HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 November 1983

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

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question as detailed in the schedule that I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

SALINITY CONTROL

In reply to the **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (21 September).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government considers the proposal for an international symposium on salinity, irrigation, and drainage as it affects the Murray and Darling Rivers to have considerable merit. Salinity is one of the most important water resource issues facing Australia today, and is clearly a national problem. It is considered that the proposed symposium could have a more national flavour with the inclusion of additional topics covering dry-land salinity and water conservation issues. The involvement of the River Murray Commission will be investigated. Accordingly, I have asked the Minister of Water Resources to further investigate this matter with the view to developing a proposal.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXES

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say what action the Government is taking to stamp out the avoidance of State taxes that could be costing the State up to $10 million annually? Since I raised the need to reduce liquor taxes in this House yesterday, I have received calls from several people drawing my attention to the extent of tax avoidance in South Australia. The areas that appear to be the main targets for avoidance are the liquor industry, cigarette retailers and outlets selling instant lottery and beer tickets.

While it is difficult to estimate the total tax avoided each year, it has been suggested to me that the State Government is being deprived of revenue of at least $10 million annually. I am informed in the case of both tobacco and liquor a minority of retailers are shipping stock from interstate without notifying the South Australian Government.

The previous Government took positive action to reduce tax avoidance by appointing a special officer to identify cases of avoidance within the liquor industry and to prosecute offenders. I am told that the practice of avoidance has become more prevalent in the area of tobacco sales since the State Government increased the tobacco franchise earlier this year.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The topic the Leader raises is an important one, but I do not know how accurate is the estimate he has given on the extent of tax avoidance in this State. Estimates are hard to make because of the various taxes and ways in which they are levied. But, there is no question that there is tax avoidance, as there has been historically over a long period. Indeed, in Opposition, I was critical of the previous Government, particularly after evidence of tax avoidance at Federal level, translated into areas such as stamp duties, became available. It seemed that there was a considerable reluctance in some cases to close loopholes, or to properly enforce the legislation.

If tax avoidance is allowed to continue, it not only means that some persons who should be paying, in terms of their responsibility, are getting away with it but also that the general level of taxes is probably higher than it need be because of the extent of avoidance. Since coming to office we have addressed this problem directly. In April this year Cabinet authorised the appointment of extra staff to the State Taxation Office specifically to consider tax avoidance. I cannot remember the number offhand, but I think it is about 12 officers. This was done on the basis that their employment could be justified in terms of the revenue savings that would result from this exercise.

Over subsequent months processes have been set in train to advertise those positions, to make appointments, and to train appropriately those appointed. At this stage the full complement is still not in place, but that should happen soon, when we will have a much larger team studying this whole area of tax avoidance.

PLANNING ACT

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether the Government has considered bringing in amendments to the Planning Act that would provide grounds to local government bodies to disallow investors and developers from entering businesses or development that economically could easily be regarded as not viable? I cite two cases that might occur in the city of Whyalla, and I am sure that if we investigated there would be plenty of similar cases in the State where expert opinion might easily have deemed doubtful about their economic viability.

The first was the building of a motel which, after a short time, was placed on the open market. The second was a possible proposal to build a second indoor cricket complex, which economic experts are saying a city the size of Whyalla could not sustain economically. I am concerned that local government has no power, as I understand it, to disallow in those circumstances. Yet, it would seem that applications of the nature I explained are doomed in terms of economic survival and, therefore, should be the subject of deep thought before being allowed to proceed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member's analysis of the present position in law is absolutely correct. I think there are probably good reasons why planning laws should not, except perhaps at the extremity, admit of the consideration of economic questions. These things for the most part are left either to market forces or other areas of Government surveillance or intervention. However, the honourable member will be aware that in respect of a rather different sort of investment, in a different part of the State, the Government considered what limited powers were available to it to take economic factors into account and decided that in respect of that matter it was inappropriate to proceed, but nonetheless that it should examine closely this concept of the wisdom or otherwise of admitting the sorts of questions the honourable member has raised.

In the light of that decision a working party has been set up that embraces both my Department and the Department of State Development. They will be considering the circumstances of the Renown Park shopping centre approval, not to review that matter because it is now beyond doubt all the proper approvals have been granted, but as a case study into the appropriateness of planning being expanded to embrace these sorts of considerations.

It would be unwise of me at this stage to speculate on the outcome of that working party or indeed what attitude

the Government might take to it. However, I can assure the honourable member that the concerns that he has expressed are under the Government's sight in relation to this inquiry and, once the inquiry has been completed and the matter placed before the Government, I should have more information for the honourable member and for the House.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say when construction tenders will be called for the Adelaide railway station redevelopment project? In a speech given some weeks ago on 8 June to a South Australian tourism conference, the Premier said that construction tenders for the project would be called almost immediately, after an agreement to proceed with the project was announced.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If one examines the statement made, it also pointed out that there was certain design work to be done in relation to this project, and that is proceeding. Until that has been completed, the actual construction tenders cannot be let. I understand that is proceeding at the moment, and I would expect, in terms of the agreement reached that envisages a commencement of the construction phase by July 1984, that that time table can be met.

SMOKING ON TRANSPORT

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport consider introducing legislation to give private bus companies or owners the power to prohibit smoking on privately owned buses that provide the only means of public transport from a particular area to places of employment? I have been contacted by a constituent who suffers from asthmatic hay fever and who is required to catch a private bus service, not from within my own district but from Victor Harbor and Willunga to Adelaide. Recently, this gentleman had to leave the bus because there were four people smoking on it. He had an asthmatic attack, and had to get off the bus for his own personal health. I have conducted my own investigations into this matter, and it would seem that neither the bus company nor anyone else wants to accept the responsibility for ensuring the health and safety of my constituents in this matter. That is why I am asking the question of the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for her question and appreciate her concern. It is a matter on which I would receive about one letter a week: it is quite a regular occurrence. However, at the moment there is no power which enables a coach proprietor to prohibit smoking in his vehicles. The State Transport Authority has its own by-laws which provide that no person shall smoke in any portion of a vehicle not set aside for that purpose. However, it is not possible for a private company to have by-laws.

Certain private companies request voluntary abstention, and display a 'Thank you for not smoking' sign. However, total prohibition probably is not desirable in view of the lengthy journey times and distances involved with many private bus operators and technical difficulties associated with isolating smoking and non-smoking areas in these buses, most of which have air-conditioned systems. It is not the present intention of the Government to legislate to prohibit smoking on long distance buses. It is considered that policy relating to smoking in privately owned buses should be left to the discretion of the individual companies concerned.

AURORA HOTEL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Did the Minister of Housing ask the Acting State Secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation, Mr Larry Hughes, on 8 November to extend for a further week the union ban on work at the Aurora Hotel, despite advice from a State Industrial Commissioner that the builders labourers involved were in breach of their award and were acting illegally? I have been informed that on 4 November Mr Commissioner Pryke, acting as a board of reference, advised the union that its ban on the Aurora Hotel was in breach of the award and, therefore, illegal. As a result, the Acting State Secretary of the Union, Mr Larry Hughes, assured the Commissioner that he would put that advice to a meeting of the management committee on 8 November. On that day, however, the Minister contacted Mr Hughes and asked him to ensure that the ban was extended for a further week. It has been put to me that the Minister's action amounted to encouragement to the Union to act illegally, and that his interference with the industrial jurisdiction in this way was completely improper.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As a result of a meeting held in the office of my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, there was a proposition that possibly the Housing Trust could come up with a programme to save the site and save the hotel. I did ask the building union to honour the picket line. If that is the answer that the member for Light wants, 'Yes.'

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The Minister interfered with the industrial jurisdiction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

T.W.U. FEES

Mr TRAINER: In view of the allegations made by the member for Todd on 25 October regarding overdue Transport Workers Union membership dues, can the Minister of Labour advise whether it is the practice of other organisations apart from unions to require overdue membership subscriptions to be paid? After the member for Todd made this allegation, I contacted the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union (Mr Keith Cys), a constituent of mine whom I hold in high regard, to hear the other side of the story. Following those discussions I have reason to believe that other organisations do indeed require overdue membership fees to be met.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: One has become used to the attacks made by the member for Todd not only on trade unionists but on working people as well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member has been quite vicious since he came into this House.

Mr Becker: Nonsense!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is not nonsense at all. On several occasions the member has used the Chamber of this House in which to hide behind his attacks on the working-class people in South Australia.

Mr Ashenden: Give me some examples; be specific.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not hear the latest attack that he made during a speech he made on 25 October, but I read the honourable member's comments in *Hansard* a couple of days later. I thought then that here was a person who showed absolute and extreme ignorance of what happens in the industrial field.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: First of all, maybe it would assist matters if the honourable member keeps quiet for a moment and stops interjecting while I tell him a few facts

about the industrial scene. The member attacked the Transport Workers Union, which is held in very high respect not only in South Australia but on the national scene.

Mr Ashenden: Like the teamsters!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It registers its rules in the Federal Industrial Court.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let us face it; we are used to these sorts of attack from the honourable member: now he is trying to describe the Transport Workers Union as similar to the teamsters. The honourable member should jump outside and put that on the television and see how he gets on.

Mr Becker: Is that a threat?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member suggests that I am threatening the member for Todd. I would suggest that in his speech the member for Todd threatened the Transport Workers Union—that is where the threat lies. I do not think that the member for Hanson even read the speech or heard it.

Mr Becker: I was in the House at that time.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member for Hanson usually shows a little more respect for the working class than does the member for Todd. If the honourable member wants to support that sort of stuff, in future we will know what he is all about as well. I want to inform the member for Todd that the rules applicable to the Transport Workers Union (or to any other union, for that matter) are registered in the Industrial Court. They are challengeable rules; anyone can go along and challenge those rules if they are dissatisfied with them. They have not been challenged. Every industrial organisation has the right to claim back dues where those dues are owed. I have not talked to Keith Cys about the matter referred to by the honourable member or to the other person to whom the honourable member referred in his speech, although I point out that had they bothered to ring up the union—

Mr Ashenden: They did.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not believe that. Had the employees bothered to ring up the union at the time when they were dismissed or retrenched the union would have taken them off its cards until such time as they were re-employed. I have investigated plenty of these situations over the years, and I have always been able to discover that there was a second side to the question, namely, that an employee had left the industry or gone away and not been in touch with the organisation with which he was involved, or had forgotten or deliberately had not paid his fees. A time eventually comes when the employee's cards are examined and he is found to be unfinancial. That is what happened in the case referred to by the honourable member. Acting quite within the rights under the registered rules of the organisation the union notifies the members concerned about their arrears. That is the first action that is taken. The honourable member can shake his head or do what he likes, but the fact of the matter is that every organisation has a responsibility to notify a member that he is in arrears.

In most cases, people who do not respond eventually are contacted by a debt collection agency. That is what happened in this case. No law was broken. Every opportunity would have been given to the members concerned. The member for Todd can shake his head, but I can cite literally thousands of illustrations of instances where people have left an organisation (which could have occurred for many reasons), and where it has been up to them to contact that organisation to seek relief from payment of fees until they are re-employed or until they resign from the industry altogether. When any new member joins the Transport Workers Union, he is given a book of rules which clearly identify that situation. It states that, under these rules, one shall be a member of that organisation. One of the rules happens to be that members must give three months notice and must be financial at that stage if they want to resign.

Mr Mathwin: Do they all get the book?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes, every member who joins that organisation gets the book. I think that that explains something to the honourable member about the machinations and workings of trade unions and industrial organisations. The member may get some further surprises today when he learns that I have two letters in my possession. The first is to the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union of South Australia, Mr Keith Cys, and is signed by Mr A.A. Achatz. It is an interesting letter.

Mr Hamilton: He is looking sick.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Well, if he is not sick now he will be when I read this letter. He may need some aspirin in a moment.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I could give him something better than that.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am sure the honourable member could; he may need something better than that. I will read the letter, which is not from the union but from a qualified accountant. Dated 16 November 1983, it states:

Dear Keith,

I refer to our recent discussion concerning criticism by Mr Scott Ashenden in the South Australian House of Assembly grievance debates. I believe that Mr Ashenden debated this issue with the view of attacking a union in Parliament, in order to gain advantage for the Liberal Opposition through press reporting. He has obviously overlooked the fact that the association the Liberals support, that is, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry S.A. Incorporated, use the same methods of collecting their members' subscriptions, having had practical experience with the Chamber of Commerce through my accounting firm of A.A. Achatz & Co.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member should listen, so that he can learn. The letter continues:

I decided in 1977 to join the chamber with the view of being able to enlist the support of the chamber in trying to assist the owner driver transport operators, following discussions with officers of the chamber. However, after 12 months, I gave up, as the chamber indicated that if higher freight rates were to be the result of their assistance, then they would be working against the interest of many of their existing members.

I then decided not to renew my subscription for the 1978 year and ignored accounts, being of the opinion that the membership would be automatically cancelled as is the case in most clubs encountered by us in our audit work.

We now come to the interesting part of the letter:

However, in November 1979, I received a letter from the chamber's solicitors, threatening legal proceedings. I of course immediately paid the account and sent in a written resignation advising that the chamber had not attempted to assist owner drivers, the group of underprivileged small business which we were trying to assist, and that, therefore, the chamber would not be of any benefit to my firm or my owner driver clients.

So, you see that the rules of the chamber are not much different to the T.W.U., concerning payment of subs, and conditions of resignation. When my firm's membership was accepted by the chamber, I was not advised of resignation rules, which in the case of the T.W.U., all new members receive a copy of that rule. I suggest that you advise Mr Scott Ashenden of this, in order to improve his knowledge of industrial associations.

I further wish to state that at least the T.W.U. is helping small business in the form of owner drivers, and have improved the conditions and earnings of these people in a responsible caring manner as opposed to the chamber who did nothing.

One final point really puts the nail in the coffin. Another letter needs to be read so that the record is clear in *Hansard.*

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the Leader is going to allow his back-benchers to make stupid claims, they will get the reply.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have been around a long time; they will not bustle me. For the purpose of educating the honourable member, I will read a letter, dated 1 November 1979 addressed to Mr Achatz from Mollison Litchfield, which states:

> We act for the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (S.A.) Inc., of which your company is a member. On our instructions your company is in arrears of dues owed to our client in the sum of $214. We wish to point out that when our client accepted your application for membership, it was expressly agreed that you would abide by the rules of the chamber. We have been instructed to bring to your attention, in particular, the provisions of rule 12, which provide, *inter alia,* that each member shall pay to the chamber an annual subscription which shall become payable immediately upon the posting of an account in respect of the subscription. We have therefore been instructed to claim the said sum of $214 from you plus $21 in respect of legal costs incurred by our client in this matter to date—

this is the crunch line, which may teach the honourable member something—

> we further advise that, if you fail to discharge your liability in the manner mentioned above within 14 days of the date hereof, we have received instructions to institute legal proceedings for recovery of the amount outstanding. You will no doubt appreciate that additional legal costs will be incurred, should it be necessary for such action to be commenced.

I make no criticism of that letter. I make no criticism of the right of the chamber to collect its arrears, in the same way as I make no criticism of the Transport Workers Union. They both have that right because they are industrial organisations and have registered rules as such.

AURORA HOTEL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At the meeting on 8 November that the Minister for Environment and Planning had with representatives of the Save the Aurora group, Baulderstones, the City Council and the Building Trades Federation, did the Minister reveal that the Government was urging the union to extend for a further week its ban on the demolition of the Aurora Hotel?

The Minister held a meeting on 8 November with parties involved in the Aurora Hotel dispute. In his Ministerial statement to this House later that day the Minister said that it was clear that Baulderstones had acted within the law and that understandably the company was concerned with delays to the project and that it was now entitled to proceed with the development. However, as the member for Light has just revealed and the Minister of Local Government has confirmed, also on 8 November the Minister of Local Government asked the Building Trades Federation to extend for a further week its ban on the project.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: At that particular meeting the representatives of the Save the Aurora committee indicated that they thought a move was available to save the Aurora, the phrase they use which would be that the Housing Trust would look at the possibility of purchasing the property for use as a rooming house. I can recall that as early as 1973 or 1974, when I was Minister of Housing, I had a visit from someone basically calling himself a social worker who was working with what was then called the South-East Corner Group and who indicated to me that there was an erosion of rooming house capacity within the city which would create problems for the society of the city as time went along.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I presume you're going to answer the question.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I did have that in mind, Mr Speaker, I trust with your permission and that of the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: I would be trusting along similar lines.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir. I reported this to the then General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust, who prepared a report on this matter. That was about the time when there was a change in portfolios and when I went to education and became interested in other things. So, I lost the thread of whether in fact the Housing Trust continued with this proposition. Quite candidly, I had pretty well forgotten all about it, so when the matter was brought out on to the table at this meeting it was not altogether new to me. It invoked some sort of response from me because it reminded me of that earlier approach. There seemed to be some validity in the viewpoint that there is a problem with low-rental accommodation in the City of Adelaide. So, whilst in terms of the sort of costs that were indicated (in very general terms by the representatives of Baulderstones) it seemed to me that probably it was not a financial proposition for the Government, nonetheless I reported this matter to my colleagues. What then transpired has already been revealed here.

