HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 September 1985

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

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 116 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE BEACH

A petition signed by 332 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Coast Protection Board to include Hallett Cove beach in the sand replenishment program was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

CLEVE-KIMBA ROAD

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (27 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Highways Department assumed responsibility for the Cleve-Kimba road on 10 September 1985. The District Council of Cleve and the District Council of Kimba were responsible for maintaining the road in a satisfactory condition for traffic prior to that date. The road will receive the customary level of departmental maintenance effort. The basis for the allocation of funds for construction purposes will remain unaltered, that is, funds will be allocated having regard to the level of funding available for expenditure on arterial roads and the priority of the work in relation to that needed on other arterial roads in the State.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

By command—

Technology Action Program—Report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TECHNOLOGY ACTION PROGRAM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When releasing three weeks ago the 'Principles for Development' in the State over the next five years, the Premier stated:

(1) Fundamentally, our economic and social future depends on the intellectual resources and the skills of our people.

(2) Information, knowledge, expertise—these are all powerful tools in a modern economy. They are essential prerequisites for a State gearing itself for the 1990s.

(3) We must look to the skills of our work force, the drive and ability of our entrepreneurs and the flexibility and sophistication of our decision-makers.

We are seeking to bring this about, and to create in South Australia, a centre of technological excellence. The Technology Action Program (or TAP) is a listing of Government activities designed to realise certain goals in this quest. During the past year the Government has spent much time ensuring that its own efforts are being used to promote greater innovation and technological development and change in the State.

The Government has reviewed its entire incentives policies, that is, financial assistance given to industry. It wished to ensure that this expenditure actually promotes Australian innovation and technological change. As a result of this the State Development Fund has been created, and within it an Innovation and Technology Program. This is a major initiative which will have a big impact in future years. In the past year many advanced technology activities in the private sector have been assisted and, as a result, many new and exciting ventures are getting under way. This will be greatly expanded in future years. This activity is included in TAP.

Another major initiative is a review of Government procurement to ensure that Government procurement activities actually assist innovation in Australian industry.

There are several other activities which are part of TAP. The first of these is the work of the Education and Technology Task Force (ETTF). The Government's decision to have both education and technology under one ministerial portfolio is also now bearing fruit. A few weeks ago the ETTF released an interim report. A second major report is due next March. Our South Australian initiative led to the creation of a national task force, under the auspices of the Australian Education Council, which I chaired and which has just completed its work. It will report to the Australian Education Council at its 52nd meeting to be held on 11 to 13 October 1985.

We are witnessing the beginning of a major period of change to our education system, which is designed to produce those intellectual resources, work skills, innovation and entrepreneurship, needed by the State and which were referred to by the Premier. This complements programs such as the YES scheme announced last week and which was based on the Kirby report, work to develop technology studies courses by SSABSA, and many other initiatives already going on in the education field.

Another important component of the TAP is the Industry and Technology Futures Study, which will be developed and coordinated by the South Australian Council on Technological Change. This activity is a coherent attempt to look at expected technological changes on an industry by industry basis, and is designed to encourage the development of cooperative approaches to ensure the rapid implementation of the technological change which is so necessary in many industries, but at the same time to ensure the most equitable possible outcomes to all parties. The aim is to prevent problems occurring which could threaten our excellent industrial relations climate in the State by looking a considerable distance ahead rather than waiting until technological change is on top of us. Although the overall responsibility will be with the Council on Technological Change, other important bodies such as the Industrial Relations Advisory Council will also be involved.

The Technology Action Program also includes a commitment to put in place promotion groups to develop a more energetic, coordinated and cooperative approach to new industries. An aerospace technology promotion committee modelled on the already successful biotechnology

promotion committee will be established. In South Australia we have many activities in the aerospace technology field, but so far there is no 'industry' in the fullest meaning of the word. Likewise a committee to develop an environmental technology promotion committee in South Australia is planned in 1985-86.

The new Commission for the Future has as part of its motto: 'The future is not some place we are going to, but one we are creating. The paths to it are not found but made.' The major challenge before us is to commit ourselves to making the path to a really advanced economy in this State. In the 1930s a similar series of decisions to industrialise the State were made by the Government of the day.

QUESTION TIME

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier ask the Small Business Corporation to monitor closely and report regularly to Parliament on the impact of the capital gains tax on small business in South Australia? In his submission to the tax summit, the Premier said that, before a capital gains tax was introduced, all the potential problems in its application and administration should be fully explored and resolved to the community's satisfaction. However, that has not happened. The Federal Government has taken no action to explore the problems associated with the introduction of the tax, and the *Bulletin* poll that was published yesterday has clearly evidenced that there is widespread opposition to a capital gains tax.

Among the problems that the tax will impose are a discrimination against proprietors who cannot change their employment without incurring a tax penalty, a positive disincentive to the formation of small business because of the absence of fully realised capital gains, and a considerable reduction in the ability of existing businesses to establish new premises, or for a sole proprietor to change his or her line of business because of the absence of roll-over provisions for businesses.

In view of the serious problems such as these and his own support for a capital gains tax, the Premier should ask the Small Business Corporation to monitor closely and to report regularly to Parliament on its application and administration so that anomalies and difficulties can be immediately identified and brought to Canberra's attention without delay.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that that suggestion has some merit. I will certainly refer the matter to the Small Business Corporation and see what it can do in this area.

ADULT UNEMPLOYED

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Employment give the adult unemployed of our State an assurance that every endeavour will be made to alleviate the discrimination that they are experiencing in relation to being judged on their age and not their skills and ability? When seeking employment, many adult unemployed have experienced discrimination based on age. These people have skills and abilities which fit the job requirements and, in some cases, have undertaken retraining programs, only to find that, when they apply for jobs, their acceptability is reliant upon answering one simple question: 'How old are you?'

With the retraining and job programs now being initiated for this group of people, it would seem from the comments of the adult unemployed that, unless this age discrimination attitude is not taken into account, the total benefit that can flow to the unemployed will be severely affected and the State's economy will be disadvantaged.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am very happy to answer the honourable member's question. In fact, this morning I had the privilege of addressing the annual general meeting of the Don't Overlook Mature Expertise organisation—a valuable group in South Australia. I am pleased to note the significant support for that organisation by the member for Brighton over the years.

