last election. The establishment of this council is a new approach to industrial legislation and it is worth giving a trial. If the experiment does not work then it has the appropriate sunset clause which will see its demise. There is a need in the industrial world to allow people to express opinions to try to gain concessions and at times to try to change the minds of other people and organisations away from the glare of publicity. Certainly at a later stage recourse to public debate on a point of view would still be available.

There has always been a principle in the Australian scene that agreement should be reached by way of conciliation and discussion, and this Bill merely enlarges the opportunity for this process to occur. The Government believes that apart from the opportunity to exchange ideas by employer and employee organisations both groups should have an opportunity to be forewarned of proposed industrial legislation. It is most desirable that all the decision makers in industrial relations need to know what is about to happen in the field in which they are practising. It is indeed true to say that more has been achieved by way of co-operation in society than by way of the adversary system.

The Labor Government believes that conciliation and co-operation are goals that should be pursued. There is nothing wrong in trying to promote progress and harmonious relationships. It is unfortunate that the previous Liberal Government ignored the basic rule of industrial relationship in that very little attention was given to the consultative process, and a confrontation approach to industrial legislation was only too apparent. The by-passing of the recommendations of the Cawthorne Report where industrial legislation was introduced in September last year is a classic example of the confrontation style of the previous Government.

One of the important functions of the Industrial Relations Advisory Council will be to examine in detail the Cawthorne Report and give it full consideration. Mr Cawthorne's suggestions for improvement of the industrial scene are worthy of deeper consideration. The report stresses that a consensus view is especially necessary in industrial relations matters. Any imposition of change without widespread acceptance is doomed to failure. The idea behind the Bill is not completely new. An Industrial Relations Advisory Council was formed by the Minister of Labour and Industry in 1971. It was a non-statutory body which comprised representatives of the four major employer organisations in this State as well as representation from the United Trades and Labor Council. It was a successful council and Mr Cawthorne recommends that the status of that body be reviewed. The South Australian Government believes that this legislation is worthy of a trial. It is an experiment that all members should support.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to express my support for the Bill on three basic premises. First, the Government has a mandate to introduce the legislation. Secondly, no matter on what side of the House we belong we all desire to have

good industrial relations and this Bill is perceived by the Government to be an instrument to achieve this. If the Government intends to follow through with this Bill in the spirit which has been expressed, then I can only support it in its general intention. Thirdly, some reservations have been expressed by members on this side about the ultimate success of the council. However, if the experiment does not work the Government will be able to repeal the legislation.

The first thing I would really like to address is what Government members have been saying about industrial relations in South Australia. Since they have been in power from 6 November 1982, and even before then, they have placed great credence on the fact that they have maintained the best industrial system in Australia. I point out that that situation applied well before the present Labor Government came into office in South Australia. I want to explode forever the fallacy that is perpetuated within this House that the dealings of the Labor Party with the unions have brought about good industrial relations. Figures on industrial disputation show some revealing facts.

For instance, since the Second World War South Australia has had one of the lowest levels of industrial disputation of all States. That was not a product of Labor Administrations but of Sir Thomas Playford's Administration. The scene was set after the Second World War by Sir Thomas Playford, who maintained good relations between Government, employers and workers. The figures are very revealing; for example, in 1963 South Australia had 1.6 per cent of the working days lost throughout Australia, which is an incredible record. At the same time, New South Wales had 53 per cent of the industrial disputation and the previous year it was as high as 60 per cent.

Today's figures show that those relativities have not altered. Those figures show that our good industrial disputation record is seated in history which tells us that Sir Thomas Playford set the ground work for good industrial relations in this State. It had nothing to do with members of the present Government or their previous Administrations. I will go further: the figures throughout the 1960s show that the situation in South Australia changed only slightly, so Administrations did not matter.

During the 1970s and later, when for most of the time we had a Labor Government, the lowest numbers of days lost was in 1980, a year in which we had a Liberal Administration and in which only 1.8 per cent of the working days lost throughout Australia was attributed to this State. That could well show that the Liberal Government was a better administrator of industrial relations than was the Labor Government. I get tired of listening to the lies and half-truths that come from the other side of this Chamber.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order and ask him to withdraw what he said.

Mr BAKER: Certainly, Sir, it is not lies but continual untruths about the record of the Government in the industrial relations field. After all, the figures, which can be statistically tested, show that there is no change in industrial relations, whichever Party has been in office, over the 35 years since the Second World War. We have a good industrial record in South Australia, one that stands up nationally. Some people say that the Labor Party can achieve better industrial relations when it is in Government by controlling the unions over a whole range of matters.

Let us take the example of New South Wales. We would expect that the industrial record there has been improved under Labor, but it has not. If we must talk about industrial relations, let us talk about the facts of history. In 1980, the Tonkin Liberal Government achieved the best industrial record over a period of 20 years, but I am sure that members opposite will not accept that statement. However, the figures substantiate it. All that we have done is to maintain our position relative to the national average in this respect. Members opposite should therefore understand the fundamental fact that they do not have a monopoly on good industrial relations.