MICROWAVE OVENS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, ask his colleague to investigate claims that radiation leaks from microwave ovens in food outlets may be injurious to workers' and customers' health and that there is no legal requirement for regular safety checks on microwave ovens in South Australia? It has been put to me that with the proliferation of microwave ovens in South Australia there may be a danger to employees' health. I have been supplied with a press cutting from the *Western Mail,* dated 30 April 1983, which states, in part:

> Radiation leaks from microwave ovens in fast food outlets have sparked concern for the safety of workers and customers.

The article points out that in Western Australia it was found that four microwave ovens were leaking dangerous levels of radiation. The article continues:

> Some of the microwave ovens were leaking because door seals had been damaged or the doors were out of alignment or dented.

The following comment is quoted:

> It should be noted that we are not legally required to make the checks... We rely mainly on the goodwill of councils to check up on fast food outlets using microwave ovens.

The articles continues:

> Australian Consumers Association liaison officer Jan Nary said prolonged exposure to low level radiation could cause health problems. 'There is plenty of evidence to show that high doses of microwave radiation can cause problems, especially blindness,' she said. 'Often the problems take years to surface... Immediate steps should be taken by the Government to ensure the safety of workers and customers in fast food outlets.'
>
> Liquor and Allied Industries Union secretary Eugene Fry said he was concerned that his members could be exposed to excessive levels of radiation from microwave ovens. 'Clearly something needs to be done to ensure that employees in fast food outlets are not endangering their health,' he said.

As it has been put to me that that situation may apply in South Australia, will the Minister obtain a report to try to allay the fears of my constituent?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not sure whether it refers directly to the Attorney-General or to the Minister of Health. As I recall, a committee is investigating radiation protection, controls and measurement. That may well be a more appropriate source to consult, but I will endeavour to obtain information on this matter for the honourable member.

AURORA HOTEL

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I ask the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Industrial Affairs, whether he believes that the Minister of Local Government acted improperly when, without consultation with any of the other parties involved in the dispute, he asked the Building Trades Federation to extend its ban on the Aurora Hotel—or, as the Minister euphemistically puts it, to continue the picket lines for a further week—despite advice from an industrial commissioner that the ban was in breach of an award and was illegal.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It was my understanding (and I might be wrong) that there was never really a ban on and that the people concerned said they were on a picket line.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It was not their picket line. Let us be clear about the situation. If the builders labourers themselves had a picket line, there would be a black ban. It is because of the industrial naivety of the Opposition that they do not understand the difference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Do you want an answer or not? Just keep quiet, and you will get an answer. It is again an illustration of the naivety of the Opposition when it confuses the two issues. I understood that what the builders labourers and I think the Builders Federation had decided was that they would not cross the picket line put there by the Save the Aurora people. That is an entirely different situation from the builders labourers or the B.T.F. having their own black ban and establishing their own picket line. If Opposition members cannot see the difference, they must be blind. There is none so blind as those who do not want to see. That is the situation at the moment: the Opposition does not want to see.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: They are trying to make something of what the Minister of Housing said or—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am trying to explain the difference with a picket line. Do you want an answer or not? You do not want the answer I am giving; that is the problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: You will get the answer I am giving you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One thing that I will not tolerate is a shouting match. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, it is a great display of ignorance and arrogance on the other side of the House. It suits them down to the ground. I have tried to explain the difference to members opposite. As they have had no industrial experience, they would not know the difference. I am trying to help them understand what the circumstances were. In relation to the Minister acting—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Do you want an answer, or not? Just keep quiet, will you? Just keep quiet while I give an answer.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am trying to answer the question but you will not let me.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Are you ready now for the answer? I will give it to you. The answer to the question of the honourable member for Torrens is this: the Minister of Housing is a Minister in his own right, and any duties he has an obligation to perform in that regard he has a right to perform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CROWN LANDS

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate what is being done about the misuse of Crown lands? It has been brought to my attention that there is an ever increasing misuse of Crown lands, such as tree felling for firewood, vandalism, rubbish dumping and ring-barking of trees for no good reason. I have been asked whether campers should be prohibited from the use of such sensitive land sites.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We would, as a Government, be loath to ban the public generally from using Crown lands: we believe that Crown lands are there for the use and enjoyment of the public, particularly where they are not specifically allotted to a lessee. Where there is some sort of lease agreement, usually it sets out the basis upon which the public can be admitted to those areas. I would like to thank the honourable member for the question, because we are very concerned about this matter. In certain areas of the State, and the Riverland is one that I can think of, it is unfortunate that the legacy of a long weekend is usually the ring-barking of trees, trees cut down, and rubbish left all over the place. It is important that members of the public in general understand that they are breaking the law when they indulge in these activities on Crown lands. Crown land designation is not an invitation for people to do whatever they want.

We have drawn this matter to the attention of the law enforcing authorities. We would prefer that an education campaign is sufficient, and that people will take heed of warnings. We do not want people to be prosecuted necessarily in these circumstances, but certainly the force of the law will be applied where people simply act irresponsibly in sensitive areas such as those to which the honourable member has referred.

AURORA HOTEL

Mr RODDA: Did the Minister of Local Government inform A.W. Baulderstone Pty Ltd of his request to the Builders Labourers Federation on 8 November to extend the union ban on the demolition of the Aurora Hotel for a further week and, if not, why not?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In answer to the first question, I did not contact Baulderstone's. I sent a minute to the Housing Trust to ascertain whether it would consider the Aurora Hotel site as possible rooming and residential accommodation. By the time the information came back to me that the Housing Trust was genuinely interested in studying the site and wanted to investigate the proposal, it was about 5 o'clock. The meeting of the unions was due to take place at 5.30. I then sent one of my staff to the union's

office to explain that the Housing Trust was interested, and to ask if they could possibly honour the picket line.

I then contacted the Premier's Department and the Housing Trust's General Manager, and asked the General Manager to contact Mr Merisch in Sydney as soon as he possibly could, and I think that contact was made at 11 o'clock that night. The following morning, Mr Merisch and Mr Goodman from Sydney had instructed their officers in Adelaide to give full co-operation to the Housing Trust's engineering staff so that they could investigate the possibility of taking over the development.

COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Labour report to the House the progress of the Community Employment Programme scheme introduced by the Labor Government, and the benefits achieved by those schemes for South Australia's unemployed and the South Australian economy? I refer to an article which appeared in today's *Advertiser* and which highlights the benefits that will be attributed to South Australia from the Community Employment Programme. The article states:

> The Federal and State Governments yesterday jointly announced approval for 10 new C.E.P. projects in South Australia costing about $577 000.

It further outlines that it would employ 34 people. With increased unemployment in the community over the past few years, but with a reduction in unemployment in South Australia recently, these schemes have proved to be of great importance, as highlighted in the *Advertiser* today.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Indeed, the benefits under the scheme announced this morning come under the C.E.P. However, I would like to go back in history and give the House some information. The wage pause funds have been generating most of the job creation schemes, and the C.E.P. is just starting to get mobile. More than 200 projects have been approved under the wage pause funds resulting in about 2 200 jobs being created.

Many of these jobs will not necessarily provide people with permanent occupations, but they will generate permanent jobs afterwards. That is one of the attributes of this State's efforts to generate permanent full-time employment, and in many cases these schemes will generate full-time employment. The Hawke Federal Government allocated $21.7 million this financial year under the C.E.P. scheme, and we have been assured that a further $33 million will be allocated next year.

South Australia has a wide and extensive programme in which to operate in trying to devise excellent projects. We have attempted to notify all people in South Australia interested in such projects inviting them to bring forward their proposals. So far under the C.E.P. scheme 23 different projects have been allocated, all in high unemployment areas, and further projects will been announced in the near future. The State Government has allocated $5.7 million to job creation schemes, and we will soon announce the first of those schemes. In fact, I will be announcing one of those schemes on Saturday morning which, I believe, will be of major significance to South Australia.

Finally, I place on record the fact that I an not satisfied with the projects that are coming forward. When the Government originally announced the creation of these schemes, a stipulation was made that jobs under the schemes were to comprise 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female labour. I know that the member for Coles would appreciate what I am saying. However, we have been unable to fulfil that obligation, and I am not satisfied with that. The reason why this has occurred is that the proponents of the scheme are not offering schemes that comprise jobs that are traditionally held by women.

I have made some press statements about this. I have also contacted various departments to see what they can do about the matter. I have given instructions to my own Department to see whether or not we can ensure that the percentage of women involved can be lifted to the 50 per cent mark. That will be almost impossible to do this year but, as I have said, some forward planning is occurring for next year when $31 million will be made available for the project. I can only hope that we successfully encourage proponents of various schemes throughout South Australia to give some thought to how women can be employed within those schemes.

Officers of the department concerned are available to talk to people about these projects. I have made that known to councils, community and welfare organisations, and so on, as well as to women's advisers. Everyone is working on this matter. Recently, I received a report from the Women's Advisers Task Force, which is looking at the matter of women's employment generally. In regard to these projects I am not satisfied with the situation, and I am critical of the fact that we have not been able to fulfil the Government's intentions in this respect. I would appreciate receiving advice from anyone who can assist, and I again call on organisations to search their souls to see whether they can overcome these problems.

GOVERNMENT IRRIGATION AREAS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: How does the Minister of Water Resources account for the Government's recovering only 26 per cent of the total cost of operating and maintaining Government irrigation areas when private irrigation schemes by necessity meet 100 per cent of costs and periodically carry out rehabilitation works with a rate structure significantly less than that of the Government? Recently, I received from the First Mildura Irrigation Trust a statistical schedule setting out details of a number of irrigation areas in both Victoria and South Australia. The schedule indicates areas such as Merbein, Nyah, Red Cliffs, Robinvale, Tresco, Mildura, Renmark, and Berri, which are the Government irrigation areas.

The schedule sets it out on the basis of a 9.144 megalitres per hectare application rate. It moves across the chart giving the total charge for irrigation and drainage rates. The schedule indicates that, in the main, the total irrigation and drainage charges amount to between $250 and $275 per hectare at the application rate of 9.144 megalitres per hectare.

In the case of the Government irrigation areas of South Australia, the charge is now $350.80 per hectare compared to all other areas listed operating in a like situation. How can the Minister account for the Government's operating in a like situation and providing similar services but only meeting 26 per cent of the total cost? I seek leave to have the purely statistical table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Engineer/Manager's Report No. 21/1983

FIRST MILDURA IRRIGATION TRUST
COMPARISON OF DISTRICT CHARGES ON BASIS OF 9.144 Ml/Ha WATER USAGE

District	Water Right and Extra Water for usage of 9.144 Ml/Ha	Irrigation Charge (Water Right and Extra Water)	Drainage Charge (Water Right)	Total Charge Irrigation and Drainage ($ per ha)	Relativity based on Mildura at 100%
Merbein	9.144 Ml/Ha	× $25.10 = $229.50	× $2.00 = $18.30	$247.80	98%
Nyah	7.62 Ml/Ha + 1.524	× $25.30 = $192.80 + 38.50	× $2.18 = $16.60		
	9.144	$231.30	$16.60	$247.90	98%
Red Cliffs	9.144 Ml/Ha	× $26.90 = $246.00	× $2.89 = $26.40	$272.40	108%
Robinvale	7.62 Ml/Ha + 1.524	× $29.80 = $227.10 + 45.40	× $2.17 = $16.50		
	9.144	$272.50	$16.50	$289.00	114%
Tresco	6.096 Ml/Ha + 3.048	× $25.30 = $154.20 + 77.10	× $3.13 = $19.10		
	9.144	$231.30	$19.10	$250.40	99%
Mildura	6.0 Ml/Ha + 3.144	× $33.00 = $198.00 × $13.00 + 40.90	× $2.35 = $14.10		
	9.144	$238.90	$14.10	$253.00	100%
Renmark	7.5 Ml/Ha + 1.644	× $30.52 = $228.90 + 50.20	Included in Irrigation Charge		
	9.144	$279.10		$279.10	110%
Berri	6.12 Ml/Ha + 3.024	× $34.90 = $213.60 + 105.50	× $5.18 = $31.70		
	9.144	$319.10	$31.70	$350.80	139%

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The E. & W.S. Department is recovering only 26 per cent, after the increase in water rates announced earlier this year, of total costs including maintenance and operating costs, and that indicates clearly that the Government ought to consider what I referred to last week: namely, to investigate the problems associated with the Riverland, not only in regard to water charges but also to overall problems in regard to market forces and such costs.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If members opposite give me the opportunity, I will answer the three questions at once. In regard to operating and maintenance costs, the schedule does not indicate, as has been claimed, that the Department is inefficient. It means that we are not charging enough, and have not charged enough in the past. The member for Chaffey was the Minister for three years and ought to know the problems in the Riverland. He owns a property there and, as a consequence, should understand—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The charges are the highest.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I will be coming to that in a moment. You ought to know that you have to compare like with like.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should be using the term 'the honourable member' and not 'you'.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Chaffey is not comparing like with like. There are two essential differences: first, Government irrigation areas in the Riverland are pumping operations with smaller holdings.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: You are talking about the Mildura situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a private conversation. I ask the member for Chaffey to desist from interjecting.

Mr Becker: It's a very interesting conversation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: You have to compare like with like.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson is out of order: although it may be an interesting conversation, nobody else can hear it, apart from anything else.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: One has to compare like with like. The system and figures referred to by the member for Chaffey are for Mildura, and refer to larger holdings and to gravitation rather than pumping situations. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is supported by Government loans, but a deputation from that organisation came to me last year and asked me to defer the interest on those loans. As a result of that deputation, I deferred the interest repayment on that loan. The Renmark Irrigation Trust has difficulties, as do the growers in the Riverland. One of the difficulties is that the Riverland growers are not getting the price they should be getting for their produce, as I explained last week.

I forget the last point the honourable member raised, because his question contained two or three separate questions. Let me repeat that the E. & W.S. Department is not inefficient. If it were, that situation would not have arisen only in the past 12 months. The member for Chaffey was Minister for the previous three years, and if the Department was inefficient it would be a reflection on him. It is considered that he was the worst Minister of Water Resources this State has ever had.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WOMEN PRISONERS

Ms LENEHAN: My question is to the Chief Secretary.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am sorry I am hesitating, Mr Speaker, but I am waiting—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not surprised that the member for Mawson is waiting. We might as well install a

telephone line between the member for Chaffey and the Minister of Water Resources, the way this is going on. The honourable member for Mawson.

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Chief Secretary please investigate recent allegations that women who are detained in South Australian prisons are denied equal access to education and employment opportunities? In particular, will the Chief Secretary state whether women in South Australian prisons will have equal access, where possible, to all trades to be offered and employment undertaken at the new Yatala industrial complex and to all trades being taught and employment being undertaken at the Cadell Training Centre, Adelaide Gaol and other correctional institutions in South Australia? It has been put to me by my constituents and other members of the community that women serving in South Australian prisons, although few in number, traditionally have been denied equality of access to rehabilitative programmes which would enable them to leave prison with a range of skills so that they could find employment upon release.

Mr Mathwin: They have the best conditions of any prisoners.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mawson to ignore interjections and to carry on with the explanation.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I am ignoring the member for Glenelg. The explanation is that women traditionally have been denied—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to come to order mighty quickly.