The matter of adult mature unemployed is very serious. In order to understand the magnitude of the problem, one must realise that from 1980 onwards 15 000 jobs for the 45-plus age group have been eliminated. That is a significant indicator of just how serious the problem is. It is also true that the nature of the unemployment problem amongst mature adults involves two factors: one is the mismatching of skills with job opportunities (and that is certainly being addressed by the Government in our packages) and the second more serious problem, in terms of how one tackles it, is the barriers that exist in the minds of many employers and people in personnel offices in enterprises. Those people have a mental hurdle that they will not get over in terms of the utility of someone over 45 years.

The latter factor requires the most forthright attack in terms of changing attitudes, because surely no-one could propose reasonably that people over the age of 45 years lose capacities, skills, or potential utility in regard to places where they might work. Yet, that is the problem that very often keeps people out of employment, because employers cannot cross that barrier.

As to the first point, as part of the wide ranging employment and training packages we have introduced programs that are targeted specifically at the adult unemployed. We have already acknowledged the seriousness of the youth unemployment question and we have announced a number of packages in that regard. I point out that 30 per cent of the people to be assisted under the employment package that this Government announced recently—a $23 million three-year package—are adult unemployed.

Programs that target their needs include a new $425 000 adult unemployment support program that involves grants to groups that are concerned with adult unemployed so that they along with us can assist in providing jobs or improving job prospects for people.

My colleague the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins) gave a donation from that fund when he launched it at DOME a couple of weeks ago. There is the adult skills training program; the expansion of the self-employment venture scheme which will assist about 240 unemployed people; the expansion of the New Opportunities for Women (NOW) program, which offers mature women the choice to decide on an occupation based on a wide range of options; and of course there is even a component of the Jubilee 150 Youth Employment Scheme that is targeted at adult unemployed.

I am not about to suggest that that will eliminate the problem, but it is at least a start towards facing the problem—the first start ever made by a State Government. I acknowledge that more needs to be done. We will examine that and look at what we can do, but we have started with a significant investment.

I also acknowledge that the mental hurdle of overcoming ageism—discrimination against those over a certain age—must be tackled. I hope that we can reach the stage, such as is the case in the United States already, where it is not possible to discriminate against people on the basis of age. I have also undertaken to approach the Federal Government to identify the needs of this group and I have asked that in its planning it take the lead of South Australia and incorporate similar programs within its system.

TATIARA MEAT COMPANY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Why did the Premier mislead the House when he said that he would contact the Tatiara Meat Company yesterday to discuss the illegal industrial dispute threatening jobs and vital export areas and why is the State Government still refusing to condemn the union which has caused this trouble?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Several times.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he said it several times. When the Premier was asked about this dispute yesterday he said that the Government was taking two courses of action. He said that he would contact the company after Question Time and that the dispute had been referred to the Minister of Labour. He did not contact the company yesterday as he promised, and had not done so today until the start of Question Time. The Minister of Labour has also said that he will do nothing about it. The Tatiara Meat Company in Bordertown is Australia's largest exporter of chilled lamb to the United States, Japan, Germany and Switzerland, but because the Transport Workers Union has illegally banned the movement of its products it has already lost orders worth $350 000, and tomorrow the company will have to lay off workers. The only contact made with the company was by the Department for Community Welfare, offering to help those who will be laid off.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I repeat: the only contact from the Government was by the Department for Community Welfare offering its services to those who will be thrown out of work. In view of the difficulties that this South Australian company is facing through the loss of export orders and jobs, the Premier must now answer to this House for his Government's complete lack of action in seeking to help the company, or being prepared to publicly condemn what is a completely illegal union ban.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Firstly, I have not contacted the company yet: that is correct. At the time questions were asked yesterday, and there was a series, as I recall—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The same thing happened then as is happening now: after I got out one sentence in an attempt to answer the question there was uproar from members of the Opposition, complete rowdyism, heckling and attempts to interject, all in the interest of preventing my speaking or saying what action was, or was not, possible.

In that context I made the point that it was my intention to contact the company and in so doing point out the way in which members of the Opposition were seeking to exploit this situation: they have no intention of trying to solve the problem, and no genuine concern for the workers involved or the company. That was the fact, and any member in this House would testify that that was the way in which the Opposition approached this matter.

While I have not yet contacted the company—and I will explain why in a minute—I assure the Deputy Leader that he need not hold his breath, because it is my intention to contact them and to explain those matters to the company's principals directly. The behaviour of the Opposition on this matter has been absolutely scurrilous. Now, as to the dispute itself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There we are, Mr Speaker: I turn to the dispute, to an explanation, and there is immediately uproar and interjection. Why? Because, quite clearly, honourable members opposite will—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Stop smiling.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: One can only smile at the way in which this Opposition is seeking to raise a matter of public—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It is a joke.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a smile of pity, not mirth, I assure honourable members, that this is the Opposition that we have in this State. As soon as I embark on an explanation, this is the reaction that I get. It is really childish—quite juvenile. For the benefit of those members who may be interested—and I know, for instance, that the member who represents this district is interested, and I must say that he has not interjected or carried on (he is actually walking from the House, but no doubt he will check the *Hansard* record shortly)—let me explain what has happened. At the time the question was asked yesterday I had not seen the communication from the company. I knew no details of the dispute, as I think I made clear. All I could say was that I would undertake to investigate the matter. I assumed that, if we had had such communication, the normal practice would have been followed, that is, to refer the matter to the Minister of Labour.

In fact, I ascertained after Question Time that the communication referred to was a telex to the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, for his attention. Copies were sent to the Minister for Primary Industry; to Mr Howard, the Leader of the Federal Opposition (whose office no doubt rang the State Opposition here to advise of the matter); to me, as the Premier of South Australia; to Mr Crean, President of the ACTU; to Mr Ian McLachlan, of the Farmers Federation in Canberra; to Mr Bartell, of the Sheep Meat Council of Australia; and to Mr Austin, Chairman of the AMLC.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: One was sent to you and one was sent to us—don't kid us!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the listing on the telex of those to whom it was sent.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have read out my name, and the telex was copied to me. I will repeat, for the honourable member's benefit, that it was sent to the Prime Minister, with copies to the Minister for Primary Industry, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, the Premier of South Australia, Mr S. Crean, Mr I. McLachlan, Mr K. Bartell, and Mr R. Austin. It was not sent to the State Opposition, but, as I say—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Yes, it was.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It must have been hand delivered or separately sent, because there is no reference to that on the telex itself. It was sent to me, presumably as a matter of information. It was not brought to my attention until I made inquiries about it yesterday. Having done that—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It was raised with you a month ago.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Tatiara dispute did not occur a month ago. Is the Tatiara dispute connected with Mudginberri?