Mr Ferguson: We did not say we had.

Mr BAKER: That seems to be what members opposite have been telling us for years. It is the great fallacy as told by Labor members. We all desire good industrial relations, and any mechanism that we perceive to be for the good of South Australians should be initiated and used. I have reservations about the Bill before us on a number of grounds. I understand, however, that the Minister in charge of this matter has good intentions and I expect that he will pursue those intentions under the umbrella of the committee to be set up.

The Cawthorne Report has been described by the Minister of Labour as a fine document that will lead to better industrial relations over the next few years. However, I reject his statement that the Cawthorne Report is a document of substance. Indeed, I consider that the document, as framed, is inadequate. At page 29 of the report, the author states:

> The essential strategy of my proposals on this topic was to recognise that trade unions are essential for the proper functioning of Australian industrial relations systems and the consequent desirability that persons as a rule should belong to an appropriate union. Consistent with this approach, I suggested that it would be appropriate for the commission to have power to award preference to unionists in a meaningful form.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the honourable member a ruling by the Speaker last evening concerning certain aspects of the Cawthorne Report. I do not see anything in the Bill referring to preference to unionists, so I ask him to come back to the point.

Mr BAKER: The point I was making, Sir, was that one of the recommendations in the report is that an industrial relations advisory committee be set up as a statutory body and, if such a committee is set up, many of the matters contained in the report will be put before that committee, as the Minister presumably will want to follow the recommendations of the report. Any committee set up under the auspices of this document will at some time address this document. When I look at the document itself, I shall be addressing it in that light, and I shall be looking at the relevant parts of the document as they apply to the sort of recommendation that will necessarily come before the committee. The report goes on to state:

> It is clear that the prohibitions on the right to strike have met with no or little success in Australia. The experience of the U.K., Canada, and the U.S.A. supports this line.

We are talking about countries that have had a poor industrial record over the years, something which at least one member opposite will understand. We are not talking about countries with an enviable industrial record. In fact, the author of the report went to England, although I do not know from the report whether he visited the United States or Canada. He certainly did not look at the systems operating in Europe. So, he is looking at the system that we have inherited, a system of settling disputes that relates to our historical beginning and not to any real reforms as they may relate to superior systems in other countries. That suggests that there is a lack of prescription in the document, because the author did not have the opportunity or has failed to avail himself of the opportunity to understand that there are better ways of doing things and conducting ourselves than those inherent in the systems referred to. Referring to 'Industrial action and the common law', the report states:

> I also suggest that the balance of argument comes down in favour of some form of immunity in tort for unions and unionists engaged in industrial action.

It is not quite clear where that industrial tort should start and end, but I should hope that it does not stop where we have industrial disputes, such as the shearers strike, that involve bodily injury. Let us be clear about industrial relations. It is not clear from the document what redress should be granted in the case of a firm or a small proprietorship that is so affected by a strike that it must go out of business and put off its employees. That has happened in respect of the Builders Labourers Federation, where companies have been forced to the wall and unionists laid off. We have seen a number of examples in New South Wales where, in fact, industrial disputation stopped the provision of railways and loading facilities, and there has been a loss of employment in those areas.

Mr Mathwin: It certainly happened in the building trade.

Mr BAKER: It certainly has happened in the building trade right throughout Australia. There are some memorable instances where, in fact a tort action should have been taken and sustained so that all the people could have received some justice in the system. Again, it is based on a false premise. The document does make the point that the number of industrial disputes is lower in South Australia. At least he recognises that. There are some good points in this document, but unfortunately, when we are talking about the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, the document states:

> Once again, time and resources did not permit an adequate investigation of this delicate area. It is largely for this reason that I am loath to make any recommendations on the submission.

This refers to the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, which is at the heart of this matter. He failed to come to grips with it.

An honourable member: Let's see you come to grips with it.

Mr BAKER: I was not paid to come to grips with it. On page 19:

> I favour the draft amendment contained in the 1979 Bill as the best approach to this question.

He was referring to the powers of the Industrial Commission, and could not decide on the width or terms of reference, but he could certainly decide on the powers. The report continues:

> This amendment would allow the commission a discretion to authorise by award a union official, subject to such terms as the commission thought fit, to enter the premises of an employer subject to that award, for the additional purpose of interviewing employees in relation to the membership of that association.

There are some provisions included. I know that they already operate, but they are abused now and there is no right of redress for the employer. That is not canvassed in this document. Turning to the section on industrial agreements and non-members of the contracting association, we read:

> . . . the commission were satisfied that the agreement reflected the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the employees and that it was in total fair and reasonable, then the agreement should be binding on the employer in respect of all persons referred to in the agreement whether members of the contracting association of employees or not.