Ms LENEHAN: It has been put to me that women have been denied access to a range of training programmes other than what have been seen as traditional female areas where jobs do not exist.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am aware that many complaints are being made about the Women's Rehabilitation Centre. Those complaints are being investigated. A certain amount of difficulty exists in the proposition put by the honourable member that I would like to canvass. One of the great difficulties with the Women's Rehabilitation Centre is that it caters for 24 or 25 prisoners and it is difficult to provide trade training for such a small group. A new industrial complex has been constructed at Yatala but the Government does not intend that prisoners to be housed in the new complex at the W.R.C. and the new minimum security prison be trained in that industrial complex, because certain problems are created when moving low security prisoners in and out of a high security prison. Those prisoners, 40 in number, will probably work in the low security areas in the garden, in the dairy and outside of the Yatala compound but within the fenced area.

Without investigating the matter much more closely, I do not think it will be possible to provide opportunities there for the female prisoners. Certainly there is great logistic difficulty in providing at Cadell training for the women at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, because special training is undertaken in the orchards, and to move women from the W.R.C. to Cadell does not seem to be reasonable. I do not think Adelaide Gaol would provide many opportunities for training women from the W.R.C. The fact of life is that few prisoners in South Australia have been getting adequate trade training. It is also a fact that the work women do has been concentrated in the laundry and cooking areas. I must say though that within the male prisons laundry and cooking activities are carried on by male prisoners, so that sort of work is also being performed by male prisoners.

I think the cause of the concern is that women prisoners in South Australia do not have an opportunity to do anything but work with the needle, in the laundry, or at cooking. I should think that people would acknowledge that I have inherited a whole host of problems within the correctional services in South Australia. We are trying to attack as many as we can at one time and I think we are making considerable headway. We really have not had a good look at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, but once the new prison becomes operational we will need to have a look at the total regime there, and that will be done. The concerns that the honourable member has brought to the House have been expressed to me over a number of years. They are real and apparent problems and I will have them investigated and bring down a reply.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DEPUTY PREMIER'S REMARKS

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: I wish to make a personal explanation with reference to remarks made earlier this afternoon by the Deputy Premier, who misrepresented both my position and my constituent's situation almost completely in the points that he made. In his attack the Deputy Premier said that I raised the matter originally in the House so that I could attack the Transport Workers Union. I would like to make quite clear for all members that I raised this matter in the House because I was approached by a constituent of mine who had approached the Transport Workers Union and who had not been able to resolve the situation with that union. He therefore asked me, on his behalf, to raise this matter to see whether any help could be provided to him.

The Deputy Premier was in error in many ways, but probably one of the main ways was that the constituent on whose behalf I was making the representation was never a member of the Transport Workers Union and that was admitted by the Transport Workers Union itself. There are many other points on which I will subsequently take an opportunity to ensure that the correct facts are put fully before this House.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LAND ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1969. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Land Acquisition Act to give people who believe that they have had their land acquired without proper discussion or without the right to lodge an objection to the acquisition an opportunity to do so. The present Act, which was passed in 1969, in my judgment is quite defective. It does not allow for what most people would believe to be a basic democratic right, that is, to be able to lodge an appeal against an arbitrary decision of a Government department.

Unfortunately, once a person receives a notice that his or her land is to be acquired, all rights are lost in that piece of real estate. The largest and single most important financial transaction for most people in our society is the purchase of a house. When a State Government department moves

in and acquires that property not only can people be divested of their home, but in many cases they can be forced to leave an area they like to live in and are given only a relatively short time to make adjustments involved. It has appeared to me for a long time that it is quite improper, quite wrong, and contrary to all forms of British justice that people should be treated in such a fashion.

An honourable member: I thought it was Australian justice.

Mr GUNN: Australian justice for the benefit of the honourable member; but I thought we operated under the British system of justice. The situation I outlined normally arises when a Government department, in its wisdom, determines that it wants a piece of property and cannot be bothered, in many cases, entering into proper negotiations.

An honourable member: And local government.

Mr GUNN: As my colleague interjects, local government has this authority, but in acquiring a property a Government department does not have to enter into lengthy negotiations. The Minister can sign an order, and if the Minister is not fully aware of the situation he could easily sign a piece of paper and a person's property is acquired. I wish to cite a couple of cases for the benefit of my friend, the Minister of Community Welfare. I will explain clearly and briefly to the House what happened in the notorious case of a property on Burbridge Road. To this day that property has never been used by the Highways Department for purposes for which it was acquired.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I hope they brought it to the attention of this House, because the current situation is quite disgraceful. It cannot and should not be allowed to continue. Two elderly people had owned a property on Burbridge Road for a long time. Because a person refused to meet his obligations to pay rent, and because he had political friends, the Government of the day moved in, one hour before that property was to be publicly auctioned, and compulsorily acquired it. It may be said that these things are not done arbitrarily, but I understand that that was done clearly by direction of the Government of the day. I also understand that in 1977, at the time of a State election, that docket was called to the Premier's Department and certain material which would have been embarrassing to the Government was removed from it. Yet, those people did not have the opportunity to go before an independent court and argue that they had been wrongly dispossessed.

Another case brought to my attention by the member for Coles relates to persons who some time ago had their commercial property compulsorily acquired. The Department did not use it, and the former owners wished to repurchase it, but they have been asked to pay what they consider to be greatly in excess of the price they originally received for that property. Now we have had cases in the member for Mallee's district where persons who have not wished to leave the land have had their land compulsorily acquired by the Department of Environment and Planning. The only right a person has now is to go to the Land and Valuation Court and argue that the amount offered is too low. The Government of the day, with total backing from Crown Law Department, can go to court and argue at great length, which can make it very difficult, if not impossible, for persons without resources. The total backing of the Government and its finances ensures that in many cases those people are not in a position to legally fight the matter in the courts. That is my second point.

Thirdly, current legislation really does not give any protection to a person. I quote from the section:

15. (1) The Authority may, at any time after the service of a notice of intention to acquire land, and before the publication of a notice of acquisition in respect of the land, acquire the subject land by agreement.

(2) Notwithstanding the fact that a notice of intention to acquire land has been served upon any person, the Authority may decline to proceed with the acquisition of the subject land.

(3) Where the Authority determines not to proceed with the acquisition of any land, it shall forthwith serve a notice of that fact upon all persons on whom a notice of intention to acquire the land has been served.

Those people should be entitled to some compensation because of the trauma they have experienced when the Authority or Department has determined to acquire their property. Section 12 provides:

12. (1) A person who has an interest in the subject land may within thirty days after service of a notice of intention to acquire the land or within thirty days after information and details are furnished under section 11 of this Act (whichever is the later) by notice in writing served upon the Authority–

(a) request the Authority not to proceed with the acquisition of the subject land;

(b) request any alteration in the boundaries of the subject land;

or

(c) request that any part of the subject land be not acquired, or that further land be acquired.

(2) Without limiting the effect of subsection (1) of this section, a request may be made under that subsection upon the ground that the acquisition of the land and the execution of the undertaking thereon would—

(a) seriously impair an area of scenic beauty;

(b) destroy or adversely affect a site of architectural, historical or scientific interest;

(c) create conditions seriously inimical to the conservation of flora or fauna that should, in the public interest, be conserved;

or

(d) adversely prejudice any other public interest.

(3) The Authority shall consider any request made to it under this section, and shall, within fourteen days after receipt of the request, serve notice in writing upon the person by whom the request was made, indicating whether it accedes to, or refuses, the request.

That is Caesar appealing to Caesar, because the Authority which has determined to acquire this house, land or property, if asked to investigate its own decision, obviously will not come up with a contrary decision because that would be an admission that it had made an incorrect decision in the first place. I believe that the limited right of appeal contained in that section is quite unsatisfactory. My views were strengthened when I recently read an article which appeared in the *News* on 19 October 1983 headed '"Land Grab" Compo will increase' and which states:

Amendments to the Land Acquisition Act will be introduced in the Federal Parliament soon. The Federal Administrative Services Minister Mr Brown, said this would mean more open procedures for land acquisition; greater public accountability for decisions to acquire property and more generous provisions for compensation. This would be achieved by:

New acquisition procedures with owners being notified of their rights and able to seek valuation and legal advice at Commonwealth expense.

Review by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal of acquisition decisions and offers of compensation; and

Expansion of the categories of compensation for compulsory acquisition to include a 'solace payment' where the principal place of residence was acquired.

More generous compensation would be paid for disturbance. Compensation for acquisition of a principal private residence would be based on the cost of a replacement property. This would apply when compensation would otherwise be insufficient.

I agree with the Commonwealth Government's proposals and it is high time that this Parliament took similar action. I have introduced this Bill hoping that the Minister and the Government will give it serious consideration. If they believe that there are better ways of achieving the aims that I have outlined, I shall be happy to consider any measure they suggest. However, I am of the strong belief that the situation is very unsatisfactory.

People's rights can be greatly affected and they have little right of redress when dealing with Government, semi-government authorities and, in some cases, local government.

The existing law is quite wrong, and I therefore call upon the Government and the House to support the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 10 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* replaces subsection (3) with an extended provision that requires the authority that is proposing to acquire the land to give notice to the owners of their right to apply to the Land and Valuation Court for an order directing the authority not to proceed with the acquisition. Paragraph *(b)* inserts a new subsection (5) which requires the notice of intention to acquire land, if it is to be served by post, to be posted by certified mail. Clause 4 replaces section 12 of the principal Act. At the moment this section allows an owner of land to make a number of requests of the authority, including a request that the land not be acquired. The authority must consider the request but need not agree to it. The new provision will allow an owner to apply to the Land and Valuation Court, and empowers the court to direct the authority not to proceed with the acquisition. The grounds on which the court can make an order are the same as those that appear in the existing provision, except that a ground relating to hardship has been added. Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to section 14 of the principal Act. Clause 6 makes consequential amendments to section 16 of the principal Act. I sincerely hope that the Bill will receive a speedy passage, and I commend it to the House.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER RETICULATION SCHEMES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should immediately allocate up to $5 million to allow the Engineering and Water Supply Department to commence construction of those water reticulation schemes which have been continually deferred and in each succeeding year should provide a further $4 million until all the 32 schemes currently listed by the Department are completed.

From time to time I have raised the problems that my constituents have been experiencing in relation to the lack of adequate reticulation services in the electorate of Eyre. I am aware that there are a number of other electorates in this State which require water schemes. I am of the considered opinion that there can no longer be any justification for the deferment of all these schemes. From time to time I have detailed to the House the massive subsidies that the State Government allocates in other areas. However, the stock answers provided by the Minister to me and my constituents are that the schemes are not economical and that therefore, the large expenditure required on them cannot be justified. From a Budget in excess of $2 000 million, I am only asking for an allocation of $5 million for the first year. As this House has been asked to support revenue measures which will bring in millions of dollars to the Treasury, I believe that the request that I make on this occasion is not only justified but long overdue.

If the Government and the Parliament of this State want people to live in isolated areas, produce products that can be sold on the world market, create jobs and bring export income and overseas currency into this country, the State Government has to be prepared to do a little in return and to give those people some confidence in continuing to invest in and improve their operations. We are faced, virtually on a daily basis, with Ministers making announcements of the expenditure of millions of dollars in many various ways. Many of those projects will not bring in any money whatsoever. The Minister for Environment and Planning intends to spend $700 000 in his district to prop up some cliffs. I am trying to get the water supply extended west to Ceduna, and if we had a similar amount allocated this year it would go somewhere towards getting that scheme off the ground. There is the Festival Theatre subsidy where, because of poor building and design, the Government could be required to spend millions of dollars. If a Bill dealing with that matter comes before this House, it will not get my vote while all these other projects in South Australia, particularly in my electorate, have been neglected for years.

It is becoming an absolute scandal that people living in isolated areas are continually being discriminated against. They pay their taxes like anyone else. There was an announcement yesterday that the metropolitan transport system was purchasing 40 new buses. No-one blinks an eyelid. Up to $1 million will be spent on a railway station at Salisbury, but let anyone try to get a few hundred thousand dollars for an isolated community and one would think that they are trying to shift the Rock of Gibraltar. Members often wonder why people like myself get a little irate in this House, but having lived in an isolated community myself (and I make no apology for standing up and supporting these people) I intend to continue to raise these matters as often as possible until there is some justice in relation to the expenditure of Government funds in this State.

I could provide this House with a list as long as the Leader's telex, presented recently, listing the taxes and charges that the Government has recently inflicted on the people of this State. When one looks at the electorate of Eyre, one sees the need for a water scheme west of Ceduna, the people at Terowie want a pipeline there, and a number of water mains in country areas need replacing. Obviously, there is not enough money available to do that at present. I have been advised by one of the leading pipe manufacturers in this State, that it is looking very closely at its operations. It was delighted when it saw this motion on the Notice Paper, and it hoped that it might bring the Government around to accepting its rightful responsibility. The people in the areas concerned have had to make large contributions towards having electricity connected to their homes. Because some lived more than 16 kilometres from a telephone exchange, they were charged like wounded bulls to have their telephone connected.

Many of them have only one television channel to watch and, because of the arrangements involving major sporting organisations, they have been denied the opportunity to even see the Melbourne Cup or the football grand final. I could go on with a list as long as one's arm of the sort of discrimination with which they have to contend. Children living in these areas have to get up early in the morning and travel long distances on school buses, and there are various other impediments. Surely, in 1983 when we are spending millions of dollars in other areas, these people are entitled to a fair go. Considering the list of 30-odd schemes which the Minister gave to me some time ago, I believe that these projects are long overdue and that an immediate start should be made to deal with some of them. This would employ people in constructive enterprises which would have work available there for a long time. In my judgment, it is no good spending money on schemes which are artificial or which will employ people in jobs that will not have a continuing benefit to the community.

I urge the Minister and the House to treat this matter seriously, because I have not brought it up for the purpose of blaming this Minister or his predecessor. This matter has been going on for a long time. The situation is gradually getting worse and worse, but I believe that the time has come to take positive action to solve the problem once and for all. My colleagues the members for Alexandra and Mallee and other members could raise particular matters. However, in view of the time constraints on me, there are a number

of issues in relation to this matter which I want to raise. I intend in due course to seek leave to continue my remarks.

However, I say to the Minister that I want to know what sort of long-term assurances he, the Government or this House can give to those people with whom he has had discussions about their future in relation to getting adequate water supplies, because it is absolutely wrong to just keep putting them off. I believe that he has a responsibility to say, 'In two years time, this scheme or that scheme will commence.' If one goes through the Auditor-General's Report, as I did the other day, there are literally dozens of areas in which the State Government is involved in subsidising uneconomical exercises, organisations and groups that do not bring any money into the State Treasury. The projects about which I am talking are investments in the future of South Australia which will have long-term beneficial effects and which will help the economy of this State, helping also the people who are producing products which can be exported and will bring in revenue and create jobs. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PATAWALONGA DREDGING

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to make an urgent commitment to dredging the Patawalonga channel and to carry out such works as are required to maintain a navigable waterway for the safe all-weather passage of marine craft; and further, calls on the Government to announce its proposals and planned commencement dates.

In moving this motion, I would like to pick out the key points in the motion and address myself to them. First, I call on the Government to make an urgent commitment to dredging the Patawalonga channel, and I emphasise 'urgent commitment'. Secondly, I urge the Government to carry out such works as are required to maintain the channel once it has been created; and, thirdly, to create a channel and protection for the on-going safe all-weather passage of marine craft, the owners of which choose to use Glenelg as their focal point.

I will quickly dwell on the city of Glenelg, which honourable members know is the prime beach resort of metropolitan Adelaide. It has the potential to be the focal point of the recreational boating industry in this State, and I do not think that anyone who has visited Glenelg can dispute this fact. Within the Glenelg area are some of the State's top caravan parks, motels and hotels, and there is no doubt that it is a focal point for the tourists who visit South Australia.

We are looking at a scenario whereby the city of Glenelg by its very nature is a tourist mecca which has hotels, motels and caravan parks. We can claim quite genuinely that we have the potential to become the focal point of recreational boating in the State and we have the facilities there, short of the actual channel. Members should not underestimate the recreational boating industry as a creator of jobs in this State. It exists and is spread around Adelaide operating out of small businesses which cover all forms of recreational boating, including the retail level where there are boat yards in Adelaide brimming full with a stock of yachts up to 40ft long down to the 9ft fishing dinghy. We have speed boats and boats made in South Australia that are involved in only pleasure and fishing. Also scattered around Adelaide we have the potential for employment in the construction of boats and builders who can construct boats up to 40ft long for recreational purposes down to the 6ft fishing boat.