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Of course it is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to resume his seat. I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order, and honourable members know the consequences that now follow. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: How is it that the report I received said that the problem has been caused by a dispute involving TWU drivers preventing shipments of meat by air from Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne as part of the TWU campaign to gain a 38-hour week for its members employed at those airports and over health and safety claims

served on the Department of Aviation? That was the reason given to me.

The transport workers are involved in the dispute, and I have communicated with the federal office of the Transport Workers Union. I have suggested to it that a case exists for an exemption to be made in the case of South Australia in the Tatiara meatworks because of the impact this dispute can have. That communication has been sent. The Minister for Labour has also been dealing with the matter. I refer honourable members to his response yesterday to the Hon. Martin Cameron in another place. In that response he put very clearly on the record the way in which these matters should be handled, who has jurisdiction and how best we can intervene to ensure that the dispute is not accelerated or spread but in fact is solved. That is what we are doing.

At the appropriate time, when all the facts are gathered together and when we know what sort of response our approaches have had, I will be contacting the meatworks, as I said. In so doing I will advise it that it is most unfortunate that hopes of settlement in this matter have probably been set back as a result of the politicking of the Opposition on this matter.

PLANNING APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Deputy Premier hold discussions with the Planning Appeals Tribunal to endeavour to have the process of hearing appeals speeded up? Recently a case was presented to me where the local city council made a decision to disallow a building application to build a home in a certain area. The council decision was made in 19 days. The applicant's appeal against the council's decision was granted. The problem is that the appeal hearing took six months to issue. Such a length of time, in my opinion, causes several further problems, not the least of which is that it discourages developers or residents from appealing and rather encourages many to take a chance and bluff their way through a decision by council or local government.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If that time for hearing was typical of the time in relation to hearing cases in the Planning Appeals Tribunal, I would certainly be very concerned indeed. I am concerned about this particular case and, of course, I will take up the matter. In relation to the honourable member's reference to the time taken for the hearing, it was not clear to me whether that referred to the time from when the matter first went before the tribunal in a formal sense to when a decision was brought down, or whether that time also included the time taken in the conciliation machinery which is now part of the planning system or the development control system and which has been reasonably successful in many cases in preventing these matters from going on for formal hearing. It is a feature of the new Act which I think has been generally applauded.

I am aware of certain problems that exist. From time to time local government authorities have put suggestions to me as to how the whole process could be speeded up. The Government has made additional part-time appointments to the tribunal as a means whereby further hearings can take place. If that course seems necessary, obviously it is one that I will take up. The answer is, yes, I will certainly take up with the Planning Appeals Tribunal the matters which the honourable member has raised, both as to the specific case he has cited and in relation to generally ascertaining the measures that we should undertake.

MEATWORKERS DISPUTE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier persist with his earlier statement that there is no connection between the meatworkers strike at Tatiara and that at Mudginberri? In answer to a question earlier this afternoon the Premier suggested that there was no connection whatsoever between the dispute at Tatiara—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He said it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he did not suggest it; he said it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —and the dispute at Mudginberri. A report in today's *Advertiser* refers to a meeting of unions which was held to back the meatworkers at Mudginberri and states:

> About 10 unions, including the Waterside Workers Federation, the Federated Storemen and Packers Union, the Transport Workers Union and [a number of others] met . . . to discuss tactics. The federal Secretary of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union, Mr Jack O'Toole, said the union would take national industrial action.

On the *PM* program on Monday of this week a Transport Workers Union official stated that the dispute at Tatiara was part of the national program which was flowing from the Mudginberri dispute. In view of these statements, does the Premier persist with the statement that he made earlier this afternoon, or is he abysmally ignorant of the facts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only report on the information that I have before me. I am not the federal Minister for labour. This matter is within the jurisdiction of federal awards and the federal courts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not even the State Minister of Labour. The matter was drawn to my attention for the first time yesterday. The report that we have is that the Transport Workers Union is waging a campaign to gain a 38-hour week for its members employed at airports, and over various other claims. It has served a claim on the Department of Aviation and as part of the pursuance of that claim the union has imposed certain bans and limitations, including those preventing the shipment of meat by air. I have simply reported that, as the facts that have been presented to me. They have been put before the House for its consideration.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You are appallingly ignorant.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Unley.

SHOWGROUND DISRUPTION

Mr MAYES: Will the Deputy Premier, as Minister responsible for police matters, report to the House on what steps his department has taken to reduce the disruption to businesses and residents from patrons leaving the Wayville showgrounds at the conclusion of functions held there? I raise this matter because of concerns expressed by local business people and residents about continual disturbances occurring as a consequence of people leaving functions at the Wayville showgrounds.

The increasing use of the showgrounds has highlighted this problem. I have received the following letter, dated 11 September, from a local business:

> Following last week's show, we would now like you to be aware of the problems we have been experiencing. Our premises are on the corner of Greenhill and Goodwood Roads. Throughout the year we employ Metropolitan and Security Services for a patrol five times during the evening with additional calls on weekends. We rarely experience any problems other than when functions are held at the showgrounds, in particular during Royal Show week. This year was no exception. Despite the employment of a security service and the measures we ourselves have taken, we again experienced vandalism.

As this matter is of increasing concern to residents and businesses in the area, I ask the Deputy Premier what steps can be taken to remedy the situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Some sort of problem always arises when, often late at night, large numbers of people leave a public function to return to their motor cars to go home, and it is a problem about which the police are especially sensitive. However, I agree with the honourable member's contention that perhaps in relation to the showgrounds there is a problem of far greater magnitude than that which normally obtains at football ovals, racetracks and other such places, partly because, of course, as a result of development over the years the showgrounds are very close to an old established residential area.