Again, we have the situation where we have to apply rules. The rules are that we change them according to what we believe will produce the best result. It really depends on which side of the fence we belong. Referring to wage fixation, quite a classic statement appears there. We are talking about the Industrial Commission.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will resume his seat. I have been extremely tolerant about his references to the Cawthorne Report. There is nothing whatsoever dealing with wage fixation in the Bill that is now under discussion. I ask the member for Mitcham not to deal with that matter.

Mr BAKER: I will not pursue that matter; I take your point, Sir, although I believe the matter to be extremely important. The report addresses the question of unionism, and makes a number of statements. On the subject of objection to union membership, the Commissioner says he realises that the grounds for objection to union membership are too narrowly defined, being confined to religious aspects only. The report stated that it was not possible to make up one's mind, and suggested that on this issue a further step would be to allow an exemption to be granted where a person genuinely objects on the grounds of conscience. The author of the report could not make up his mind on that issue; it is something to which the Council will have to address itself.

We have heard today reference to the Public Service and the way in which the present Government is enforcing compulsory unionism. This is a matter of concern to a large number of employers, and apparently it is going to spread far wider than its present ambit. It is of concern to me that the report could not come up with a recommendation as to what is a justifiable reason for saying, 'I don't want to belong to a union.'

Those comments summarise some of the points. I take the Acting Deputy Speaker's point: many of these matters referred to in the Cawthorne Report are not directly referred to in the Bill. I have grave reservations about many sections of this report, either through lack of definition or lack of thought—

Mr Mayes: Or lack of experience.

Mr BAKER: —or lack of experience. I suggest, also, that Mr Cawthorne lacks experience in understanding industrial relations throughout the world and I think, that is a point for some regret.

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: A number of reports are commissioned. Some are accepted; others are not. In this case, we never reached the stage where the report either could be accepted or rejected.

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: There were certainly many reports put before the previous Labor Administration.

Mr Mathwin: That was years and years ago—we haven't done that yet.

Mr BAKER: I understand they are still trying to grapple with it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the member for Mitcham does not need all the assistance that he is getting.

Mr BAKER: I have some reservations about the contents of the Bill as it stands. The relevant provisions have already been adequately pointed out to members on the other side. I believe some difficulties will eventuate with some of the provisions and my suggestions for improvement would have included no voting rights on the council for the Minister. I believe that it is an act of faith. If he wants the council to work as a body of consensus, then he should have no right to vote on it, and he should understand that the results of those meetings will depend on consensus rather than on having the final say in the matter. I am concerned that the Minister is locked in to the results he obtains from the council, and how well he will be able to grapple with those when he has to come back to Caucus if they are unfavourable to him.

Mr Mathwin: They will not go to Caucus if they are unfavourable, will they?

Mr BAKER: I do not think they will. I have considerable reservations about how it will operate, but it is incumbent on the Minister to make it work. If changes are needed, then I am sure he will bring those matters before the House to be amended. The legislation is only a formality to set up

the instrument, and I wish the Minsister well with the Industrial Relations Advisory Council as constituted, and trust it will be a success.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): It is understandable that the members opposite are opposed to the Industrial Relations Advisory Council Bill. The same rational approach to industrial affairs that it embodies will throw into even sharper contrast the arrogant, provocative approach the previous Government took to industrial matters.

In case they have forgotten, let me remind honourable members of the results of that approach. During the Liberals time in office we saw the first ever Public Service strike in this State. During the Liberal Government's term of office we also saw the first ever stoppage by schoolteachers in this State. That was not bad going in a State that had one of the best industrial records in Australia until members opposite took over from the Labor Government.

Mr Ashenden: Are you sure you've got the right speech?

Mr PLUNKETT: The honourable member is aware of the action he can take if he disagrees with what I am talking about. The strikes stemmed largely from the fact that the Government of the day and the former Minister of Industrial Affairs thought that they could intimidate the unions involved; they thought that they could steamroll their way over the unions. However, as has always been the case when workers feel that they have a legitimate case to put, they refused to lie down and be run over or intimidated. The previous Government had a provocative and negative approach, which is shown up by the more rational approach taken by the present Government, as indicated in the Bill before the House.

It is no wonder that members opposite do not like my comments. Not only was the previous Liberal Government's attitude to industrial relations provocative, but it was arrogant in the extreme. The fiasco concerning the former Minister's refusal to make public the Cawthorne Report is well documented. The matter would have been laughable had it not been so serious. Taxpayers' money was spent in the compilation of the report, but the Minister then claimed that the public had no right to know of the result. That was bad enough, but there was something worse, namely, the adamant refusal of the former Minister and the previous Government to take into account the major recommendations of the Cawthorne Report. Mr Cawthorne is an expert on industrial relations and is known by all to be unbiased. His report was the result of a year of research, but the Government refused to listen.