Of course, the problem relating to Glenelg is that we fully recognise the potential of the recreational boating industry, but we do not have the launching facilities there to allow boats to go out and come back in all weather. The only place to go is North Haven or O'Sullivan Beach. Adelaide, as a tourist centre, needs an outlet at a central point along the metropolitan coastline that will provide for 24-hours-a-day, all-weather launching and retrieval of boats. The people who would use that outlet would be recreational fishermen and yachtsmen.

I hasten to point out that the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron has a very real concern about the channel being completed because it has to launch boats on rescue missions either at North Haven or somewhere else along the coast as best it can. It is a real concern to its members that they are not able to launch at Patawalonga, centrally located on the coastline. Of course, if they launch elsewhere it extends the time from receiving a call to when they can undertake a rescue. People in boats that go out to sea in relatively calm weather and are caught in a storm experience the problem that, when they go back to the Patawalonga, the tide has gone out, sand bars appear and they cannot get back in, and there is the very real risk of a disaster. Boats have been damaged, and the last thing any member would want to see is loss of life because of boats not being able to get in and out of the Patawalonga. I have mentioned the central location and the importance of the Patawalonga to the tourist industry, and I ask members to consider that aspect as well.

In Glenelg we do not under-estimate the problem that will face the Government of the day in trying to rectify this matter. A movement of sand occurs up and down the coast (primarily up the coast) each year, and every time a channel has been dug sand has moved in and filled up that channel. I think in 1981 a dredging programme was undertaken, but at the time the dredge had insufficient capacity to dig out the channel, and it was eventually withdrawn. Since that time the dredging company concerned (I think it was called Marine Industries) has upgraded its plant and equipment. As an option I think the Government should very carefully consider whether that company now has the capacity to go back and cut out the channel and keep it clear.

The Government has also addressed itself to the possibility of the Department of Marine and Harbors acquiring a suction dredge that could be operated up and down the coast. The difficulty is in trying to design a dredge which could be suitable to operate at Outer Harbour and which could then be used on the Patawalonga estuary. A big problem that the Government will have to face in regard to a dredge of that size being used at the Patawalonga site is that the volume of soil that comes up from such a high velocity and high suction dredge is considerable, and it will have to be put somewhere, either in a barge which could take it out to sea but which would take an awful amount of time, or on the north beach. If it were placed on the north beach area, there could be a problem of pollution that could extend from the north beach to the West Beach area.

I do not under-estimate the problem. I know that the Minister would agree with me that the problem is real, and I sympathise with whoever is placed in the position of having to solve it. However, the matter must be addressed and solved. It is solvable, and all that is required is for the Government to make a commitment to spend the money to do it. I realise that priorities are the name of the game, but the people of the City of Glenelg believe that the Patawalonga project has the potential of turning Glenelg into the greatest tourist Mecca on the metropolitan coastline.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Is it not already?

Mr OSWALD: I have said previously that it is, but it will cement it in that position. Such a project will create at Glenelg a focal point for boating that South Australia has never seen. I believe that the Government has been lax in its attitude towards the entire recreational boating industry:

it has not rated that industry as warranting high priority. On behalf of the residents of the City of Glenelg and all those involved who want to use the area, I point out that the Government should study again its allocation of priorities, and amend its attitude in regard to solving the problem at Glenelg.

Once the channel is cut and a by-pass system designed and placed in the vicinity to pick up the sand and take it across the mouth and on to the north beach, we will have overcome the long-term problems that have occurred there. I know that this matter has been addressed by Governments of both persuasions. The former Liberal Minister of Marine made a commitment that, following the completion of the O'Sullivans Beach launching facility, the Government of the time would then turn its attention and give priority to the Patawalonga project. The residents of Glenelg were delighted to hear that but were mortified when the Liberal Government lost office, and that priority was given reduced status.

I know that the present Government is studying the problem and that officers in the relevant departments have been charged with trying to come up with a solution. However, our concern at Glenelg is that the matter is so far down the list of priorities as to have virtually fallen off the page. I would ask that, when the Minister refers this matter to Cabinet, he make the most forceful representations that the priority for this project be upgraded. We want to see a commitment to the project, although I realise that it will involve a reallocation of resources. However, the potential benefit of having a navigable waterway there at the centre of the South Australian coastline is immeasurable for recreational boaties and the tourists who come down there on a day-to-day basis.

Most honourable members are familiar with the arguments associated with the dredging of the Patawalonga. The main point I want to make today is in assuring the Government that the people of the City of Glenelg and all those involved in the recreational boating industry view this matter most seriously. I earnestly urge the Government to make a commitment now to dredging the channel to ensure that we have an all-weather navigable waterway available to residents of South Australia for years to come.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

FEDERAL POLITICIANS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, increasing the number of Federal politicians by 36 at an expense to taxpayers of $3.6 million is not justified and therefore the proposal should be rejected by Federal Parliament.

I note that in today's newspaper reference is made to a suggested increase of 35 Federal politicians. I am not sure of the figure, although I have my doubts that it would be 35 as suggested, because that would make either an even number in the Lower House or break the nexus between the Lower and Upper Houses. Be that as it may, although it was reported that the Lower House in Canberra voted as recently as yesterday in regard to an increase of 35, I will base my argument on 36. In doing so, I know of all the emotional things that can be said, such as whether we in this House believe that the South Australian Parliament should be increased in numbers in the Lower or Upper House.

At this time of high unemployment, I could not condone such a move. I also point out that, in my opinion, the Federal Government's move to increase the numbers of politicians is a selfish move on the part of the Labor Party and the National Party. It cannot be classed as being anything else. It would incur a cost estimated at $3.6 million, at a time when within the community tens of thousands of people are unemployed. To suggest increasing the number of Federal Parliamentarians by 36 as being a method of trying to help in regard to the unemployment problem is a joke.

There is no doubt that that $3.6 million, if used to provide modest reward jobs, could create job opportunities for many people, which together with receipt of benefits such as leave, long service leave, and the like would provide jobs worth about $20 000 each—an actual base salary would be about $12 000 or $13 000. That could cater for about 120 new jobs each year in this country and would give unemployed people the opportunity to work. That, alone, is sufficient reason for one to say at this time, having regard to the economy of the country, that there is no justification for 36 more Federal politicians.

At the same time, it must be understood that the task of a politician today in representing the electorate is not as difficult as it was 50 years ago. We create a lot of work for ourselves, because in many cases we have become social welfare workers, and Federal politicians have entered into the same field. This trend has emerged because we want to win and hold seats. People come to us with complaints about their having a rough trot in the world and that, for example, they have not received a response to a request for community welfare assistance from the Social Security Department or assistance from some other Government agency or from legal aid (which is Government funded), hoping that we will solve their problems.

We automatically take it up and see it as our job, and rightly so. However, quite often we get involved in those areas when, if we referred the matter straight back to a person in the appropriate Department, the workload that our office takes on would be less. The same applies in the Federal field. If we went back 50 years, how would a Federal politician in Perth get to Canberra? It was by a train that took days—there was no other way. Ships and bikes were too slow, but now we have aeroplanes.

Also, Federal politicians have staff available to them. A massive library research team is available—something past politicians did not have. They have electorate offices and often have more than one person on their staff—a research person and a secretary. They can have offices in the centre of the city or in their electorate, if they so choose. Past politicians often did not have in their offices, typewriters, photocopying machines, or telephones to ring anywhere in the country at no cost to them.

If the country and the economy were booming with plenty of money for everyone, they might be able to justify some increase. However, an increase of 36 is quite massive. The Lower House has about 125 members. There are about 10 Senators for each State with a limited number of Senators for the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. The National Party can say that, if we get an extra country member of Parliament, country people will get better representation. I would say that that depends on the person elected, and it is unlikely that it will make any difference to the lifestyle of any individual in a country electorate. At the same time, it will bring more members of Parliament into the city electorates, and country people may say that city people have too many electorates already. I will not argue one way or the other, as we are talking of the Federal field.

It is selfish to say that we want to put people into highly-paid positions when the country is suffering a shortage of jobs. Arguments that it will help the Parliamentary process are hogwash. Will better legislation be passed? Will bureauc-

racy bow when the pressures are on with a few extra members of Parliament? The response of the Parliament for legislation to help people leans heavily on the shoulders of Cabinet and the Government of the day. Unless the House happens to be evenly balanced (and that has only occurred a few times in the Federal Parliament), pressures can be brought to bear by an Opposition.

Some would argue that, if you had a small number in a minority Party, they could act as the wedge between the two major organisations, whether it be a National Party/Liberal Party coalition or whether it be a coalition of another Party with the Labor Party. At present we see the Democrats in that position or a couple of Independents in the Upper House in Canberra. It is not a good practice unless we have a significant number of Independents (a greater number than one or two), as too much power ends up in one or two people's hands. I was disappointed to read in today's paper that the Federal Parliament's Lower House has approved an increase in the number of Parliamentarians in the Federal Parliament. It was unfortunate that, when the States created the Commonwealth Government—

Mr Gregory: Did the National Party vote for it?

Mr EVANS: If the honourable member had been here, he would have known that I made that point earlier. The answer is 'Yes'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr EVANS: The States created the Federal Parliament to govern in areas where the States could not. That was the original intention and it is a pity that, when the Constitution was written, it did not include an obligation that, whenever it wanted to increase the number of Federal Parliamentarians, it had to go back to the States to get approval. I know the way the Constitution is worded: it has to work roughly on an even number of people in any electorate. With a redistribution the boundaries are drawn on that basis. I have no argument with that but, to suddenly increase the number to 36, is too high.

Over the years we have developed Government agencies to help people in difficulty. In so doing the Parliament thought that that would take some pressures off Parliamentarians and that such agencies would work effectively. In the main, those agencies do work effectively. It is the fault of Federal and State politicians that we have become social welfare workers in many areas. I do not know whether we can get out of that field or whether the next move will be for extra staff in our electorate offices. That may be a better way to solve the problem Federally as it would cost less. If a Federal member was given one extra staff member in his office, it would cost no more than employing 36 politicians.

Mr Groom: People want to deal with the member.

Mr EVANS: That is a pretty poor statement because, in most cases, it is difficult for a constituent to get in contact with Federal members because, for a significant part of the year, they are in Canberra. To use that argument in favour of employing 36 more politicians is hogwash, and the member for Hartley knows it.

I have moved my motion in all sincerity, and hope that the House will support it to show the Federal people that we do not need any more highly-paid politicians or any more people in the community employed at the expense of the taxpayer. We need to create more jobs for young people who are looking for employment, and we can create more jobs for the same money. I hope that all members support my motion.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stock Diseases Act, 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that the member for Victoria raised a subject of some concern to him and his constituents in the South-East during Question Time on 24 August 1983 when he asked a question about an incident involving diseased sheep in the Lucindale district, and during the grievance debate on that day he expanded upon those concerns. The matter to which the member for Victoria drew the attention of the House involved a specific incident in which the movement of diseased sheep put at risk flocks on adjacent properties. In this case the sheep were carrying the disease of footrot.

South-eastern South Australia is one of several districts that has been affected from time to time with the footrot disease. I do not intend at this stage to detail the enormous expenditure and devastation that follow the introduction of a disease of that kind into a flock of sheep. I can assure members that those of us who have experienced the implications of footrot within their sheep are well aware, not only of the enormous amount of work that it involves but also the enormous amount of loss in weight and value, and in some cases by death, of sheep as a result of that disease. Its eradication becomes an equally long and painful process.

For the purposes of controlling, and where possible eliminating, that disease, the Stock Diseases Act, 1934, has been introduced and amended in order to not only provide penalties for the infringement of good management of livestock flocks but also for the purpose of providing guidelines for good management of properties where livestock is kept. Among other things, the Act provides clearly for the procedures that shall be adopted when a disease has been identified in a flock. In the case of footrot, the subject that prompted me to introduce this Bill, the Act provides that the stock inspector of the district shall be notified when a disease is suspected or found to be inherent in a mob of sheep. Section 19 of the Act provides:

(1) Every owner of diseased stock and every owner of stock which are suspected by the owner to be suffering from disease shall—

(a) within twenty-four hours from the time when the stock are discovered to be diseased or are suspected by the owner to be suffering from disease, notify, by the quickest practicable means, the nearest inspector who is an officer of the Department of Agriculture or the chief inspector at Adelaide that the stock are discovered to be diseased or, as the case may be, are suspected to be suffering from disease, together with a description of the stock, the number thereof and the place where the stock are situated:

Further, other paragraphs of that section require the stock owner to adhere to certain procedures in relation to controlling and confining that disease during the process of its clean up or eradication. For example, upon notification, the inspector may, by using his or her discretion, advise the adjoining landholders of the find, and this, for obvious reasons, will enable those adjoining landholders to exercise some good management with respect to keeping their stock, or making every effort to keep their stock, from the immediately adjacent properties on which is the identified diseased flock. However, there is no specific requirement under that section or any other section of the Stock Diseases Act that insists that all neighbours abutting the property carrying diseased stock shall be notified at the time of the identification.

This Bill, in part, proposes that that action is taken and that it shall be mandatory for the inspector to not only

insist upon but to ensure that all owners of properties abutting the property with diseased flock are advised accordingly. Quite apart from it being a courtesy to do so in the ordinary process of blocking all risk avenues of the spread of the disease, it seems to be common sense to me and to the member for Victoria, who has prompted this issue. It would be good sense, and it would be accepted and supported by those who have had experience with footrot, as they know the implications and the costs attracted by its introduction into a flock.

The other purpose for introducing this Bill is to confine the movement of stock by vehicle only from a property where the disease is prevalent. In other words, the purpose of the Bill is to amend the Act to ensure that no diseased stock, in this case sheep affected by footrot, traverse on a public roadway without the specific permission of an authorised inspector of livestock. We are not seeking to prevent any stock so diseased from travelling on a public roadway at any time because, on thinking the subject through, we recognised that there might be specific occasions for special flock maintenance purposes (say, in the case of drought) where there is a need for the feeding and watering of the stock to traverse them along a roadway. In those special circumstances, provision should be made whereby an authorised inspector can approve such movement.

So, with that minor qualification we are seeking to limit (indeed, prevent other than in the very special circumstances outlined) the movement of stock on foot along a public roadway. Again, I suggest that there is no need for me to spell out in bold print the reasons, bearing in mind that, in communities such as the South-East region of South Australia and in other communities where sheep flocks are prevalent, if a person is allowed to move sheep on foot along such roadways, obviously others are, too. A follow-up flock could contract the disease simply by walking over the same ground, kicking the same clods, moving through the same grass, and so on.

Some argument has been presented that the risk of picking up footrot from the ground on which footrot diseased sheep have traversed is a thin one, and that the disease does not stay alive for more than a few days. Veterinary scientists have suggested to me that, in the right conditions and circumstances footrot disease may well stay alive up to seven days. Others in the same profession dispute that and claim that the life of the footrot virus in the ground, on the ground, on the stump, in the bark, or in the grass, is no more than a day or two, if that.

Notwithstanding the variation in professional advice along these lines about the life of the virus off the hoof of the sheep, there is a risk. While there is some risk it is our job in this place, I believe, to seek to eliminate it. One of the areas of the Act is loose in that regard, and that is the one to which I refer. For the two reasons I have outlined, I hope that, knowing the support that exists amongst the Liberal Party and amongst my rural colleagues in particular, that this brief explanation and the introduction of the Bill to amend collectively the Stock Diseases Act will attract the support of members on the other side of the House for yet another step in controlling a disease which has cost this State, and indeed the nation, millions and millions of dollars over the years that we have run sheep here. It will continue to do so while we fail at any level to exercise the most stringent controls on flock management practices. An explanation of the clauses of this Bill has been circulated to the Minister or spokesman on the Government side of the House. I seek leave to have that explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 proposes an amendment to section 19 of the principal Act, which deals with the duties of owners of diseased stock, or stock which are suspected to be suffering from the disease. One duty is to inform immediately the nearest inspector and another is to comply with directions given by that inspector. However, there is no specific duty to inform neighbouring owners. The amendment inserts such a duty.