This matter has been taken up with the Police Commissioner, and standing instructions have been issued to all patrols to take special note of the situation at the showgrounds, especially when people are leaving late at night at the end of a function. I give the commitment to the honourable member that I will continue to take an interest in this matter. I will call for reports a little later in the year, when we can evaluate the results of the first two or three months of this closer surveillance of the area and see whether further measures are indicated.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Premier's statement to the House yesterday that home loan interest rates must be reduced mean that he will refuse any application from building societies for a further rise in interest rates this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My statement was aimed, certainly, at pointing pressure on all those institutions that must decide whether or not to respond to the current rise in interest rates not to go into that area unless it is absolutely necessary for firm financial reasons. Although under the Act the Government could introduce a regulation that would peg the interest rates charged by building societies, that power is not being used for the good reason that, while perhaps achieving the benefit of a pegged interest rate, we may also put in jeopardy the financial viability of a building society. I ask members which is worse: an interest rate that may be rising, or a building society that could go out of business? Clearly we are not in that situation. The current financial situation of building societies is very healthy indeed, as is the housing loan and other markets.

However, if interest rates continue to rise, our economic recovery can be jeopardised. This is a matter of the gravest concern which we are taking up with our federal colleagues, especially in so far as Reserve Bank policies on money supply are influencing the pressure on interest rates. I believe that the community as a whole, as well as the financial institutions, has a responsibility not to allow increasing interest rates to become some form of self-fulfilling prophecy, because part of the problem at present concerns the expectation of the market that rates will rise. That expectation is not well founded. They do not need to rise. The real level of interest rates is at a record high.

Therefore, there does not seem to be a reason for the interest rates rising in the way that they are. I am not going to say here in the House, in answer to a question, what reaction I will have if the building societies make an approach, but to date they have not done so, although we all know that the pressures are certainly there. The matter has to be looked at on its merits at the appropriate time.

HALLETT COVE TO HACKHAM RAILWAY LINE

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister for Environment and Planning, verify claims made by the member for Davenport, who has several times in recent months maintained that the State Government has abandoned the option for the Hallett Cove to Hackham railway line, because the railway reservation on which such a line would run has been removed from a recent supplementary development plan? At least three times in recent months the member for Davenport has gone on record as saying that the Labor Government has deleted the old Hallett Cove to Hackham railway line from the Adelaide Development Plan. On one occasion he went further and alleged that the Government had sold, or was going to sell, off the reservation. He claimed that the Government had therefore deleted this possible transport corridor. As the Southern Transport Plan is now being displayed at a series of southern shopping centres (this week at the Aberfoyle Hub), some of my constituents are perplexed about the fact that the railway option is included in this plan when the member for Davenport maintains that the Government has deleted it.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You have.

Ms LENEHAN: If you listen, you might hear the answer. I have spoken to the Minister of Transport about the plan—

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Well, it is in my electorate and I think I have every right to be angry—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LENEHAN: —about the plan which is on display, regarding which there has been a firm commitment from the Minister that the railway option is in fact included. It now remains for the Minister to explain how it could be possible for the member for Davenport to consistently repeat what he has been alleging about the development plan.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think it is very wise of the honourable member to check out thoroughly what the member for Davenport says, because any one of three factors could be operating. It is just possible that the member for Davenport has not done his homework properly and that he has not looked closely at the documents involved. I think it is unlikely that is the case, but it is possible. It is also possible that the member for Davenport does not understand supplementary development plans and the way in which they operate. I think that there is a higher probability of that factor, although it is still somewhat remote.

The third possibility is that the member for Davenport is indulging in his usual practice of living dangerously. By that, I do not mean jumping in front of buses and things like that, but rather, shall we say, pushing the limits of truth beyond their natural frontage. I think that I may be able to illustrate that as I go along. Let us remember what we are talking about here. Dr Scrafton in the early 1970s put forward a proposition, which it was understood at the time was reasonably down the track, for the extension of the Adelaide to Noarlunga Centre railway line down the peninsula, certainly to Seaford, and possibly ultimately into the Aldinga and Sellicks Hill area. There was subsequently a proposition for the revival of the railway corridor from Hallett Cove through Morphett Vale to the Hackham area.

I believe that there was also a proposition for the connection of this line to the Noarlunga Centre, producing somewhat of a loop. I know of no proposition that has been considered beyond what is there, nor indeed would it be sensible to consider any possible railway connection other than those various options.

So, whatever the planners might do, we have to keep in mind that they are the only options that have ever been placed before Governments—either the Tonkin Government

or this one. The key document is the amendment to the Metropolitan Development Plan concerning transportation. It was authorised in May this year. In that plan there is a map (MA/4A) showing existing railways, proposed public transport routes, arterial roads, proposed arterial roads and some other roads.

It is quite clear that that map does not show the Willunga railway reservation. It is on that flimsy basis that the member for Davenport has been operating. It is true that there are those people who do not altogether appreciate comics, because although they can understand the pictures they have trouble with what is written in the little balloons above the characters.

The planning equivalent of that is, of course, a supplementary development plan which consists of a map but also an explanatory document—one which is set out in the Queen's English, for the most part. If one does not read the explanatory statement accompanying the map, one might feel inclined to accept the proposition that the reservation had been deleted.

However, if one reads page 14 of the statement one will understand why I said that the honourable member has probably been living dangerously again. The statement is quite unequivocal about the matter of the railway reservation; it totally destroys the proposition that the reservation has been deleted in the sense that the Government has ruled out once and for all any suggestion that the line should ever be built. This is what it says:

> A possible future railway line along the easement of the disused Willunga line from Hallett Cove to Hackham is not to be shown on the plan at this stage because it is the subject of a current study and evaluation and will require a separate amendment if it becomes a firm proposal.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is not removed, in the light of that statement. The map is a portion of the supplementary development plan. It is the drawings; it is not what is in the balloons above those characters. There is a further respect in which the honourable member has been misleading the public and, in particular, the people of the south. The honourable member, I think by interjection, revealed that he is aware that there has been discussion between the District Council of Willunga and the Government about the sale of a portion of that old easement.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That's right.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I make perfectly clear that that transaction, which I assume is occurring with the full support of the member for Alexandra (because it is in and will remain in his electorate), has nothing to do with any of the options I have outlined. There is no proposition, and there never has been, that a railway line at any stage in the future should be relaid from the McLaren Vale area through to Willunga. Yet, the honourable member would try to pretend that because that transaction is going on somehow the Government is abandoning any proposition for the reinstitution of rail transport in the south. In two respects, the honourable member has been shonky: he has deliberately tried to mislead the public or he has completely misunderstood the way in which the planning system operates.