Rather than say honestly that they disagreed with the recommendations, but that they would allow them to be publicly discussed, members of the Government simply refused to publish the report. The Government not only refused to allow public discussion on something that the public had paid for, but in some cases it introduced measures that went against the spirit and the letter of the report. In other words, the Government on a whim was making decisions affecting the lives of a large proportion of the South Australian population.

Expert advice was ignored; the public was excluded from discussion about the merits of the expert advice. As my colleague, the Minister of Labour, said during the second reading explanation, it was a case of the Government's thinking, 'Well, if we don't agree with it, it must be wrong—no-one else is going to know about it.' That was the attitude of the previous Minister. As a consequence, trade unions and employers affected by changes to industrial law were not even consulted.

This matter may have something to do with the fact that the Liberal Party, in Opposition, has seen fit to make sure that the previous Minister of Industrial Affairs is not responsible for the Minister of Labour shadow portfolio. Let members opposite explain why the former Minister of Industrial Affairs has been downgraded. I think that the Cawthorne Report has a fair bit to do with it. Even though members opposite have never publicly said so, they know full well that the former Minister made a very big mistake. If the action taken was not deliberately arrogant, as members opposite would suggest, then we must draw the other conclusion: it was simply the action of a thick-headed Government.

Mr Mathwin: The Cawthorne Report?

Mr PLUNKETT: I am not talking about the member for Glenelg now; although I think he is thick headed, I was not particularly referring to him on that occasion. The attitudes of the previous Government are what we are trying to eliminate in regard to the Bill before the House. Those with any industrial experience, and even those who are not well versed on such matters, know that it is inevitable that workers and employers will be opposed to each other at some time or other. As a trade unionist of long standing, I know that there are times when confrontation is the only way to achieve a result. However, through its conciliation and arbitration system, Australia has evolved a framework for settling disputes with a minimum of confrontation. The Bill before the House is simply an extension of that general approach.

We want to ensure that workers, through their representative organisations, and employers can have a say in that which affects them. I might remind members opposite that the establishment of the Industrial Relations Advisory Council was one of the planks of the Labor Party's election platform. I might also remind honourable members that, as the Labor Party won the election, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of the population of South Australia approved of what it planned to do.

The role of the council is to advise the Minister on proposed changes to industrial laws and the implementation of policy affecting employment and unemployment. Members opposite have claimed that such a role amounts to overriding the processes of Parliament. What a load of rubbish! The Government is assembling experts in their respective fields and asking their advice. Surely there is nothing wrong or improper about asking advice on the best way to do something. The Government will lay down the policy and will reserve the right on whether to proceed with a course of action, and final approval will come from Parliament, when the Opposition will then have the opportunity to say as much as it likes about any aspect of the proposals. Surely there can be nothing wrong with such straightforward and sensible procedures. If for some reason the arrangement does not work, Parliament will have the chance to debate that matter as well.

The Bill contains a sunset provision, which means that after three years the legislation will expire. The Government of the day and the Parliament will then be able to review the Act to ascertain whether any changes need to be made. I cannot understand why the Opposition would oppose this Bill. It was prepared after discussions with all parties involved, so it already has the approval of groups of different persuasions. The Bill's biggest danger from Opposition members' point of view is to show up their shallow industrial policies. The Minister of Labour's second reading explanation states:

> Only through an advisory procedure can we reach an agreement on issues that significantly affect our lives. Last year's State election and this year's Federal election show that this is the approach most favoured by the Australian community.

In conclusion, I refer to the previous speaker, who I notice was very quick to criticise the trade union movement. Indeed, all speakers from the other side of the House can only see

fear where the unions are concerned. I have heard no discussion and seen no evidence of fear anywhere indicating that some businesses may go bankrupt or that they cannot pay wages. I have repeatedly stated in this House that the Liberal Party has a one-track mind, and that is to look after the highest business people only.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: The only thing that they seem to be capable of is to make criticisms such as those that the member for Todd made a few moments ago. He has not even heard what I am talking about but persists in interjecting. If he had listened to what I had said or read *Hansard* he would find that my remarks on the Bill make more sense than anything he has said. He should go back to being a car salesmen, as he almost had to do after the last State election.

In conclusion, I urge members opposite to speak with representatives of the building industry, because I have it on very good authority that the private sector of that industry has said, 'Thank God Labor has got in and done something.' Labor, over the last six months, has done more than the Liberal Government did in three years.

Members opposite must understand that they are, indeed, on the opposite side. They do not know what to talk about on this Bill, and that this is one of the reasons why the Minister of Industrial Affairs in the last Government has not been acceptable as the shadow Minister of Labour. After the State election they changed his position immediately. They realised that his performance was one of the reasons why their Government was feeling very uncomfortable, along with 18 other reasons on that side which I will not go through, one by one. The former Minister has not the confidence of the members of the Liberal Party to be their shadow Minister on these matters. They do not trust him, and they down-graded him. If members opposite have anything further to say on the Bill, I hope that they will read it thoroughly and then say something sensible. If they do that, they may then be able to see why this Bill has been introduced.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I say for the relief of the member for Peake that I am supporting the Bill, which is a very weak and gutless piece of legislation, as the member for Peake intimated. This legislation follows a promise made by the Labor Party before the last election that it would do something about the matter in question and form an Industrial Relations Advisory Council, which is exactly the same thing as has operated anywhere previously: the only difference, I suppose, is that the members of the council will be reimbursed for their efforts.