Clause 3 inserts an additional subsection to section 25 of the principal Act, which is concerned with penalties (on leaving diseased stock on roads or lands). The proposed new subseciton (2) would also make it an offence to drive stock along roads, which is consistent with the intent of the provision that diseased stock should not be placed in a situation where the disease might spread to other stock.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FINGER POINT SEWAGE DISPOSAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. H. Allison:

That this House views with great concern the threat to the health and well-being of residents of Port MacDonnell and the threat to the abalone, crayfishing and tourist industries, and seeks immediate reinstatement of the Finger Point sewage disposal scheme to the current public works programme as requested by South-East residents and local government bodies, and as previously committed by the Liberal Government, for completion in 1986.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 993.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I have several times over the past few months debated this issue, and will continue to do so. I remind members that the Liberal Party acknowledges the serious nature of the problem. It provided, over a two-year period until it lost Government, $750 000 to commence the Finger Point sewage scheme. The present Premier has consistently refused to reinstate the project. The former Labor Government said that the project was to commence at least 10 years hence. Now, we have independent evidence which has completely vindicated the stand that I have taken over the past eight to nine years since I have been the member for Mount Gambier.

I refer to the report headed, 'South-East Coast Protection District Study Report', prepared for the Coast Protection Board of South Australia by the Urban and Environmental Planning Group, dated May 1982, which was released I believe by the Minister for Environment and Planning about 15 October (a Saturday morning). It was commented upon in the rural and State presses on the following Monday, 17 October. At page UEPG 12/26, paragraph 12.9.2, headed 'Liquid Waste', states:

The most serious instance of the disposal of liquid waste is the Mount Gambier sewage outfall at Finger Point, where raw sewage is discharged into the sea. The impact of this practice on the marine environment is discussed in some detail in section 6.6.2.2 of this report.

Without further ado, I refer immediately to the section which carries the heading, 'Mount Gambier Sewage Outfall, Finger Point', and which states:

The untreated sewage of Mount Gambier, together with the effluent from a number of factories, is discharged into the sea at Finger Point. Some details of the composition of the effluent and discussion of alternatives to the present method of disposal are given in a report prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply. (1977).

I will comment briefly on that in a few moments. The report continues:

The sewage is pumped to the ocean outfall to protect the underground aquifers of the region from which the water resources of the South-East are almost entirely derived.

A second paragraph states:

The environmental effects are two-fold: the impairment of aesthetic and recreational amenity of several beaches, and contamination of the marine biota.

Section 6.6.2.2.1 is headed 'Aesthetics and recreational amenity'. I will have to be selective in quoting, because private members' time is at a premium, but I ask members who think that selectivity is to remove some of the counter evidence simply to go to this volume, and they will quickly realise that every line and paragraph vindicates the criticism that I have made of the absence of a suitable effluent scheme. There is nothing in the report that I would not be prepared to quote absolutely verbatim. However, one of the more important factors is this:

Movement of the sewage... is a function of the prevailing wind direction, the shape of the shoreline and configuration of local reef systems. In the winter months, the prevailing high velocity components of the wind regime are from the south-west and the general movement of the effluent is on-shore. . . .

What a damning statement! The effluent moves 'on-shore'. The report continues:

... while in the summer months, the effluent generally moves north-west under the influence of the then prevailing winds.

The whole intention of the scheme was that the effluent would move to the South-East and away across from South Australia, way south of Victoria. The whole purpose of the scheme is defeated, as is clearly stated in this paragraph:

There may, however, be a significant variation within this general pattern. Circulation patterns in Blanche Bay within the off-shore reef line are such that water enters the eastern side and moves west.

In other words, it moves backwards from the originally intended flow west. It moves in an anti-clockwise direction. The report continues:

Thus the sewage is not as efficiently dispersed as was expected, and this has resulted in very high bacterial counts nearshore. During the periodic tests carried out by the E. & W.S. between April 1972 and April 1976, the count 1 km north of the outfall along the coast in Blanche Bay reached 180 000 *E. coli* per 100 ml seawater (19 April 1973), and 1 km south it reached 55 000 *E. coli* per 100 ml on the same date (E. & W.S., 1977). As generally recognised standards of bathing waters are less than 100 *E. coli* per 100 ml seawater, these waters are not suitable for general recreation or for activities bringing people in contact with seawater within several kilometres of the outfall. As a measure to reduce the risk of possible outbreaks of bacterial infections, the E. & W.S. has purchased land and shacks either side of the outfall, and there is restricted public access with a locked gate at the road entry.

The report continues, in the immediately ensuing paragraph:

There are differing reports of just how popular these beaches were for swimming and surfing.

I can assure the compilers of this report and members of the House that, in my experience of almost 30 years of residence in the South-East, it was once very popular practice on the part of myself, colleagues and other residents of the South-East to visit those beaches, particularly during the summer months. There is no doubt at all in my mind as to the continuing popularity of these areas and in fact, the enhancement of the South-East coastline as a tourist area, had the effluent outfall not been constructed in such a way as to allow effluent to come on-shore instead of going well away from the coast.

It also goes on to say that the beaches of Umpherstone Bay have been popular with surfers at certain times of the year. I must say that I have had correspondence from national and State surfing bodies asking that the effluent scheme be changed to restore those beaches to their former popularity. I am quite sure that many surf carnivals could have been held there during the past decade or two. The report then continues:

Tests by the E. & W.S. (1976), with drift cards which indicate the movement of grease and floatables, showed that these components could be expected to be blown shorewards if the wind was at all onshore.

'If' is hardly the correct word, because the prevailing wind in the winter months, and in spring and autumn, is a south-westerly wind which has to bring the breakers on shore. That is what makes it such a popular surfing spot. So, the report understates the situation rather than overstating it; it is a modest report. It also states:

Besides high bacterial levels and their possible direct effects on human beings, there are the other problems of grease and floating components of the sewage, and the soluble contents and their effects on marine life ... The beach to the north-west of the outfall was strewn with unsightly plastic and paper objects.

In clause 6.6.2.2.2, headed 'Effects on the marine environment', the salient points are that the observations of the party were limited to the rocky intertidal area and adjacent beaches. They did notice that the reef was in a grossly eutrophic condition. It was highly enriched to the state where very little could survive other than that highly enriched plant life, algae and giant kelp. They also say that large amounts of what appear to be sand cemented together with organic material had accumulated in crevices and pools. Subtidally (that is below the tide level), no observations were able to be made, other than a photograph that showed large concentrations of a kelp forest, but it is below the sea level where the problem lies for the fishing industry and for people swimming in the water. Subsequently, the report states:

The E. & W.S. (1977), paper states that the waters around Finger Point are not major breeding grounds for fish.

Several of these statements say 'are not', but the point that I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that I believe that the area was in fact a breeding ground. There is no evidence to say yea or nay, but the fact that the area was a clean unsullied area, one of the world's most rugged coastlines, would indicate that there would be very little problem for marine life.

More importantly, the report says that lobster pots are dropped by local fishermen only a few tens of metres from the plume (that is where the effluent discharges). It continues:

... and it is highly likely that at least some lobsters caught, both in the immediate vicinity of the plume and also further away, are contaminated by components of the outfall discharge.

It also points out lobsters are not static and have been known to move. It continues:

... there are larger dispersive movements up to 80 km over a period of six months to four years from release. Although digestive processes in lobster might be expected to eliminate pathogenic micro-organisms, nevertheless, surviving organisms can spread on the surface of muscle tissues (used for consumption), during processing.

There is a possibility of contamination which could affect our markets. The report continues:

The greatest danger to the local fishing industry comes from the heavy metal content originating from industrial imputs and other chemicals disposed of into the sewerage system. This component—

and this is a highly significant point—

was entirely ignored by E. & W.S. (1977), although currently they are carrying out analyses on rock lobsters, abalone, periwinkles and limpets captured near the outfall.

The significance of heavy metal would be brought to everyone's attention were they to read a book published eight or nine years ago on the mad cats in a Japanese city, where the cats had consumed fish which had ingested heavy metals and which drove not only the cats mad—that was the first sign of the problem—but also the children. There is a high incidence of insanity and mental impairment in that area in Japan, in one of the Japanese bays. It is a very commonly

known book, but I have forgotten the title. The report continues:

Heavy metals are among the most dangerous and least understood of contaminants. They are not degradable and there are no genetic mechanisms known capable of coping with too great a burden. Mercury, cadmium and lead are generally considered to be the most hazardous, especially for humans, although copper, zinc, silver and chromium may be particularly toxic to marine biota.

So, the incidence of heavy metals has to be studied as a matter of urgency. The report continues:

There are many examples of the effects of heavy metal poisoning in the literature. For example, cadmium can combine with alginic acid, a substance which occurs in the cell walls of brown algae such as *Macrocystis* and *Ecklonia*, and this facilitates cadmium up take into organisms which feed on these algae.

A subsequent comment says:

It is imperative that the quality of rock lobster and abalone products remain above suspicion—

obviously for the sake of our home and export markets—

Although the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries has made analyses of heavy metals (throughout the State) on a sporadic basis when the opportunity arises . . . there is no systematic quality analysis of processed lobster and abalone for heavy metals, although it is believed that this is a health authority responsibility. We would stress the importance of immediate, regular monitoring of the heavy metal content of the effluent from Finger Point and of the biota of surrounding areas.

A later paragraph states that there are 16 proposals for treatment of the sewage. It goes on to elucidate on a number of those, but refers specifically to the fact that the projected population of Mount Gambier indicates a 20 per cent increase by 2000 A.D., with further increases of pollutional loading from new industry; a potentially large fish processing factory, a cultural processing factory and a skin store are currently proposed. The report goes on to highlight future problems which should be addressed immediately. Alternative No. 4 of the 16 proposals involves the construction of a secondary treatment work at a capital cost of $6.58 million, with an annual operating cost of $336 000. It further states:

This is a very attractive alternative with respect to public amenity, and heavy metal concentrations would be reduced by 50-90 per cent (P. Norman, pers. comm.). Nitrates and phosphates in the effluent would possibly cause a reduction in diversity [in the various forms of marine life] in the immediate vicinity of the outfall, but this would be a feature of all but tertiary treatment—

which is the most expensive of all alternatives at $18 million, and we certainly were not looking for anything as grandiose as that. However, it goes on to explain the benefits of alternative No. 4, which was the most desirable option that the Liberal Party had looked at when in Government and which it had started to implement. It further states:

In our opinion, the best solution is a secondary treatment plant for sewage combined with firm action to stop the input of heavy metals to the sewerage system at their sources. The latter would require efficient monitoring of sewers coming from sources of potential pollution, and heavy penalties imposed for any breaches of the regulations regarding sewerage inputs. Some alternative mode of disposal must be arranged for these unwanted sewerage inputs which will keep the pollutants from reaching either the sea or underground aquifers.

Of course, the beauty of alternative scheme No. 4 is that there is a sludge treatment plant adjacent to the coast, and there is strong evidence that this would not affect the water table because there has been a monitored programme for several years showing that the water continues to move from the coastal lagoons towards the sea. In other words, there is no return of that material to the water table and, therefore, the risk of it being consumed by people drinking or pumping for domestic purposes.

Once again, I would ask the Premier and his Ministers to view this report (an independent and very comprehensive report) with the same concern that I have been viewing the whole situation for the past eight or nine years, not on a political basis but from the viewpoint of the safety of the people and the welfare of industry and commerce in South Australia. I have tackled all Governments in South Australia since becoming a member in 1975, without respite, and convinced my own colleagues in the face of some opposition at the time that action was the most favourable alternative: inaction carried a very high risk.

I ask the Premier to listen to one comment which I received by telephone only a couple of days ago; that, if we continue to raise quite massive additional taxes by f.i.d., liquor taxes, and the like, and if we are to consider alternatives to the Hilton Hotel (such as another convention hotel) at a time when the Manager of the Hilton Hotel said only yesterday on radio that he would not be able to sustain any competition of that nature, can we not more rationally utilise the funds in this State towards ensuring that the existing industries in the State and its population are properly looked after? It is, after all, far better to provide work through a constructive scheme of this kind rather than looking for alternative means of employment by spending tens of millions of dollars on projects which may or may not be useful. The Deputy Premier himself today said that he was having problems with ensuring that projects were properly allocated. If we can allocate funds towards projects which are of inestimable value to the State, I would ask the Premier and his Ministers to review their position.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That—

(a) a Select Committee be established to inquire into and report upon all aspects of the guarantees given to the Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows councils in respect of South Australian Local Government Grants Commission funds, and alternative sources of funds, and all aspects of assistance given to councils involved in earlier amalgamation arrangements;

(b) the committee be so structured as to be chaired by the Premier or, alternatively, the most senior House of Assembly Minister available and comprising the Leader of the Opposition or his most senior shadow Minister available in the House of Assembly, and three other members in accordance with practice, but excluding any member who served on the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows;

(c) the members of that Select Committee be required to attend as witnesses if so requested to by this Committee; and

(d) the Select Committee be required to report on the likely consequence of any future local government amalgamations or adjustments being able to succeed without there being a clear undertaking that the abnormal costs associated with the particular Parliamentary directions will be provided from Grants Commission or Department of Local Government funds.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1193.)

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mallee. The honourable member for Light. If the honourable member speaks he closes the debate. I draw the attention of all honourable members to the motion appearing on the Notice Paper. Are there any further speakers? If not, I must call on the honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I congratulate my colleague, the members for Alexandra and Mallee on their contribution to this very serious and very important motion. I regret that I am unable to congratulate the Minister of

Local Government on his contribution, because he failed completely to address himself to the four paragraphs of the motion. I will grant him that he did address the financial difficulties of Strathalbyn and Mount Barker, and indicated a course of action that had been undertaken by his office to offset some of the financial debacle perpetrated against those two councils. However, nowhere in the period of time that the Minister addressed this motion did he address the real problems and issues which are known to a number of members in this place, that is, those members who have been on a Select Committee inquiring into the District Council of Meadows and its boundaries.

I want to take briefly the four sections of the motion and refer to them, raising again the points which have been brought forward and the unanswered questions which currently exist, and because they are unanswered questions I suggest that it fortifies the necessity for this motion to be supported by the House. It is supportable by the House because it will impact on all future local government amalgamations until the vital questions are answered. Paragraph *(a)* of the motion was phrased in that manner purely and simply because it had become apparent that undertakings which had been given to members of the Select Committee and upon which they formulated their final view in respect of this matter had not been fulfilled. It was vital that the financial requirements should be a fact of life for the new councils, because it was necessary to guarantee the integrity and job opportunity of a number of members of the former Meadows council (that is, the staff of the former Meadows council) who were being transposed to other employment.

Whilst there was an understanding with the members of the unions involved that a likely end result was expected to see the redeployment of officers, it was subject to there being funds to allow the redeployment of officers. In seeking that undertaking an understanding as to where those funds were to come from was quite clear in the minds of the members of the Select Committee, and it has been pointed out that that information exists on the record and it is known in the minds of those people on the Select Committee that there was every opportunity and expectation of additional funds coming from the Grants Commission.

Subsequent events have indicated that the policy of distribution did not make that eventuality likely. However, it was a view that was held by all members of the committee at the time when the decision was taken. The view held was believed to be factually correct, and it is just and proper that the Minister has subsequently provided funds from within the Department of Local Government to fulfil a broken commitment, even though that commitment was probably made contrary to the Commission's policy and was an offer that was not deliverable.

Paragraph *(b)* of the motion concerns the committee's membership structure. This has been so structured to give a clear indication of the genuine concern of the Opposition in regard to the events that led to the debacle in regard to the previous Select Committee. It provides that the investigation be made by senior members of this Parliament who have had the opportunity of investigating every aspect of this measure having regard to the lingering questions that were unanswered by the Minister when he was questioned in this place. Paragraph *(c)* concerns the provision that members of the Select Committee be required to attend as witnesses, if so requested. This provision was made purely and simply to stress the importance of getting to the truth of the matter. Some of the material put to the Select Committee was done in *camera*.

Paragraph *(d)* of the motion concerns future local government amalgamations. The Parliamentary direction referred to concerns the fact that it is the Upper and Lower Houses of this Parliament that make the final determination as to the future composition of local government bodies. The investigating committee does not make that decision on its own, as it is not a decision made by a body outside Parliament. The final decision is made by Parliament and is proclaimed by the Governor.

Parliament makes a decision, which is binding upon the outside body concerned, and if a direction given causes some economic disquiet to a local government body or impacts on it by forcing it into expenditure not due to its own decision or not in the first instance of appreciable benefit to its rate payers, that decision needs to be backed up with necessary finance from the Government. Two Select Committees of the Legislative Council are now investigating two new council amalgamations. One concerns the Kadina, Wallaroo, and Moonta Council areas, and the other concerns the Corporation of the Town of Gawler and the District Councils of Light, Barossa and Munno Para. In regard to the committee associated with the corporate town of Gawler, in particular, if the committee decides that the boundaries of Gawler be extended (and I am not speaking either for or against the proposition, but I am just stating the facts) that decision will impact on the District Councils of Light, Barossa and Munno Para, resulting in a disturbance in the financial balance of those three councils. Also, the addition of rate payers and areas will impact on the C.T. of Gawler, and conceivably, it could receive additional funds as a result of the change.