McDONALD'S RESTAURANT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would love five minutes to respond to the Minister, but I realise I cannot have it. I suggest that the Minister looks at the evidence I presented to the Planning Commission.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will come to order.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Does the Premier support the ban imposed by the building trades unions on the construction of a McDonald's restaurant at Noarlunga? This ban has been imposed on a half completed restaurant over the issue of youth award rates. The Premier has previously backed the line that the union is taking in this dispute.

Last week, the Minister of Labour stated that the State Government did not support—I stress 'did not support'—the need for youth award rates. I have been informed that the claim by the Vice-President of the Building Trades Federation (Mr Carslake) that McDonald's proposed to pay its employees only $50 a week is totally incorrect. The facts are that under the wage scales negotiated in Western Australia a 15-year-old will receive $103.20 a week—more than twice that suggested by Mr Carslake, the union official—and an 18-year-old will be paid $206.40 a week.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Listen to members over there supporting the trade union movement like a group of parrots, supporting the trade union on a ban like this on a building site.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Listen to members opposite backing up the builders labourers on their bans on building sites. In view of the fact that McDonald's now employs more than 800 people in South Australia, and the false premise on which this ban is based, will the Premier say whether he agrees with this union's action or whether he will join with the Opposition in condemning it?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government, of course, does not support the ban. However, the Government's responsibility—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Doesn't the Premier want to answer?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am the Minister representing the Minister of Labour in this place. I assume that the honourable member wants the relevant Minister to provide the information that he has with a good deal of detail. If the House is genuinely interested, as I believe it is, in the problems surrounding this case, then I am only too willing to give to this House all the information that I have received from my colleague. The Government's responsibility in this matter is to do what it can to conciliate and to ensure that there is a proper resolution to the issue.

McDonald's advertising of so-called cadetships follows a test case decision by the Western Australian Industrial Commission on junior rates handed down in July. The decision points out that the applicants in that case failed to prove the point that an arbitrary reduction in wage rates for juniors would increase their prospects for employment. The commission did allow, however, for employers to enter into agreements with individual employees who were prepared to accept less than award rates subject to the ratification of the commission. The Western Australian Industrial Commisison's proposal on this, which would allow two or more junior employees of the same age in the same establishment doing the same work to receive different rates of pay, is industrially unworkable. McDonald's is apparently the first employer to attempt to put this unreal policy into practice through its advertisement for cadetships in Western Australia.

Whilst the Government clearly does not condone the action taken by the BTF in this matter, it does appreciate the union's concerns about the attacks that are occurring on youth wages in this country. The Government has stated previously that cuts to youth wages will not solve the problem of youth unemployment. This view is supported by

recent studies into this matter such as the Kirby Report into labour market programs, the 1984 OECD report on a review of youth policies, and the Hancock report on the system of industrial relations in this country.

In relation to this particular dispute, it should be pointed out that the industrial agreement applying to McDonald's restaurants in this State does provide for junior rates (as a percentage of adult rates) as follows: under 17 years, 50 per cent; age 17, 60 per cent; age 18, 70 per cent; age 19, 85 per cent; and age 20, 90 per cent. It is also not apparent that McDonald's is in such financial difficulties that it has to further cut youth wages. It is important for such action to be seen for what it is and to understand why the trade union is acting in the way it is. What is important is that the matter is resolved as quickly as possible.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: All the way with the builders labourers—that is your policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport.

LARGS NORTH FIRE STATION

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Emergency Services inform the House when the new Largs North fire station will be built? I have a letter from the Hon. Jack Wright, then Minister of Emergency Services, stating that the station would be built in the 1986-87 financial year on a site on the corner of Victoria Road and Willochra Street, Largs. In this week's issue of the *Portside Messenger* it is stated that the Metropolitan Fire Service has no immediate plans to establish a new station at Largs North. The article further states that a new station at Largs Bay has been on the books for some time and that it has not been decided yet whether it will be located on the site at Victoria Road and Willochra Street. In view of the recent events that clearly show the ever-present fire risk on LeFevre Peninsula and the need for updating of plant and equipment and adequate manning, this matter is now more urgent than ever, and I would appreciate an answer from the Minister as to when the station will be built.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will speak with the Metropolitan Fire Service and bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

MOTORCYCLE NOISE LEVELS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise whether it is the intention of the South Australian Government to proceed with the introduction of the N1 requirement, a modification of the existing Australian design rule No. 39 relating to motorcycle noise levels? I have received considerable correspondence from motorcycle dealers who are strongly of the opinion that the introduction of this requirement, along with the proposed 92 DBA stationery test relating to noise levels on motorcycles, will have a devastating effect on their business and will, in fact, force a number of these people out of business.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As a former member of the Australian Environment Council, the honourable member would know that noise pollution from moving vehicles is a difficult problem and one with which that council has been grappling for some time with singular lack of success. At the most recent meeting of the AEC, the matter of noise from heavy vehicles was discussed and a request was made for further information. The document in respect of which there has been some public comment recently was prepared as part of the necessary preparation for next year's Australian Environment Council meeting. It is certainly not the intention of this Government, nor of any other Government around this nation, as far as I am aware, to introduce any such measures in advance of that meeting or, indeed, to do so on a one-off basis.

One of the obvious problems in relation to moving sources of noise is that, by definition, they are moving. The arguments that are put forward from time to time for uniformity in relation to the traffic code are equally cogent in relation to these matters. First, the outcome of this matter is not known at this stage. Secondly, I am not aware of any Government—certainly not this Government—that will be acting on any such recommendations in advance of next year's AEC meeting which is to be held in South Australia in the middle of the year. Thirdly, any initiative, ideally, will be taken on an Australia-wide basis.

INCOME LINKED PENALTIES

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House whether the Attorney-General's Department has had time to consider the system of income-linked penalties for offenders that have been operating successfully in Victoria over the past 12 months? The Victorian Parliament has introduced income-linked penalties and community service programs instead of gaol for those who cannot pay fines. The legislation, which is applicable to all offences punishable by fines, does allow for some fines to be paid by instalments. The onus is on the offenders to say that they do not have the ability to pay. At the moment in South Australia the poor are being punished with imprisonment for not being able to pay fines.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interesting and important question. I can advise the House that the Attorney-General has received information on the Victorian model and, indeed, on other similar models. The issue has been the subject of some considerable discussion by the Justice and Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of Cabinet. I will obtain a full report from the Attorney and make it available to the honourable member.