It will be interesting to find out from the Minister when he recovers from his illness, and not from the present junior Minister representing the Minister of Labour, what remuneration these people will receive. No doubt when the Minister of Labour returns he will want this Bill as it is. I can visualise his going back to Trades Hall and saying, 'Here it is, I have done it again.' It reminds me of the actions of Mr Chamberlain, before the Second World War, who said, 'Peace in our time.' A few months after that, the world was in more strife than it had ever been previously. What this Bill contains is merely window-dressing, as some of my colleagues have said. It is a nothing Bill.

Mr Mayes: Why are you upset about it then?

Mr MATHWIN: There is no problem at all. We have a new Minister, and I must congratulate the member for Peake for his rapid elevation to the front bench.

Mr Ashenden: It's an improvement on the Minister who was there before.

Mr MATHWIN: I hope that the honourable gentleman will stay there, because he knows an awful lot about shearing and wide combs. The problem with this Government is that it thinks it is the only answer to the needs and problems of the unionists in this State. It believes that members on this side of the House have never had anything to do with unions, workers, and the like.

Mr Whitten: That's what was said last night.

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Price last night apologised, having misinterpreted my intention. I was a member of a union for many years. The stark facts are that had I remained in the United Kingdom I would have climbed to great height in the trade union movement there.

The member for Peake said that we on this side of the House were arrogant, that we made rules according to what we believe and that we really did not know what the workers were all about. He said that during our term of office the Public Service had its first strike. We have seen the effects of that and the pay-off this week from the Government for the trouble that was caused by the Public Service during the election campaign. There was the schoolteachers' strike that he mentioned, and we all know about the pay-off there. We all know the dire straits now facing the Minister of Education in relation to this area, and we know that there has been a pay-off. The two matters raised by the member for Peake have both involved pay-off situations.

He suggested that we should make public all reports commissioned by the Government. He ought to know (he should talk with some of the members who have been here a little longer than he has) that a number of reports commissioned by different Governments will never see the light of day. The Sangster Report on water rating is an example. That report was never made public by a former Government, and it is never likely to be made public by either a Liberal or Labor Government. So, a number of reports are not made public.

The honourable member also said that Australia is a country where there is conciliation and arbitration, yet his Party and his Federal Leader are great ones for supporting (in fact they will demand in the near future) a return to collective bargaining in the industrial field. According to my information that is what the Labor Party is about, yet the member for Peake boasted that Australia is a good country for arbitration and conciliation.

Quite frankly, I think that the conciliation and arbitration system is a good one, whereas I certainly do not believe that the collective bargaining situation is a good system when one looks at what happens financially, particularly in America, in relation to that matter.

Dealing with the Bill, I would like to point out a few matters with which I disagree. In relation to constituting a council of 10 nominated members, clause 6 of the Bill provides:

(i) four shall be persons nominated by the Minister, after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia to represent the interests of employees; and

(ii) four shall be persons nominated by the Minister, after consultation with associations of employers to represent the interests of employers.

Of course, this is a veto situation as far as the Minister is concerned. He will ask for a number of names to be given to him—maybe eight or 12 names, but certainly more than four—and he will choose the personnel from that list. He will select the people who will act on this council: there is no doubt about that, although I suppose that this happens in certain other areas.

That is the situation according to this Bill, which is supposed to be a great Bill for all concerned in South Australia. The Minister likes to regard it as a great step forward. Clause 7 of the Bill provides:

(2) The Governor may remove a member of the council from office if—

(a) he becomes mentally or physically incapable of carrying out satisfactorily the duties of his office;

How does one determine that? Who knows when a person is mentally deficient? Standing on this side of the House, I could challenge a few members on the other side as to whether or not they are mentally deficient. So, how is a definition possible? The Bill continues:

(3) The office of a member of the council shall become vacant if—

(a) he dies;

Well, that is obvious. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF MEADOWS

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the address to His Excellency the Governor.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to draw the attention of this House to the disgraceful performance of the Chief Secretary at a seminar at the University of Adelaide last Saturday. It was a seminar on imprisonment alternatives and public safety in the 1980s, and it was a non-political forum. The seminar, which was attended by three members of Parliament, namely, the Hon. Anne Levy, the member for Morphett, and myself, was addressed by a number of speakers, one of whom was the Chief Secretary. Other speakers were the shadow Chief Secretary, Mr Wotton, and Mr Justice Kirby who, as members who have heard him will know, is an excellent speaker and, indeed, a person of great knowledge and intellect.