The Select Committee associated with the District Council of Meadows did not finalise an adequate financial appreciation of the effect of the council amalgamations. A difficult financial conundrum was posed to local government in regard to the Meadows fiasco, and it behoves this House on behalf of local government and future Parliamentary Committees investigating these matters to undertake a proper inquiry to determine what are the financial implications of decisions made by this Parliament in regard to local government. Even if the Minister cannot accept the provisions contained in paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* or *(c)* of the motion, at least he should be prepared to accept the premise contained in paragraph *(d)*, amended if necessary, to give it a bite.

I would hope that, notwithstanding that the Minister is the only member from the other side who has spoken to the measure and has said that it will not be supported, there has been a change of heart and that the Government will vote with the Opposition so that this vital fourth sector of the motion in total can be invoked. I find myself in the position where, if this motion is defeated (this is not a threat but a statement of fact) and there has been no clear direction given to existing or future Select Committees as to how the financial conundrum of amalgamation should be approached, I will be seeking to appear before at least one of those current Select Committees in order to draw to the attention of members of such Committees the consequences of any decision they take relative to the finances of the councils involved. It does not matter whether the vehicle is the Gawler Select Committee or the Kadina/Wallaroo/Moonta Select Committee. In order to draw members' attention to the situation, I suggest that we move into the present form of amalgamation procedures at our peril if we have not sorted out the financial implications, such implications fitting well into the previous comment I made that we have to be concerned about the domino effect.

If we take an action against one council or a group of councils and have left over bits of other councils, they (the bits) are in difficulty and the shockwaves will be felt by councils on boundaries other than those involved in direct amalgamation. The important issues have been defined, and I seek the support of all members of the House for the passage of this motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Later:

The SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that, during the division earlier today on the honourable member for Light's motion, the honourable member for Hartley was inadvertently left off the list of Noes. I direct that the votes and proceedings be corrected accordingly.

IDENTITY CARDS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Evans:

That, in the opinion of this House, all Australian citizens over the age of 18 years should be issued with identity cards to control tax evasion, exploitation of social security and welfare benefits, detect illegal immigrants and control under-age drinking in licensed premises.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 1367.)

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I wish to raise a couple of issues in speaking to this motion, about which the member for Fisher has raised several interesting issues. I wish to canvass other issues which I believe are relevant to the general topic, namely, the need to have some form of identification. I am aware that a working party is currently looking at the whole area of identification. Quite possibly some of the issues that I will canvass this afternoon have been addressed by that working party. There is no disagreement that welfare recipients have had problems, and indeed are experiencing a range of problems, in getting the concessions to which they are entitled. I refer to concessions offered in the private sector (such as those for admission to picture theatres and other forms of entertainment) to people holding concession cards. However, a problem exists because of the multiplicity of concession cards which has produced an extremely complex system.

It would seem that there is a need for a simplification of this system of identification cards or a form of identification, based on the fact that this system is extremely complex. I would now like to look at a proposal that has been discussed, I believe, and possibly discussed also by the working party, regarding the need for some form of State concession card. This State concession card would include a photograph of the concession recipient and would probably apply to the State Transport Authority and to concessions given by it. However, such a State concession card could also be used when applying for electricity concessions, council rate reduction concessions, motor registration concessions and, as I have mentioned earlier, picture theatre and other entertainment concession areas, such as admission to the Royal Show, as well as to some supermarkets.

I am led to believe that certain supermarket owners and, indeed, chains would be prepared to offer some form of concession to people in receipt of welfare benefits. However, because we have so many different types of identification procedures and cards, concessions in supermarkets are not available to people receiving welfare benefits. In relation to a State concession card fears have been expressed to me personally, and I agree with them, that we are in danger of placing a stigma on people who carry that card if the card was available only to people in receipt of welfare benefits. There would then be a danger of those people being identified easily and that stigma could be caused by the use of an identification card. In canvassing a few options which might well overcome that type of stigma, I am sure the first point has been looked at by the member for Fisher, and that relates to people having a photograph on their driver's licence.

Mr Evans: I agree with that.

Ms LENEHAN: Fine, but that also creates certain problems because not everyone has a driver's licence.

Mr Evans: It is the first step.

Ms LENEHAN: In some way that would cover only part of the problem. I believe the S.T.A. is having other problems in relation to photographs on drivers' licences. However, I agree that that is certainly one option. The second option would be the use of S.T.A. concession cards which are not only applicable to welfare benefit recipients but are also used by a wide range of people who use a concession card to travel daily to and from work and students who carry these cards throughout the community. In fact, those cards are being used widely, and they are not confined only to people who are in receipt of welfare benefits or payments. I believe that in London and other parts of the world the transport authorities use this form of identification. A person has to have an identifying photograph and a description of the person on one side and the State transport concession is on the other side of the card.

One form of identification which I believe has quite a deal of merit is an identification card for which anyone can apply for whatever reason. In my case, it might be to prove identity when I am writing a cheque. This would be applicable not necessarily for people seeking concessions but for people who want some form of identification. It would not be necessary for this to be done by having a photograph on a driver's licence. Perhaps the Department of Community Welfare could produce and print a standard identification card which was available free at all outlets of the Department of Community Welfare. It would then be up to people seeking that identification card to provide their own photograph to that office. Of course, they would have to prove that they are the person shown in the photograph, as is the case with a passport application. That could help prevent the card being used by another person.

A photograph would be provided to the Department, which would place the photograph on the card together with relevant details. It could then be sealed in a plastic cover which would protect it and also ensure that the photograph was not taken out and replaced by another. That form of identification could then be used for a wide range of purposes within our community. It would be easily recognised as being a standard form of identification and could be recognised clearly by Government agencies, private companies, and picture theatres, etc. This form of identification is used widely throughout the United States as well as in Britain and some other countries.

I disagree with the member for Fisher when he states that all Australian citizens over the age of 18 years should be issued with identity cards. I think that is where we will part company. I would turn it around the other way and say that the onus should not be on the State to issue an identity card to everyone as they turn 18, because I foresee personal problems about the civil liberties side of that. It is up to individual people who are seeking benefits and concessions to apply for an identification card so that—

Mr Evans: Even to enter a hotel under age? Would you apply that to under-age drinking in hotels? Would you include that as a provision of the Licensing Act?

Ms LENEHAN: Just a moment. Some under-age people would apply for identification cards. For example, students aged 16 and 17 years need proof of identification in order to obtain concessions at present. They could well come under this scheme, so that there would be identification for people under 18 years of age. I think that is fairly important. The onus of application would be on the individual who wanted concessions for whatever purpose or on someone who just wanted identification in a range of circumstances, not necessarily in order to obtain concessions. I think that that would overcome the valid arguments put forward by people concerned about civil liberties.

These people are concerned if there is a blanket issuing of identification cards that must be carried by every member of the public. This can be seen by people as smacking of the 'big brother' syndrome, where somewhere on file is an identification card, complete almost to the point of containing fingerprints, the whole works. In the system I have suggested only one photograph would be necessary, and that would be the photograph that the person brought into the Department. No copies would be kept in the Department for some form of later checking, so that the fear that 'big brother' is in control and that we all have to have identification cards would be overcome.

Secondly, I cannot accept the situation that this scheme should be imposed on everyone. I would think it would be Liberal philosophy that people, instead of having this imposed on them, must have the right to seek it themselves. If they want a concession they will seek to obtain an identification card.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am not supposed to answer interjections. I am not specifically addressing myself at the moment to the under-age drinking problem. I have confined my remarks to canvassing the issue broadly and looking at what I believe are some reasonable methods that we could adopt to overcome the complexity of the current system. I am not for a moment suggesting that what the member is saying in his motion is not correct, in part. Cheating is going on; people are using other people's cards. I believe the issues I have canvassed would overcome that, but at the same time they would ensure that people would feel that their civil liberties had been protected. I would be happy on a future occasion to address myself to the other issues that were raised, such as people under the age of 18 having identification and looking at the problem of controlling under-age drinking. Therefore, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CEDUNA WATER SUPPLY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Minister of Water Resources and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, should immediately take steps to provide reticulated water schemes west of Ceduna to all the communities that are without reticulated service and that such a scheme be phased in over the next three financial years.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 1369.)

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

Leave out all words after 'Department' and insert in lieu thereof: should consider the provision of reticulated water supply scheme west of Ceduna and that such a scheme be considered in conjunction with other schemes throughout the State and in the light of prevailing economic circumstances.

The motion moved by the member for Eyre is the motion he moved in a previous Parliamentary session. The amendment I have moved is the amendment I moved then, because the situation has not changed. The provision of a water supply west of Ceduna is a costly scheme which will cost probably $4.2 million on present day costs. I realise that it is no doubt important to the member for Eyre's constituents, but just as important—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: —is the one at American River.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member has beaten me to the punch. Just as important are the schemes for American River, and Moorowie, on Yorke Peninsula.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are 32 schemes which would cost a considerable amount. A debate perhaps could be held between representatives of country districts on the other side of the House, but I do not want to be the arbitrator.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We have to consider the scheme proposed for Ceduna in conjunction with all the other schemes on that list of 32 that have been deferred because they are uneconomic.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They are not uneconomic.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I will say in a minute that they are not economic according to criteria set down by the Government which were the same criteria established by the previous Administration. We have heard strong submissions over the past couple of weeks by the Opposition about increases in taxation.

Mr Gunn: Get your priorities right. It is an investment.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is not an investment; it is a facility provided to people living in outlying areas. It is not only the capital cost that is important but the recurrent expenditure too.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to cease his interjections.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We have to consider the situation in association with other schemes and in the light of current economic circumstances. As I said, the total capital cost of all these schemes is $51 million. I do not have to repeat the list. I included it in *Hansard* during the Estimates Committees. As I said, I have had numerous representations from members on the other side regarding water supply to their electorates. Presently (and maybe this is good news for members opposite), we are reviewing the whole policy regarding these extensions, but those policies are being developed as part of the mains extension policy, which I hope will be in place some time in 1984.

Of course, I believe that we need assistance from the Federal Government if we are to proceed with a majority of those schemes over the next few years. I am not unsympathetic to the member for Eyre's suggestion. Since he raised the matter in a previous Parliamentary session I have taken the opportunity to visit his electorate on Eyre Peninsula, and there is no doubt the water supply problem is difficult, as it has been over a number of years. It has not been addressed by previous Governments. Of course, cost escalation has made it more difficult as time has gone on.

So, we have to look at that scheme in conjunction with all the other schemes proposed. I would not like to be the arbitrator or judge in this matter. It is important that we consider the schemes collectively. The list I gave to the Estimates Committee is based only on the economic situation, not on priority. The Government wants to assist in this matter as much as possible. I stress that the question is one of economics only. As I said, the situation has not changed a great deal since the member for Eyre raised the matter previously.

I do not intend to speak at length. I simply point out that a policy needs to be developed to seriously address those 31 deferred water supply schemes. I hope that, some time in 1984, I will have some news for those members who have made representations to me over the past 12 months.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

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

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 1375.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): When I last spoke on this matter I referred to the foolishness on the part of the member for Glenelg in putting forward this proposal. One of the things that happens if one continually reads is that one improves his knowledge, and whilst I have not spoken to the member for Glenelg and asked where he obtained the information that he inserted in *Hansard*, I suspect that it came from the document prepared by a Mr Rawson. At page 832 of *Hansard* of 14 September 1983, the member made this comment:

> I understand that because of the push later within the shop assistants area 16 000 members were in that union in South Australia. They pay $1.58 a head to the A.L.P.

That is incorrect. I do know the membership of the shop assistants union. I know that, when I was Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council, there was a branch in South Australia affiliated to the United Trades and Labor Council which had 2 251 members: another branch had 12 000 people. I know from my activities within the A.L.P. that there was another branch which had 1 000 members. I am not sure which one the member for Glenelg is talking about. He goes on to say:

> The Federated Clerks Union of Australia has 84 000 members and assets of $1 172 701—not today but in 1976. It is also affiliated with the A.L.P.

There were some interjections, and after the insertion in *Hansard* of the material, the member goes on to say:

> That table shows the financial advantages to the A.L.P. If one adds that up, at $1.58 a head, that is a colossal amount of money.

Whilst the information the member had inserted in *Hansard* might (to him) have been correct in 1976, I can assure him that in 1976 the only branches of the Federated Clerks Union affiliated with the A.L.P. would have been in New South Wales, possibly Tasmania, and possibly (although I am not sure) the Victorian branch of the Federated Clerks Union was affiliated with the Democratic Labor Party. I know that the affiliation ceased. At the moment those people are not affiliated to the A.L.P.

Of the 84 000 members that the honourable member referred to, about 28 000 are in New South Wales. I do not know what they pay in affiliation fees in New South Wales, but it is really of no consequence. In reality, the member does not understand how trade unions operate and how the Industrial and Conciliation Act works in this State. Clause 3 of the Bill that he introduced in this House states:

> (3) This section does not apply to an association or a registered association that is registered under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904, of the Commonwealth, or is a branch, or forms part, of any organisation so registered.

All of the organisations affiliated with the A.L.P., the trade unions in this State, are State branches of Federal organisations. So, this Bill is a nonsense, and I would suggest that the member opposite knew it was nonsense when he put it up, as he knew it was a nonsense when he put it up in 1976.

If he had any intelligence he would have read the document prepared by Mr Cawthorne, the Industrial Magistrate, who issued a 400-page document on what he called discussions and issues which he prepared for the then Minister of Industrial Affairs who, as we all like to remind him, did not want it released but kept it locked up. However, in the discussion paper, Mr Cawthorne reached some fairly valid conclusions about this matter. He makes this point, and I would like the member for Glenelg to listen, because if he listens he could learn something. The report states:

> In considering the relevant Commonwealth legislation at the time which provided for the disallowance of any rule considered to be 'tyrannical or oppressive' or which imposed 'unreasonable conditions upon membership', [487] the High Court said in *Williams v Hursey* [488] that there was nothing in those provisions which could be construed as denying to an organisation of employees registered under it, and having the general object of promoting the industrial interests of its members, the power to raise and expend moneys with a view to the return at a Parliamentary election of candidates favourably disposed to the promotion of those interests. It was held that there was nothing 'tyrannical or oppressive' involved in construing the rules of the organisation concerned as authorising the making of a levy for a political purpose.

So, the High Court makes clear that there was nothing tyrannical or oppressive about what happened. It is in the honourable member's mind; he just cannot understand anything about trade unions.

Mr Mathwin: That's not true.

Mr GREGORY: It is; of course it is. The honourable member does not understand or have a clue. At page 447 of the report, Mr Cawthorne states:

> Whilst there are unions in this State which do not come within this category, it would be fair to say that of those affiliated with the United Trades and Labor Council the overwhelming majority, and in particular the largest, do have a Federal connection at law. Thus the substance of the provision would have only a very minimal effect in real terms.

When he did report to the Government, that secret report was subsequently released to the public, and in it he made this comment:

> I have been unable to discover any practical or philosophical difficulties flowing from the current arrangements, either in respect of the collection of a levy or in the location of the funds. On the other hand, even if such further provisions were desirable (and I am not convinced that any additional steps are necessary), I am aware of the particular anomalies which would flow if there were fundamental differences of approach adopted (of necessity or otherwise) by trade unions at both the Federal and State levels. In the light of this, I am loath to suggest any further legislative intervention in what appears to be an acceptable system of self-regulation of the internal financial organisation of registered associations.

Perhaps the argument put forward by the member for Glenelg would have some validity if he appeared to be even-handed. If, in proposing this Bill, he had proposed to amend also the Companies Act and those Acts which require companies to disclose where their money goes and what they do, and if he were to provide for them to disclose all the moneys that they put up in political donations, to have polls of their shareholders and have their shareholders do the same thing, perhaps I could accept that the member was being honest and was not about mischief, but he was about mischief.

Mr Groom: Why do you think he did it?