ELECTRICITY SERVICE CONNECTIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of the fact that many new home buyers now face additional costs of up to $1 000 because of the Government's direction that all new electricity service connections in the metropolitan area must be placed underground, will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government will give an exemption to those home buyers who are affected by this new policy?

I have been told that a direction has gone to the building industry that there are to be no more overhead electrical service connections made to any new homes anywhere in the metropolitan area. This Government direction has been applied since 1 September, although no prior notice of it was given to the building industry. Home buyers fortunate enough to be building a home adjacent to a stobie pole will have to pay an added cost of between $400 and $500, but those who are building on a site to which a connection will have to be made to a stobie pole on the other side of the road will have to pay $1 000.

The building companies are now receiving complaints from customers who had entered into contracts before this direction was given and whose budgets are strained due to

the higher interest rate repayments that must be made on their loans. When this matter was raised last year the Minister told the House (on 13 November) that underground services were not compulsory. The unannounced change of this policy appears to have caught many homebuyers unaware, and they are facing additional costs. Will the Government consider an exemption for those who entered into their contracts before this directive took effect?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I understand the honourable member's concern. I must confess that I am not aware of any such Government direction. I shall inquire into this matter as soon as I can and see whether I can get this issue clarified.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport provide a report on the effects on the health of STA railcar crews, and the type of assistance that may be provided to such crews, arising from level crossing accidents or accidents involving death of or injury to pedestrians on railway property? As most honourable members would be aware, I come from the railway industry. As a consequence of that, I have been approached by a number of railcar crews who have expressed concern to me about health problems arising from having been involved in railway crossing accidents. As I said in the House last Tuesday night, it has been put to me that some of these railcar workers have subsequently decided to go back to diesel engines, where there is two man crewing, rather than continue working on the STA railcars by themselves. I have also been told that some of these railcar drivers are having nightmares, and that their families have been affected. Because of the traumatic effect of these accidents—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It is all very well for the member for Alexandra to laugh about the matter, but it is certainly no laughing matter if he has any compassion at all. This is having an effect on railway workers, and I ask the Minister to bring down a report, and to also consult with the relevant railway unions to try to assist people in this position.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I point out to the House that I, too, came from the rail industry, and I am aware of many of the matters to which the honourable member has referred today. I shall certainly ask the State Transport Authority to provide me with a report, in the compilation of which I will ask the STA to involve the unions responsible for the railcar crews in the State Transport Authority.

I had two brothers who were drivers and members of the AFULE and, because of my 20 years in the railways, I am well aware of the trauma suffered by train drivers and other crew members when they are involved in collisions, especially in pedestrian collisions, which inevitably result in a fatal accident. I know of people who have given up their trade and left the railway industry because of the trauma they have suffered as a result of an accident in which they were involved. Drivers of locomotives and railcars especially are desperate to avoid collisions, because they, more than anyone else, are in the most dangerous situation, as they are in the cab. I will check this aspect out, but I am not aware of what counselling is provided for a railway worker who is involved in such an accident. I am not aware whether there is the appropriate type of counselling available, although I suspect that there may be and I am sure that there must be examples elsewhere in the industry in Australia, although I do not know about South Australia.

This is a real problem. I am well aware of the trauma and tragedy that occur when members of families in the community are involved in such accidents and of the trauma and tragedy that occur to the individuals and families of those individuals who are in control of a rail vehicle that is involved in such a tragic collision. I shall be only too happy to bring down the report sought by the honourable member.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING IN SCHOOLS

Mr BAKER: In view of public statements by the Minister of Education on political campaigning in schools, will he say what action is being taken to prevent such activity? During July, the Minister expressed disquiet about the use of a double decker bus in western suburban schools. This bus, which had no political propaganda on it, was being used to promote International Youth Year. In this regard, a report in the *Advertiser* of 13 July 1985 states:

> Mr Randall has taken the bus to five high schools where students were given a talk on IYY, shown a video on IYY and filled in a worksheet to answer questions relating to information in the bus . . .Mr Arnold said last night he was staggered that Mr Randall was still taking the bus to schools. 'People would know his bus was a sanitised election vehicle', he said—

(whatever that means). Further, the Minister wrote to Mr Randall on 8 July, as follows:

> I am writing to express my disquiet about reports that you used your campaign bus on the premises of Henley High School during Focus Week for IYY purposes.

I have received complaints that an Australian Labor Party candidate, a teacher in fact, is using his vehicle to politicise a schoolyard. The vehicle can be seen regularly parked in the grounds of a large metropolitan high school in Adelaide, with a very conspicuous roof top sign advertising the ALP and his candidature. The observation has been made that the Minister appears, on the one hand, to be opposing the effective promotion of IYY, yet on the other hand condoning the activities of this candidate. Is this another example of ALP double standards?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's last comment was out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have made clear in this place on a number of occasions my stance as Minister and that of the department on politicising activities within schools. The honourable member also raised a matter that gained coverage in recent weeks concerning Mr Randall, a former Liberal member of this place and, I believe, now an endorsed Liberal candidate, and his activities with his bus. The honourable member says that he does not know what I meant when I referred to a sanitised election vehicle: it was sanitised because it had all the posters taken off it.

I do not want to decry any activities of a member in support of International Youth Year. I believe that that is certainly a commendable cause. However, what was intriguing was the way in which the activities of that person were focused on a specific geographical area of Adelaide. If he was dispassionate about what he was doing in the coming months, he would have chosen a series of schools all over Adelaide that had no possible conflict of interest with other activities that he hopes to follow shortly. However, his activities were geographically focused on an area that could be seen as being in an electorate for which I understand the honourable member is an endorsed candidate (or at least providing students from that electorate).

I would have had an entirely different attitude if it could have been pointed out to me, for example, that he was in a dispassionate sense being part of IYY activities at Noarlunga, Smithfield, Norwood or some other place—but that was not the case. I wrote to the shadow Minister about this matter, but I have not heard from him. He has not chosen to rise to the defence of his would-be colleague. He has

chosen to abandon the matter, and I can understand that: it is probably a wise course of action on his part.