A representative of probation officers also spoke and, indeed, provided a very good paper for the seminar which was of great interest and contained a great message. There was, except for one burst during the morning session when people were asked whether they had any questions a non-political atmosphere in the seminar all day, until the arrival of the Chief Secretary.

A former Labor Chief Secretary (Don Simmons) had earlier apologised and described the situation in his day, intimating how sorry he was about the performance of that particular Government, or that is how I interpreted his remarks. However, the present Chief Secretary arrived, and the first thing he said from the rostrum was, 'I intend to be political in my talk today and not only am I going to be political: I think I am quite right in being so.' Then he proceeded to excuse himself and his Government in relation to their past record.

First, there had been some discussion on parole, parolees and the Parole Board, which one would have expected, anyway. Someone in the audience said that there ought to be an Aboriginal on the board because of the number of Aborigines who are in trouble with the law (and, unfortunately, there are indeed a great number of them). The Chief Secretary then made his first excuse, saying that, when he was a member of the Opposition and when the relevant Bill was then before the Parliament, he had tried to amend it to include an Aboriginal on the board. That was as far as he went. He did not explain why that situation did not eventuate. Of course, he did not say that the Liberal Party had widened representation on the board to provide for more laymen. He merely tried to establish that it was the Liberals' fault that there was not an Aboriginal on the board.

The Chief Secretary then went on, at this non-political seminar, to talk about the remand centre situation in South Australia and to say that it was the Liberals' fault that it was not built, adding that, when previously in Government, his Party had selected a site for a remand centre at Regency Park.

The Liberals came into office and changed the site to the one at Hindmarsh which was not proceeded with. Therefore, it is the Liberals' fault that the prison system is in such a dire situation! He did not say that the great problem these days involves high-security prisoners travelling between the prisons and the courts. In all civilised countries these days remand centres are being built as close as possible to the courts, because in future more and more high-security prisoners will be in gaol (I hope that the lower-security prisoners will not be kept in gaol), and we will be dealing with the hard-core prisoners. That is one of the main reasons the Liberal Government decided to shift the site chosen by the previous Labor Government at Regency Park to the site at Hindmarsh. I was a member of the Public Works Committee at the time, so I know that the sites nearest to the city which would have had the best advantages were vetoed by some other Parties, and the Chief Secretary would know to whom I am referring.

At this non-political seminar the Chief Secretary said that it was the Liberals' fault that the remand centre had not been built. He went on to say that the record of the Labor Party Government was good. He failed to say that the Liberal Party in Government did more in three years than the Labor Party had done in 10 years in office. To give the Labor Party its due, I would say that in its 10 years in office it did more than the previous Liberal Government did in 20 years in office. However, I think it is disgraceful that the Chief Secretary made the points he made at a non-political seminar. Unfortunately, I had to leave at that time and I was not present during Question Time; otherwise he would have got it right from the shoulder. He made political points and more shame on him for doing so at a non-political seminar.

The sanitary conditions at Yatala and Adelaide gaols are well known to prisoners, but they are probably not so well known to people outside who baulk at spending money on prisons. I think the Minister and I are on the same wave length about this situation. If the Minister had been fair, he would have said that the sanitary conditions at Yatala and Adelaide gaols are disgraceful, but when the matter was originally brought up in 1972 the Labor Government said that the cost of about $300 000 to upgrade the sanitary facilities was too high. He could have explained to the people at the seminar that when prisoners in the Adelaide and Yatala gaols wish to relieve themselves they have to use a bucket. The bucket method has been used for over 100 years, and the only difference in sanitary conditions between then and now is that once they were tin buckets and now they are plastic. That is not because they make less noise but because they do not hurt as much.

Let the Minister be honest about these things. I believe that what happened was disgraceful. He refrained from telling the seminar that his Government considered that $300 000 was too much to spend on improving the sanitary conditions in our gaols; it spent about $40 000 on the instal-

lation of sani-lavs. What a great achievement! This Minister has said that the Government did so much in its 10 years in office; well, it provided sani-lavs for use at Yatala. When my Party came into office it decided to provide proper toilets at a cost of over $4 000 000, but the Minister's Government refused to spend $300 000 or $400 000 because it believed that it was far too high. The Liberal Government put forward a plan for the upgrading of toilets. Let the Minister be honest at these seminars, whether they be political or non-political. I was upset by the Chief Secretary—

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

Mr MAYES (Unley): I wish to raise one matter which is of importance to me, particularly in my experience as a former officer of the Public Service Association. It relates to something which I believe the Opposition has been using in a provocative manner during this session of Parliament. The issue of prisons, how they operate and their administration in this State, is a matter of great concern to the whole community. I refer particularly to the period between September and November 1980. I have watched with great interest the performance of Opposition members over the past few months in regard to the events at Yatala Labour Prison. It is with a great deal of concern that I have watched sometimes the glee with which they have attacked the Chief Secretary in an endeavour to undermine his position and to embarrass him in front of the public and the community in this State.