Mr GREGORY: I do not know, and only a man of that limited intellect could respond to that. I refer to an article in the *National Times* on 14 October 1983, under the heading 'Whose money backs New South Wales Liberals?', which lists a heap of companies. The total works out to $331 600, and I notice that B.H.P. came up with $50 000; Brickworks came up with $20 000; Brambles came up with $2 500; Boral came up with $10 000; C.S.R. came up with $13 000, and so on. I am not aware of any of those donations ever appearing in the balance sheets, of their shareholders ever being consulted by their directors, or of it being reported at annual meetings that these donations have been made.

However, if one considers the trade unions and looks at their balance sheets as they are required to be published by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, one will find where the money goes because anyone who was in the House when I addressed this matter would have been able to hear from me the references to the metal workers' balance sheets. Anyone who had a bit of time and went into the library could look for himself and find out, so there is no problem about that.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: They put it under 'education fund', though, don't they?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is not only out of order but he is out of his seat.

Mr GREGORY: He is not only out of his seat but he is out of his mind and does not know what he is talking about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GREGORY: It shows a deplorable lack of intelligence and understanding from a former Minister of Industrial Affairs, and it illustrates why there was so much industrial strife in Government departments when he was Minister, because he just does not understand. If he did understand, perhaps we could listen to him, but he does not, or he would not make those mistakes.

However, I have had a few remarks to make in closing my address which was interrupted by the normal procedures of the House the last time I spoke. I regard this motion as a mischief which will have no effect if it is ever passed. It is a motion put forward by the member for Glenelg to take up private members' time in this House, to try to gain short political advantage for himself. It is not doing anything to advance the interests of the people of South Australia, and he should leave the trade unions and their members to manage their own affairs. They can do it quite well: they have been doing it for years, and they will keep on doing it. I oppose the Bill.

Mr GROOM secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 1379.)

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I would like to congratulate my colleague the member for Glenelg on bringing forward this measure, because I believe that it has an enormous amount of merit and requires and, I believe, deserves the just consideration of this House and far more consideration than has been given by the Government to date. What the Bill seeks to do is to give a power of higher opinion when, in the view of the Crown, the granting of bail could place the public at undue risk or where there is a high probability of non-appearance in court. It says that there are some people who have been granted bail through the normal systems who should not have been granted bail.

There are numerous cases where the bail system has been seen to be deficient. The Attorney-General has quoted a case with which he was concerned, and he instituted a review as a result. The Australian Crime Prevention Council has many such cases, and I would seek leave to have tables 1, 2 and 3 of the 1981 Australian Crime Prevention Council Quarterly Journal (volume 4 No. 5), being statistical tables, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member for Mitcham assure the Chair that the tables are purely statistical?

Mr BAKER: Yes.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1

BAIL ABCONDERS—VICTORIAN MAGISTRATES' COURTS

Twelve months ending 30 June 1978

Theft and deception	205
Drink driving (Exceeding .05% and drive under influence)*	89
Assaults (including serious)*	60
Possess/use/sell drugs	51
Burglary (including attempts)	48
Forge and utter	20
Receive/handle stolen goods	15
Other*	238
Total	726

*Many of these offences may be dealt with in the absence of the defendant.

TABLE 2

MAJOR OFFENCES FOR WHICH ACCUSED PERSONS ABSCONDED (VICTORIAN HIGHER COURTS)

Offences:	1977	1978
Wounding, assaults	35	11
Sexual offences	34	22
Robbery and allied offences for gain	29	8
Theft, burglary, etc.	123	42
Deception	110	33
Property damage	4	12
Other offences, drugs, conspiracy, etc.	12	146
Total	337	274

TABLE 3

ACCUSED AWAITING TRIAL AND ABSCONDERS (VICTORIAN HIGHER COURTS)

Year	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Accused	2 398	2 397	2 133	1 921	1 693	1 650	1 533
Absconders	99	136	151	101	122	106	64
Absconders %	5.01	6.87	8.61	6.4	8.97	7.78	5.2

Mr BAKER: I refer to the Victorian situation where similar questions were asked in 1978 about the bail system, and their system improved because of changes to the Bail Act. We are now putting forward further positive changes. What I think is probably the most salient issue raised in this matter was a paragraph in the journal, which states:

> In the five years ending 31 December 1978, 1 355 bail absconders were recorded on Victoria Police 'Daily Circulars'; additionally, of the 28 persons who have been listed as Victoria's 'Top Ten' most wanted criminals, 17 are bail absconders, 13 of them awaiting trial for armed robbery. Experience has shown that the longer the absconder can remain at large the more difficult it is to prosecute.

It says that half the people who were the most dangerous criminals in Victoria at that time were released on bail. That is an indictment of the system, and a similar situation is in force in South Australia; let me assure honourable members of that. What response have we got from the Government? We do not have a person of legal standing within the Cabinet in the Lower House, and the member for Hartley has responded on behalf of the Government.

He says that the Government is sympathetic, but that it is undertaking a review and cannot make any decision without undertaking reviews.

This was undertaken in January of this year, and to date there is no indication that the review will be completed in the foreseeable future. I would add that, while the Government is sympathetic, the measure has certain public appeal; in fact, it has widespread public appeal. I approached the Australian Institute of Criminology and one of its senior personnel said that this was a great initiative, so members of that institute thought that that was something that could help the course of justice in South Australia. One has only to make reference to the *South Australian Government Gazette*, where various cases are listed. It is interesting to note that many people who are charged with serious offences are on bail. We have Walter Joseph Martin, who is charged with murder, and is on bail. I will not go through the list of names, but there are two people charged with robbery with violence who are on bail; one person with a very long list of charges, including assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm is on bail.

Also on bail are people who have committed offences of robbery in company, attempted murder, arson, unlawful and malicious wounding, robbery in company and robbery with violence, burglary, illegal interference, attempt to commit a felony, rape, unlawful sexual intercourse, indecent assault, and a number of others. I am not saying in every case that bail is not warranted, because the status of each case is different. What I am saying is that the system is not working. It is well recorded that that is so. It is time for a change. Obviously there would be very few cases involved and they would be cases where the Crown believed that there was some extreme risk involved. It would not be the case that every month there would be five, six or seven cases. Very few cases would be involved where the Crown believed that letting a person free on bail would cause problems.

The great difficulty with law enforcement today is that provisions applicable to it are still based in the 19th century. These days we have computers at our disposal which when provided with historical information can determine the probability of an offence recurring or of a person absconding from bail or whatever.

Whenever it is indicated that that risk is high or that a history of violence is involved, people in that situation could be looked at very carefully. I believe that in that regard people in that situation are not considered carefully enough today. In those circumstances the Crown could decide that it is manifestly inappropriate for a person to be placed on bail, just as it could determine that it would be manifestly inappropriate to appeal against a sentence of a convicted person. We can now use computers to the benefit of the system and cut out some of the sludge that escapes the system.

I want to comment briefly on the Government's response to this motion. I think the member for Hartley's response could best be regarded as being a list of red herrings. In fact, he used his legal training (which unfortunately no other member opposite has) to fudge the issue. He made a number of comments about provisions suggested by my colleague. First, he said that the Bill was defective, although he did admit that the problems have mainly been fixed up; so, he dwelt on the fact that we had to amend the original proposition. The member for Hartley and other members of the House must bear in mind that we have very little professional expertise in drafting Bills; we need further instruction on such matters.

Secondly, the member for Hartley said that a time period of 24 hours would be constraining on the Judiciary. There is no constraint on the Judiciary; they do not start until 10 o'clock in the morning. In fact, a case could be arraigned prior to that time. The member for Hartley asked, 'What happens to the defendant?' Under my colleague's Bill it is quite clear that he is kept in gaol.

The member for Hartley then said that an appeal must be instituted within one month under section 172 (1). In a normal situation an appeal must be lodged within one month; this in fact provides for the institution of an appeal within 24 hours—so, surely that must be within one month. If in fact there is some anomaly in that regard it would require but a small amendment, although I do not believe it does. I believe that the law has been clearly established. The honourable member commented about the granting of bail and about what happens to a person. The proposed amendment covers that. The honourable member also suggested a review. However, nowhere in the existing Statutes, whether they refer to industrial or criminal law or whatever is there provision for a review.

Mr Groom: There are bail applications now; one goes into Chambers.

Mr BAKER: I am talking about the ability of a higher court to rule on a lower court's finding.

Mr Groom: Yes, you can go to any justice you like. If you get a refusal you can go to any other of the nine justices in the Supreme Court.

Mr BAKER: The honourable member is obviously not listening. The appeal provisions operate in regard to a higher court decision. That is what is in existence today.

Mr Groom: You can be refused in the Magistrates Court and go to the Supreme Court on the originating summons. That is the position.

Mr BAKER: The honourable member is correct in his interjection, but when the Crown undertakes for a judge or a justice to look again at a decision that has been made it must be made on appeal.

Mr Groom: That's right.

Mr BAKER: It is stated that the rules of fresh evidence apply in an appeal situation, which is quite correct. If the Crown does not believe that a person should be released on bail, there would appear to be no need for fresh evidence to be provided. If, in fact, the evidence became available later that could then be produced. So, again, the member for Hartley has fudged the issue. Finally, reference was made to the fact that the justice must give reasons why bail has been given, because in a very short time he would know whether the Crown intended to make an appeal application or not; that is the time when the judge can submit his reasons for his decision. In fact, that would be an eminently workable system. Because of the time allowed, the justice, magistrate or whoever would be able to submit his or her reasons for the decision for release on bail.

The Government has used the excuse of a review being needed. I understand that the main interest of the Government in a bail review concerns the other end of the scale where disparities occur in regard to people who are unable to afford bail or to make provision for release from gaol. I understand that that area concerns the Government. Its main concern is not about who is going to be released on the streets today or tomorrow. I wonder how members opposite would feel had such a provision been made and inserted in Statutes? How many people would suffer because that provision was not there? I think it is up to this House to take a stand on this issue. I believe I have answered all the questions raised by the member for Hartley. There may be need for one slight alteration.

Mr Lewis: He will never admit that.

Mr BAKER: He would never admit it. I believe it is about time that on a matter on which we have got bipartisan agreement we accept legislation such as that proposed by my honourable colleague which would make South

Australia a better place by making the bail system workable thereby providing greater freedom and greater protection for the community.

Ms LENEHAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INTRASTATE CARRIERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House urges the Government to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1951, sections 33, 41 and 142 as a matter of urgency to ensure fair competition between all intrastate carriers and thereby prevent any further abuses of the concessional registration of trucks belonging to interstate carriers who compete 'illegally' with local intrastate carriers.

(Continued from 9 November. Page 1565.)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I move:

Leave out 'and 142' in the second line.

I do not think it is necessary to debate this motion. The Bill was passed in the House yesterday and I have spoken about it to the member for Mallee. The explanation given on section 142 was included in that Bill and was accepted by the Opposition. I would support the motion with that amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICE FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Police Offences Act, 1953, relating to traffic infringement notice fees, made on 25 August 1983 and laid on the table of this House on 30 August 1983, be disallowed.

(Continued from 9 November. Page 1566.)

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I believe that this is a cynical political exercise. If, by so saying, I am doing the member for Eyre an injustice, I am happy to apologise to him. I understand the point he is making, because in opposition we opposed the traffic infringement notice legislation. The honourable member wishes to point out that fact. I should briefly explain to the House the difference between the Opposition's situation now compared to when it was in Government and our position now in Government compared to when we were in Opposition.

In Opposition we opposed the introduction of traffic infringement notices. On coming to Government it was acknowledged as being part of the policing process of South Australia. The policing administration and resources, as well as the courts administration and resources, had been changed to adjust to the new system. On coming to office we had a system in place. To then meddle with it would cause a great deal of disruption. Whilst we did not agree with its introduction, it is now part of the policing process, and we accept it.

The hypocrisy of the present Opposition lies in the fact that it introduced traffic infringement notices and now, with the motion of the honourable member wherein he is critical of some aspects of such infringement notices and relative charges, he is critical of his own Party's measure. We have not changed the nature of the offences. The Government is merely ensuring that the value of the penalties for breaching traffic laws is the same in 1983 in real money terms as it was in January 1982. We have done no more than that. The fees have been adjusted to cater for inflation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The real value of the traffic infringement notices today is exactly the same as it was in January of last year: we have merely ensured that the penalties remain consistent. There seems to be a wide suggestion by members opposite that the penalties under the various Acts should not increase in line with inflation: that is, if a penalty is set at $100 or six months gaol, the six months gaol remains a penalty for 20, 50 or 100 years, whilst the monetary value changes in accordance with inflation. Therefore, 20 years ago a penalty worth $20, today is hardly worth anything at all. So, for penalties to be effective and to discourage people from breaking traffic laws, they must be kept in line with inflation. We have done that and the penalties today are exactly the same as those which this Opposition wanted in 1982. Members opposite should thank us for doing that. Apart from that, the Government opposes this motion.

Mr Lewis: They are a distinct disincentive to tourism.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I wonder at my taking these motions seriously. I was trying to do so in addressing the problem. This obviously is a cynical exercise. The member for Mallee has pointed out that it is a cynical exercise by trying to relate the matter to tourism, as though we are the only State in Australia with traffic infringement notices, when his Party introduced the legislation and brought these rules into South Australia. It is 'Liberal Party in Government' legislation: it is not our legislation. The basis on which the Liberal Party introduced the legislation was along the lines applicable in New South Wales. We have followed that principle and accepted the basis decided upon by the Liberal Party in Government. In Government, members opposite thought that the legislation was appropriate, whilst in Opposition they have a different view. When things are different, they are not the same.

Mr Ashenden: Repeal it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, we are not going to repeal it. It is the height of political cynicism and hypocrisy for the Opposition to ask us to repeal traffic infringement notices in South Australia as they are now doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The very system for which they argued strenuously 18 months to two years ago they are now suggesting be repealed. We argued against it but in Government we have accepted it. The structure is in place, and the resources of the police and the courts have been adjusted to accommodate the new system. We will not now change that, as much as we opposed the introduction of traffic infringement notices. I am surprised to see the Opposition now wanting to meddle and asking us to repeal the legislation. We will not accede to that request. I oppose the motion.

Mr HAMILTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity this evening to speak on a matter which has caused me concern over the past couple of weeks. In South Australia after 5 December the services currently provided by O'Connor's Air Services to many parts of South Australia will cease to operate. Currently, O'Connor's provides a courier service transporting computer documents to most of the

major banks operating in South Australia. The company's services operate in the South-East, from Adelaide to Kingston, Naracoorte, Mount Gambier, and Millicent; in the Mid North, to Minlaton, Cowell, Cleve, and Kimba; on the West Coast, to Port Lincoln, Lock, Wudinna, Streaky Bay and Ceduna; and in the Upper North, to Port Pirie, Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Hawker. That is an extensive service.

As well as flying freight, the company provides for the majority of those towns daily air services that some have never had before and, for others, limited air services. O'Connor's current contracts will be terminated by T.N.T. Air. One can only conclude that there are link-ups between T.N.T. Air and the Ansett Group. It has become fairly obvious for a long time that Ansett does not want any other company in South Australia, or probably in this nation, to be able to carry passengers.

What has taken place in relation to T.N.T. Air's decision (and the company is based in Sydney) is to take a contract away from a locally based South Australian company and give it to an interstate company which will not carry any passengers whatsoever. Therefore, those people in my electorate and others will be denied the facility of a passenger service. Neither Ansett nor anyone else will currently provide one. That will mean a local company being placed in a very difficult position. Up to 10 or 11 pilots could be stood down. Also, six or seven support staff plus office staff could be stood down as a result of this operation.

O'Connor's pioneered these services. The company first operated an excellent service for the banks carrying some freight then graduating to passenger services, which has been of great assistance to many people. We have a clear case now of a large monopoly using its corporate strength to knock out a small South Australian company to the detriment of the people of this State. Social effects which could flow from these decisions have not been taken into account.

I appeal to those people (I will not mention the name of the gentleman in question, but I will on a future occasion) in Sydney to rethink this matter, because unless common sense applies and people in the areas concerned have their air service reinstated, it is my intention to move in this place for a Select Committee to be set up to examine the operations of airlines in this State with a view to linking these services and ensuring that people in isolated country areas are not treated in such a shabby fashion.

I have sent telegrams to Sydney. I have had discussions with Mr O'Connor, as have my colleagues the members for Mount Gambier, Mallee and Victoria. I understand that Mr Porter has been in contact with Mr Beasley. I want to briefly read some of the correspondence to the House. I make no apology for making a fairly strong attack on those people. On a previous occasion I had problems with an airline in this State when it locked out competitors and was going to withdraw services. Wherever possible, air services should be provided to as large an area of South Australia as possible. We have had the two-airline agreement for years, which protected the major airlines and greatly opened up areas for people in isolated communities.