Regarding car parks in schools, it is standard practice for car parks to be out of bounds to students: they should not be in car parks. However, I will have that aspect looked at and determine whether or not there is the possibility that this could be seen as political activity by a candidate of an area within an area and designed to attract votes. The honourable member did not, for example, indicate whether the school is in the proposed district of the candidate. If he can give me information on that, I shall be prepared to receive it and have the matter investigated so that appropriate action can be taken.

Contrary to the honourable member's final comment, the Government has not indicated double standards: we have been clear in our stand. On the other hand, that is not the case followed by certain other members or former members opposite. My Party has credibility with respect to what it believes should happen in schools, and we do not waver from what we have already publicly announced and supported.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the vote taken yesterday on the third reading of the Police Pensions Act Amendment Bill be rescinded.

When this Bill was before the House, I overlooked the fact that it was a money measure and therefore could not pass this place without an appropriate message having been received from His Excellency. The machinery has been set in motion hopefully to receive a message this afternoon but, in the meantime, the vote taken yesterday should be rescinded. I intend to let the House carry this motion and then I shall move that the third reading be put on motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the third reading of the Police Pensions Act Amendment Bill be taken into consideration on motion.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works have leave to sit on the committee during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 8 October 1985 at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, lines 16 to 24 (clause 3)—Leave out clause 3 and insert the following clause:

3. Amendment of s.56—Saving provision—Section 56 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (3) and substituting the following subsection:

(3) The operation of subsection (1) is suspended until 31 August 1986.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Members will recall that for some time now section 56 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* of the Planning Act have been in suspension. The effect of the Bill when it left this Chamber was to do away with that suspension and to remove section 56 (1) *(a)* from the Planning Act. I will not further canvass the reasons that the Government gave for that to occur.

The Legislative Council's amendment extends the suspension for an additional 12 months and does not delete that section from the Act. I understand (though of course this is not part of the message that has come back to us) that a select committee is to be set up in another place to consider section 56 (1) *(a)* and *(b)*. I have considered this. We have had a good deal of support from local government in our efforts to have section 56 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* removed.

I think that there is a growing consensus outside that indeed there are more problems with its retention. The fact that we have been able to go for 18 months without section 56 (1) in the legislation indicates that there is no danger in removing it from the legislation. However, I suppose I have to put my money where my mouth is. If I am confident in my contention, then I am confident that this will withstand the scrutiny of a select committee. In the circumstances, I believe I have no course open to me other than to urge the Committee to support the motion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am rather pleased that the Government has accepted the amendment, but, as the Minister says, he has little alternative other than to accept it. I wish that I had had the opportunity to get some of my papers, and, in particular, the *Hansard* report of the recent debate on this legislation in this place. During that debate I referred to the concern and uncertainty being felt by the community and in particular by industry in regard to the repeal of section 56 (1) *(a)* and *(b)*.

During the debate I tried to explain to the Minister that the advice that we received was varied, to say the least. Some legal people suggested that the repeal should proceed and others spoke very strongly against it. Since that time, I have also had the opportunity to refer some of the points made by the Minister about industry members to some of the people involved: to say that they are not very happy with some of the comments made by the Minister is putting it very mildly indeed. In fact, they are rather uptight about the Minister's comments, and they are very concerned about the Minister's attitude in regard to their involvement in this matter.

I concur with what the Minister has said, that it is not appropriate to go into detail about the setting up of a select committee, but I join with the Minister in supporting that move. I think that it will provide an avenue for proper information to be brought forward, and that once and for all this whole matter can be cleared up: it has been hanging around and in and out of both Houses of Parliament for an extended period of time. There is a very real need for the matter to be sorted out, and I hope that the evidence that is brought forward before the select committee will do just that. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for five amendments to the principal Act, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974. Two of the amendments deal with unusual cases which have arisen in the operation of the Act, while another deals with annual reporting. The remaining two are the most significant in that they deal with what has colloquially been termed 'double dipping'.

Both of the amendments concerning 'double dipping' are designed to prevent the proper operation of the scheme being circumvented by the payment of superannuation benefits in lump sum form.

(1) One of these amendments concerns commutation of a South Australian pension where a member moves to another Parliament. Under the present Act, where a member of this Parliament resigns to contest an election for the Parliament of another State or the Commonwealth, and he is elected to that other Parliament, he is deemed to have retired involuntarily. He is therefore entitled to a pension, the payment of which is suspended whilst he is a member of the other Parliament. The present Act, however, allows such a former member to commute a percentage of his pension as set down in the Act.

The effect of this provision is that if he remains in the other Parliament long enough he could receive full benefits from the superannuation scheme of the other Parliament as well as having the benefit of a large lump sum from South Australia. The amendment proposes to change the scheme so that commutation is not available at the time of moving to the other Parliament. A right of commutation of the South Australian pension would however be available when the former member eventually leaves the other Parliament, but only if his superannuation benefit from that Parliament's scheme does not include any allowance for South Australian parliamentary service. This amendment could save the Government a considerable amount of money on occasions.

(2) The other amendment which concerns 'double dipping' covers superannuation payments from a prescribed organisation (for example, another Parliament). If a South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Fund pensioner joins a prescribed organisation, his pension is reduced by the amount of salary payable by that organisation. When he retires from that organisation, his South Australian pension is reduced by the amount of any pension payable from that organisation's superannuation scheme. The present Act contains these provisions to ensure that a former member cannot receive double superannuation benefits.

However, the present Act does not encompass the payment of lump sums from the other superannuation scheme. By commuting that scheme's pension, a former member could achieve double benefits. The amendment will ensure that lump sum payments as well as pensions are taken into account in determining any reduction in the South Australian pension. Thus, Government costs will reduce in such cases.

(3) One of the amendments dealing with unusual cases concerns elections subject to a decision of the Court of Disputed Returns. Where a member of the Parliament loses his seat at an election but regains that seat as a result of a declaration of the Court of Disputed Returns, or as a result of a subsequent by-election ordered by the Court of Disputed Returns, that member presently loses service for the purposes of the Parliamentary Superannuation Act. Such a situation can affect a member's retirement pension entitlement under the Act.

The Bill seeks to correct this situation by granting 'notional service' in respect of the period of time that the member was unable to resume his seat. Contributions covering the period are to be paid to the fund and any benefits paid (if any) to the member must be repaid to the fund. The amendment makes the change retrospective to 1 July 1979, to cover a case which arose in 1979. Only minor costs to the Government can arise from this amendment.