I think it is important to note that in November 1980 the then Tonkin Liberal Government established a royal commission but very few people know the background to the negotiations that occurred between the unions, the Prisoners Association and the Government regarding the terms of reference that were to be applied to that royal commission. It is important to know that during November 1980 intensive discussions were initiated by the unions involved in an attempt to bring about a widening of the terms of reference from their narrow limited approach which the then Government wished to take.

The attitude taken by the then Tonkin Government and in particular by the Premier, who it appeared was handling that matter on behalf of his Minister, was that the terms of reference should be isolated and limited solely to the incidents and events that had occurred earlier that year in the Yatala Labour Prison. I think that the people who have been involved, the prison officers and the prisoners themselves, had a far greater experience and a far greater understanding of the problems at Yatala prison. It was upon that information and experience that these groups in unison called for a widening of the terms of reference.

An extensive number of letters to the Premier from all groups concerned sought a widening of the terms of reference to take into account administrative, staffing and technical matters, as well as facilities, at Yatala prison and the other correctional services institutions. That was refused repeatedly by the then Premier. I think it is important for the public to know, and it is my opinion, that had the Government then taken the step of widening those terms of reference we might have avoided what has happened at Yatala during the past few months.

Mr Mathwin: It's been common knowledge for years that an improvement in the higher administration was wanted. Something should have been done then.

Mr MAYES: The honourable member should have spoken up then.

Mr Mathwin: I did.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAYES: This is a serious issue that should have been taken up by the previous Government. Information was passed on to me by prison officers whom I know to be trustworthy and honest in respect of their working attitudes and their views on what was wrong in the prison and what should be done to remedy deficiencies there. However, the royal commission, for reasons best known to the Premier of the day, was restricted in its ability to take a wider range of evidence from the community. Certain submissions were made and it was repeatedly suggested that there should be a broader approach to the whole inquiry by the royal commission. Finally, Premier Tonkin informed the representatives of the prisoners and of the unions that the matter would be dealt with by the royal commission. Surely it was the responsibility of the Government to widen the terms of reference. Now we have the problems of threats to life and danger to the whole prison structure and to the community at large, merely because the previous Government failed to take its responsibility seriously and widen the terms of reference. This matter should be brought to the attention of members of the public, because it now seems that the Opposition is saying that our Chief Secretary is responsible for what is happening at Yatala. We are told that he should have done this and that he should have done that, yet three years ago I told the then Premier that a wider investigation was needed into staffing structures at Yatala.

Mr Mathwin: Everyone knew the problem.

Mr MAYES: But no-one did anything. The then Government went on with the terms of reference restricting the scope of evidence and suggesting to the legal officers representing unions and the prisoners that the Government was running out of funds and that the commission would therefore be restricted. This narrow and short-sighted approach could do nothing but harm to prisoners, prison officers and the community at large. This matter, which is of great concern, is being debated by the South Australian community. When the Leader of the Opposition attacks the Chief Secretary on this matter he should carefully reflect on what his Government did about the problem. After all, he was a member of that Government: in fact, in its latter days he became Chief Secretary, the Minister responsible for correctional institutions. He knows what this Government has inherited and, when he tells us to fix the problem, he knows very well that the problem was there and that he and his predecessor in the Tonkin Government could have at least initiated an investigation that would have given a proper basis for a correctional institution to be run with efficiency and with an opportunity to win.

As we are placed today, however, that correctional services institution is the subject of a report which is held by Cabinet and on which action can be taken but, had the Tonkin Government acted properly in this matter, the remedy could have been three years farther down the track.

Mr Mathwin: Conditions are more than 70 years behind those in Britain.

Mr MAYES: Possibly, but at least we could have had an inquiry to give us the answers three years ago. This problem is not something that has happened in the last two months. It has not fallen suddenly on the responsibility of this Chief Secretary, although I believe that he is handling the problem with great skill. I also commend the officers of the Correctional Services Department, including the Director and the Deputy Director, for the work they have done in respect of conditions at Yatala. I know the hours they have worked to improve the position out there.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I have several matters to which I shall refer in this debate. Today, I received a copy of the *Farmer and Stockowner* for April. On the front page of that publication, under the heading 'Minister's claim is refuted', there is the following report:

A claim by the Minister of Local Government, Mr Hemmings, that the U.F.S. had not consulted him over the Alsatian Dogs Act was incorrect, the Secretary of the U.F.S.'s wool and meat section, Mr W.L. Sutton, said last week. In Parliament in late March, Mr Hemmings said, 'It seems that the United Farmers and Stockowners have consulted with everyone but the Minister.' All I received was a letter and that was when I was an Opposition member, saying that they were opposed to my private member's Bill. They never consulted me as Minister.