When this matter was first brought to my attention I sent a telegram to T.N.T. Air in which I said:

> I would be most disappointed and concerned if any action was taken that led to reduction or loss of the services provided by O'Connor's to western and northern South Australia, as this is the only regular passenger service currently available. The service provided has been regular, reliable and efficient.

I received a telegram in reply which was very interesting, and which reads:

> Thank you for your telex of concern in relation to the services we offer in the country areas of South Australia. Please be assured that we are taking every care to ensure these services continue. We have many excellent customers in that area and we only hope that their support will grow and thus assist us in our endeavours. Kind regards.

I will not mention the man's name on this occasion, but he will get the real treatment in the future. That information has not been put into effect. The company plans to replace the twin engine Cessna service provided by O'Connor's with a single engine aeroplane which will not carry passengers, only freight. Is that looking after their customers when O'Connor's was able to provide that dual service? I understand that Mr O'Connor started off in 1976 when he was involved in pilot training. He states:

> In 1978, the A.N.Z. Bank offered a five-year contract with me to fly the two routes mentioned above. The only change in the subsequent five years was the result of the take-over by the A.N.Z. Bank of the Bank of Adelaide. The West Coast service was then required to extend to Ceduna. We were also required to service the Yorke Peninsula and this was done via a stop at Minlaton. I then separated the West Coast and Yorke Peninsula routes into two. One flight schedule ex-Adelaide was: Minlaton, Port Lincoln, Wudinna, Streaky Bay and Ceduna. The other was Port Pirie, Whyalla, Kimba, Cleve and Cowell.

Wudinna no longer has a service. Mr O'Connor continues:

> This change in operation necessitated the purchase of two further aircraft.

He explained how the service grew and what took place. Then there was an offer by a group to buy him out which did not come to anything. He was concerned about various matters and had a meeting. Mr O'Connor continues:

> For those reasons I arranged a meeting in Melbourne with Sir Peter Abeles, the Managing Director of T.N.T. I was assured by Sir Peter Abeles that I need not be concerned with any professed arrangement between Wings Australia and T.N.T. and that if I were able to establish my business in a way that my airlines routes complemented those of Ansett Airlines or its subsidiaries (Airlines of South Australia) I would be assured of the support of Ansett.
>
> In accordance with that understanding, I set about restructuring my business operations to convert all routes flown by my company's aircraft to passenger routes. This necessitated the purchase of new aircraft, and I travelled to the United States of America in August 1982 to purchase two new Cessna 402-type aircraft.

He quotes the cost, some $600 000, and continues:

> Each of the aircraft had a passenger capacity of nine, but because of the weight required for freight carried on behalf of T.N.T. I recognised that the effective carrying capacity of passengers would be five per aircraft.

He then explains that when it came to renegotiating contracts the company was advised that it had to reduce numbers lower than previously, and continues:

> Within that reduced price we had to provide in excess of twice the amount of freight that we had previously been carrying. There would be no term of any contract that might be entered into between us. I was advised that the contract would have to be—

I will not mention the figure, but it was some $848 000 less than previously. He then went to Sydney. He continues:

> T.N.T. still declined to offer the names of any company that had allegedly quoted the price which I have now been forced to accept. My company now employs 11 pilots and one office girl. In addition, Lake City Aviation which employs seven people is wholly dependent on my company's support for their continued liability. My company provides 60 per cent of all work carried out by Lake City Aviation. If my company is forced to liquidate then, apart from the loss of employment that will inevitably follow that event, there are numerous country centres in both the South-East of South Australia and on the West Coast of South Australia that will be deprived of any airline connection to Mount Gambier. The places that will be affected are in the South-East: Kingston, Naracoorte and Millicent. On the West Coast: Wudinna, Lock, Kimba, Cleve, Cowell and Minlaton. The loss of passenger services to these areas will be absolute whether or not T.N.T. arranges for other air couriers to service the banks at those towns as those air services will be freight only.

If this matter is carried through and these services are reviewed, I believe that I will have no alternative but to recommend to this House that a Select Committee be set up to examine this proposal and other matters so that we can once and for all protect people against the sort of exercise currently being undertaken. I am sorry that I have

had to raise this matter and be critical of T.N.T. Air. I thought Sir Peter Abeles was a business man who always looked after people in isolated communities.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I propose to devote the time allotted to me in this debate to talking about a subject which has been mentioned infrequently in my time in this House, which is just on one year—the subject of peace. I stand tonight to talk about peace because it is something which has concerned me for a long time, not only since I have been a member of this House—

Mr Gunn: Peace by capitulation!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! The member for Eyre was not interrupted by interjections and I ask him to give the same courtesy.

Ms LENEHAN: I find it quite strange that someone would wish to interject when a member stands in this House to talk about what I believe to be one of the most important issues facing this community in our time. It is an issue from which every member cannot hide and which every one of us must face and solve in terms of our own personal attitude to peace, and we must do so at some point, and do so for ourselves.

What really has precipitated my wishing to speak on this topic tonight was the deep anger that I felt when I picked up the *Advertiser* on Monday morning. I saw, staring from the front page, pictures of two women who had something to say about peace, and about the protest which Women for Survival are mounting at the Pine Gap base. I have always held the belief that people can hold different views from myself about a range of topics; that is the right in any democracy and it is certainly the right of the Mayor of Alice Springs to hold her point of view. However, on this occasion I felt a deep anger for her apparent lack of understanding of what her fellow sisters were about at Pine Gap. I would like to quote what Mayor Oldfield had to say about other women who had, in my view, the courage to protest about something they feel very strongly about. I quote from the *Advertiser* as follows:

> Mayor Leslie Oldfield sat by the pool at her home yesterday and told the 'dole-supported, agitating, trouble-making' Women for Survival protesters camping 19 kilometres away, they weren't welcome in her town.

The picture of Mayor Oldfield reminded me of something straight out of one of those American soap operas, *Dynasty* or one of the others, where the realisation of what is happening in the world is so far removed from some of these people that it is absolutely tragic.

Mayor Oldfield seems to demonstrate an attitude which is quite prevalent in certain sections of this community, and that is that we do not want to know about peace or about survival; we are interested only in our own personal satisfaction and our own personal (in very many cases) amassing of money and property. We are not interested in other people, and the survival of the human race. I could not help but notice in that article the complete contrast with the photograph of the other woman who was sitting on the ground. Her name is Sister Roberta, and I quote from the article:

> And 51-year-old, Sister Roberta Hackendorf, teacher, master of theology, bachelor of arts, of divinity and of social work, sat happily in the red dirt, with those same women and wondered what they had done wrong. The contrasts in the Pine Gap controversy are stark.

I would put it to this House that the contrast at Pine Gap reflects the contrast that is prevalent and obvious in our community and in our society, not just at Pine Gap but here in Adelaide, in South Australia. This is how the article describes Sister Roberta:

> She's tired, and admits she hasn't washed since she arrived here last Tuesday, but she's happy to be at Pine Gap and considers her motives to be typical of those held by the women around her. 'I am every hour amazed at the very broad cross-section of women that are here to make a stand, as women, for what they believe in.'

One could hardly describe people of Sister Roberta's calibre as dole-supported, agitating, and trouble-making. People like Sister Roberta have spent a great deal of their life working for the good of others and for the good of our community and society. It sickens me—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The unemployed have a right to be concerned about this anyway.

Ms LENEHAN: Exactly, and I pick up the point that the Minister of Education has raised. Why should not people who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed and who are being supported by our system, in their time of unemployment, have the right to stand up and be counted on important issues such as peace and the survival, not just of human kind, but the survival of our ecological system? That is what Women for Survival are on about. I quote from some of the literature in which the Women for Survival have stated where they stand on certain issues. They are not just talking only about the threats of nuclear war and the threat to world peace, but they are talking about the ecological system that exists in the area of Pine Gap. They state:

> Pine Gap is near the red centre, the heart of Australia, and it has a special significance for large numbers of people, both the Aboriginal and whites. It's delicate but the tough and enduring ecological system needs to be nurtured, and is symbolic of the care which the whole world deserves.

I put it to the House that these are sensitive statements and reflect an attitude both to life and property, an attitude that is not held widely in this community, I am sad to say. However, I believe that this attitude is gathering momentum and people are starting to think about the deeper and more meaningful issues rather than the superficial issues which many members of this House seem to spend hours debating.

I find it quite extraordinary, as a fifth generation Australian, that I have no idea of what goes on at Pine Gap. I have lived in this country all my life, as indeed have my forebears, and I do not know, as an Australian citizen, what is contained at Pine Gap. It may well be that what is contained there is discussed in this pamphlet, put out by Women for Survival who say that it is one of the most sophisticated communication centres in the world, and is central to the U.S. military operations. They go on to describe the type of complex installed there, what it does, or what they believe it does. I do not think anyone in this country actually knows what goes on at Pine Gap, and that is the point that we, as a Parliament, should consider: we do not know, that this is our country, and that another country is using what only can be described as a highly secretive and obviously very important base, possibly to monitor communication, and we in this country have no idea of what is there.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I find that a personal insult.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Eyre to show the common courtesy to the honourable member that was shown to him when he was on his feet.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you very much, Sir. I am not frightened of the member for Eyre. He interjected in my very first time after I made my maiden speech; I am quite used to him interjecting. It is rather sad, because it reflects his attitude to peace and survival in this country. That is fine; it is on the record and the South Australian community will judge him accordingly. We have, at some point in our lives, to stand up and be counted on this issue, and I feel proud to stand here tonight and talk about peace and survival. I happen to be the mother of children, and I care

very deeply that those children will have some sort of world in which to exist, a world that is not torn apart by war, by hatred, by discrimination, by oppression, and peace to me encompasses every one of those things. Peace is not just about fighting wars. It is about the way we see our fellow human beings, and if we do not stand up and talk about our fellow human beings as deserving of the right to live in peace, even though they may have idealogies different to our own, they may live under different systems of government, they may have a different colour skin, they may have a different sex from our own, they may well have different cultural and racial backgrounds, but they deserve to have the right to live in this world with peace and with tolerance. I would like to congratulate the Women for Survival for the courage that they have shown.

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

There being a disturbance in the Gallery:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I could make many points about the speech we have just heard, but I will make two. For peace demonstrators, all I can say is that those women have shown a lot of violence and provocation unnecessarily. Secondly, I point out that the honourable member's Federal A.L.P. Government completely supports that facility at Alice Springs. However, I will now go on, but I could not go by without making those points. I want to address myself tonight mainly to a speech given earlier today by the Deputy Premier, and I suggest to him that before he answers questions in future he should get his facts straight. Members opposite are laughing, but I will now go through the actual situation that led to my raising in Parliament a matter involving one of my constituents and the Transport Workers Union.

First, I make it quite clear that I was approached by a constituent seeking my help as his member of Parliament who, before he came to me, had attempted on a number of occasions to resolve the problem directly with the T.W.U. A mistake has undoubtedly been made by that union, and I suggest that the Deputy Premier should get his facts straight because he said today that my constituent did not attempt to make contact with the T.W.U. on a number of occasions, and he did, with no success, and I repeat that that is why he came to me for help.

Let us look at the situation that occurred. First, this matter relates to something which occurred five years ago when my constituent was employed as a new driver by a company which required him to join the T.W.U. before it would take him on. He agreed to join the T.W.U., but he could not at that time afford the full fee, so he offered to pay the T.W.U. half of that fee. The T.W.U. said, 'Yes, if you pay half immediately and the other half on your first pay day, we will accept that.' At that time he also asked the T.W.U. for a card to show that he was a member of the union. He was told by an officer of that union that he could not have a card because he was not regarded as a financial member of that union until he had paid the full dues. He was not given a rule book either, because, again, he was advised that he would get that when he became a member. In other words, on the union's own word he was never a member of that union.

I suggest that the Deputy Premier should make sure that he gets his facts straight, because my constituent could not have got a rule book; he was told he could not have it. Before the next pay day my constituent resigned from that employment to take another job more suited to his talents and, immediately he joined that other company, he again joined the appropriate union as he was required to do, which is quite in contrast to Mr Achatz: when he resigned from the chamber, he did not join another body like the chamber. This person did join another union, and the T.W.U. is aware of that. Five years later, the Transport Workers Union did not write a letter to my constituent or telephone him. It issued a summons for the balance of the $55. No other contact was made with my constituent.

On receipt of the summons my constituent immediately contacted the T.W.U. and said that he had never been a member, on the T.W.U.'s own advice. Therefore, the T.W.U. suggested that he should write to the union and resign. In other words, he was told to do that even though he was not a member of the union. My constituent was trying to do everything he thought was right, so he wrote a letter of resignation. However, the union wrote back stating that it would not accept his resignation until he paid the remaining half of his dues. He was not a member of the union, but was being sued by that union for dues which he obviously should never have had to pay.

He did not pay, so the T.W.U. issued an unsatisfied judgment summons. My constituent was very upset, and for the first time he thought that he should obtain legal advice, which he did. An injunction was issued by his lawyer requiring a stay of proceedings. Negotiations continued and the union said that, if my constituent withdrew the injunction, it was prepared to consider the matter. He had his lawyer withdraw the injunction. However, what did the T.W.U. do then? Without further warning, it wrote a further letter demanding the payment now of $120.50 within seven days, or he would be sent to gaol. The letter from the union to my constituent states:

> Please note that if the total amount owing is not received in our office within seven days or alternatively mutually satisfactory arrangements for its payment are not made within that time, we will have no alternative but to issue a warrant for your imprisonment.

The only letter which Mr Achatz received stated, 'Pay up, or we will take you to court.' My constituent took up the union's offer and wrote back. As he said to me, 'I am a married man with children. I cannot afford to pay $120.50 for which I have not budgeted, but I am happy to pay $10 a month.' The union suggested he do that. When he did that, the union immediately wrote back and said, 'No, we are not prepared to accept those terms. We want the money within seven days.' Therefore, the union refused to accept the offer which it had previously made. It said, 'Pay up, or go to gaol.'

My constituent was struggling financially and at that stage he came to me for help. Therefore, I felt that I had every right to raise the matter in this House because the way in which he was being treated is despicable. Let us now refer to Mr Achatz and the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Did you contact the T.W.U.?

Mr ASHENDEN: On a previous occasion I wrote to the union in relation to a similar case. It wrote back and told me that it was not my business, when I was taking it up with the union at that stage. The Deputy Premier has leaned on Mr Achatz very heavily and quoted from his letters. I point out that again, the Deputy Premier should have checked why Mr Achatz wrote those letters, just as he should have checked what exactly happened to my constituent and why I raised this matter.

I know Mr Achatz well. He is not a constituent of mine, but I know him in relation to an organisation of which we were both members. When the Liberal Party was in Government, he came to me asking me to move amendments that would virtually compel all owner drivers to join the T.W.U. I refused to move those amendments, and he told me then that he would 'get me back' because I had not done that. Therefore, I think that the Deputy Premier should

realise why Mr Achatz has taken up this matter. It is obviously an attempt by him to punish me for not moving amendments which he wanted. I also would like to stress that members should read the letters in *Hansard* tomorrow, and they will note Mr Achatz's very heavy union involvement. In his letter, Mr Achatz stated:

> I then decided not to renew my subscription for the 1978 year and ignored accounts.

My constituent did not ignore the accounts as Mr Achatz did. None were sent to him to ignore. Mr Achatz's situation was quite different: he ignored requests for payment and did not pay them. My constituent never had that courtesy. Similarly, I point out, why did Mr Achatz not contact me? He wrote to the Deputy Premier suggesting that the Deputy Premier advise me of the situation. If Mr Achatz had been sincere, I am sure that he would have rung me so that we could discuss the matter.

From his letters, one will see that he has close union affiliations and the only reason that he did not do that was, I believe, for quite strong political reasons. I also point out that the letter from the chamber to Mr Achatz was a letter which threatened legal action within 14 days. I stress that the letter from the union to my constituent said, 'Either pay up or go to gaol within seven days.'

I will conclude by making one point: I will never ever resile from representing the interests of my constituents. I raised this matter because one of my constituents had, in my opinion, been dealt with unfairly, and I will certainly never ever resile from helping people when they are dealt with so unfairly.

Motion carried.

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 November at 2 p.m.