Mr Sutton said he had written to Mr Hemmings on 22 November, in Mr Hemmings's capacity as Minister of Local Government. 'In that letter I asked that Mr Hemmings speak with the industry before either amending the Alsatian Dogs Act or repealing it. A reply was received on 14 January from the Director of Local Government who said he was replying on behalf of Mr Hemmings. It is therefore clearly established that the U.F.S. did contact Mr Hemmings as Minister of Local Government, that we asked to speak with him before a repeal of the Act went to Parliament and that Mr Hemmings did not take us up on this offer.'

Mr Sutton said the U.F.S. was opposed to Mr Hemmings's intention to allow Alsatian dogs access to all parts of South Australia. Even though the Bill passed the House of Assembly it was to be hoped it was defeated in the Legislative Council.

The most important point in that article is the allegation that the Minister of Local Government said during the debate in the House that he had not received representations from the U.F.S. when in fact it has been clearly shown that a letter was written to him and an audience saw it.

Mr Oswald: The Minister misled the House.

Mr BECKER: Yes. I took the word of the Minister when he said that he had received no representations, because I had no reason to doubt his word, but now his credibility is in question as to what is going on in his office. He should be aware of what is happening if he instructs his departmental head to reply on his behalf. This is a serious matter and the Minister should be called to account on a matter in which he has been proved wanting. The Premier and his Ministerial colleagues must look carefully at the performance of the Minister. In the circumstances the Minister should apologise to the House.

All members are subject to jokes made about them by their opponents and often I get a mention in the Labor Party newspaper, the *Herald*. On page 16 of a recent edition the following appears:

There always has to be a clown. Not for the first time Liberal M.P. for Hanson fills this role. (Probably better a clown, though, than a bore.) Heini Becker has excelled himself this time with a huge Parliamentary question on notice in the House of Assembly that must break some kind of record. He asks six questions (membership, finance, meetings and overseas trips, etc.) about a total of 227 statutory authorities in South Australia. Don't like his chances of getting that total of 1 362 (time and money consuming) separate items of information.

I hope that whoever wrote that article has inside information as to whether the Government will fail to answer the questions because, if it fails, it fails in respect of its accountability to South Australian taxpayers. It would be an absolute disgrace for the Government not to answer my questions on statutory authorities. For the past four years various questions have been asked concerning the number of statutory authorities in this State. Indeed, no-one really knows how many there are, but attempts have been made by the Public Service Board, the Audit Department and the Treasury to list them. Indeed, efforts have even been made in the Ombudsman's office to ascertain as accurately as possible how many statutory authorities there are in South Australia.

I believe that up to two years ago we could not ascertain the exact number. No matter which Party is in Government, that is an extremely disappointing state of affairs. In saying this, I am not shooting at the present Government only, because my Party was recently in Government for three years and is just as much to blame for this state of affairs as anyone else.

Mr Oswald: Should a committee be set up?

Mr BECKER: No, because research has been done in the Premier's Department to provide an accurate list.

More importantly, I want to know who are the members of those various authorities, whether they be boards or committees. For the benefit of Saboteur, who wrote the article, if he had done his homework and checked the Notice Paper he would have found that there are more than 227 authorities involved, and that the number is more like 237. Many of those statutory authorities have been broken up into further committees, and I refer for instance to the Pest Plants Control Board, with a requirement of at least 10 people, and possibly more. Many of the provisions for committees were repealed yesterday.

Then there are the soil conservation district boards, and there is a considerable number of those. Further, in the Education Department at one stage I think there were 500 people on the curriculum committee, although certainly they were not paid. The number of committees and statutory authorities goes on and on. It would be most important for the new Government to have clearly defined under whose responsibility these various organisations now come. An accurate record of these organisations would be handy for the Parliamentary Library, for the Legislature itself, and for all members. It would be useful to the new Government, because each Minister will have to review the appointments of persons on those statutory authorities. Some of the appointments (and let us be honest) are political.

I have always believed, and I have said jokingly, that when we got into Government we would not have enough volunteers amongst our own Party membership to fill all the appointments. The member for Glenelg knows, as I do, that only once were we asked to nominate someone to a board position, which occurred during the closing days of the Liberal Government. We were not even consulted on appointments to these statutory authorities. I believe strongly that there should be greater representation of women on most of these authorities, whether to make a contribution as one from an expert field or whether to be present as a consumer, as it is most important that we have consumers on many of the authorities.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Not on the Red Scale Committee, but why not have a woman consumer on the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia? At present there is in fact a woman on the Builders Licensing Board, which is an excellent idea. Also, I want to know details of the credit funds, because we know that the overall indebtedness of statutory authorities is about $1 040 000 000. But what we want to know is the amount of credit funds, where they are placed, and whether they offset the indebtedness. Some of those funds could well be held by Treasury with the authorities not receiving interest payments. It is important that the Government knows those details, too. It is important that the Treasury advises the Government so that it knows exactly where it stands and what its commitments will be in the future, which will help it with its monetary situation.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 3 May at 2 p.m.