(4) The other amendment dealing with unusual cases concerns higher offices whose salary level has been reduced. The scheme provides that retirement pensions are based on the salaries at retirement and take into account the salaries of any higher offices that a member has held during service.

At present a member's retirement pension is affected if the salary of a higher office he previously held has been reduced (in comparison to other higher office salaries) since the time the member held the office. The Bill seeks to amend the Act so that a member's retirement pension cannot be prejudiced by a reduction in the relative salary of the offices he held. Such a situation does not come about very often but, where it does, the effect of this provision will be to ensure that a retiring member is paid a pension appropriate to the level of responsibility that he previously held. This amendment could increase Government costs, but only to a minor extent.

(5) The fifth amendment concerns annual reporting to Parliament. Under the present Act the trustees of the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund are not required to produce an annual report. Whilst the trustees produced an annual report for the 1983-84 financial year which has been tabled in Parliament, the Government believes that it should be a requirement that all public sector superannuation schemes report to their Minister. A copy of the report should then be tabled in the Parliament. The Bill also contains a number of consequential and other technical amendments which are spelt out in the explanation of the clauses.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Subsection (3) provides that clause 10 *(c)* and *(d)* will come into effect retrospectively. These amendments to section 36 are intended to cater for the type of situation that Mr G.J. Crafter found himself in after the 1980 by-election in the seat of Norwood. The retrospective operation of the provision will ensure that Mr Crafter benefits from the amendment. Clause 3 replaces subsection (2) of section 11 with a provision in the modern form. The existing requirement that the Auditor-General must report is not included. However, by new section 11a (2) the Auditor-General may require the trustees to include his comments in their report which will be tabled in Parliament.

Clause 4 inserts new section 11a which requires the trustees to report to the Treasurer annually and to incorporate the audited accounts in the report. Clause 5 amends section 17 of the principal Act. New paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* of clause (2a) replace the substance of existing subsections (2a) and (2b) respectively. New paragraph (2a) *(c)* provides for a problem that the present Act does not address. Because, in calculating entitlements under the Act, additional salary is included at the levels applying immediately before retirement an injustice may occur if the prescribed office concerned had been downgraded in salary in comparison to

other prescribed offices since the member pensioner held that office. The new provision allows such an injustice to be redressed.

Clause 6 replaces section 19 of the principal Act. Subsections (1), (2), (3) and (7) of the new provision replace subsection (1) of existing section 19. The new subsections are more comprehensive than the existing provision. Not only do they reduce the South Australian pension where a pension is received from another jurisdiction but they also reduce it if the entitlement, or part of the entitlement from the other jurisdiction is received as a lump sum. New subsections (4), (5) and (6) replace existing subsection (2). These provisions allow for a return of contributions where the extent of the reduction under previous subsections results in beneficiaries receiving nothing or an amount that is less than the contributions made by the member. Existing subsection (2) enables a member pensioner to make this claim but does not entitle his spouse or children to make it. The new provisions allows this to be done.

Clause 7 amends section 21 of the principal Act. New subsection (1a) provides that a member pensioner who has retired unvoluntarily by reason of having been elected to another Parliament may only commute his South Australian pension if he is not entitled to superannuation or a retirement allowance by virtue of his years of service in the other Parliament. Subsection (1b) provides for a payment in the nature of a commutation of pension if the member is entitled to superannuation or a retirement allowance from the second Parliament, no part of which is attributable to his years of service in the South Australian Parliament. In such a situation section 19 may well operate to reduce the member's South Australian pension or to eliminate it completely. It would therefore be incorrect to refer to this payment as a commutation of the pension since it is impossible to commute a pension that does not exist. The amendments made by the other paragraphs of this clause are consequential.

Clause 8 amends section 24 of the principal Act which provides for payment of a pension to the spouse of a deceased member pensioner. The amendments made by paragraph *(c)* of this clause correspond to the amendments made by clause 5 to section 17 of the principal Act. Clause 9 amends section 30 of the principal Act. This section refers to an amount payable 'by way of child benefit under this Division'. However, with the amendment to section 19 a payment may be made (under subsection (4)) (to a child) which is neither by way of child benefit nor under Division II of Part V. The most convenient solution has been to rewrite the section.

Clause 10 amends section 36 of the principal Act. Amendments made by paragraphs *(c)* and *(d)* cater for the situation where a Court of Disputed Return declares a former member who has lost his seat to be duly elected or a former member is re-elected at a by-election after a court has declared the election of his oponent to be void. If he pays to the fund the contributions that he would have paid if he had continued to be a member together with any amount paid to him under the Act after the loss of his seat, his period of service will include the period of interruption to his membership of Parliament. Paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* make amendments consequential on the amendments to section 21 made by clause 7. Clause 11 makes a consequential amendment to the second schedule.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It is the result of effort by industry and the Department of Agriculture to improve the principal Act (the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968) so that it reflects today's practices in commercial trading in fruit and plants. The original Vine, Fruit and Vegetables Protection Act was introduced at a time when railways monopolised trade between the States and when there were fewer recognised treatments of produce against diseases and pests. Surveillance of fruit and plants under a rail transport system was relatively simple because these were channelled through and inspected at a limited number of entry points to the State.

While innovations in the treatment of diseases and pests have reduced the need for exhaustive inspections of produce, developments in transport have presented other complexities. With the advent of sophisticated high payload trucks produce can enter the State from a variety of sources and be distributed widely throughout the State.

The establishment of Adelaide International Airport has generated interest amongst Sunraysia growers in the use of the facility as an airfreight outlet to the South East Asian market. Some potential also may exist for the export of interstate produce from Port Adelaide.

The Australian Constitution is clear with regard to trade between the States and in any event no Government would wish to erect ill-founded barriers to exchanges in fruit, vegetables and nursery stock in view of the benefits that flow from such exchanges. The advantages of this philosophy are recognised by State authorities who by mutual agreement are implementing plant quarantine policies that reflect present-day knowledge and technology in plant management.

While a less restrictive approach to interstate quarantine will be taken in the drafting of new regulations under the principal Act, there is a need to incorporate in the Act stronger provisions for the tracing of illegally introduced material which might carry diseases and pests and may place this State's plant industries at risk. Greater deterrents to any person contemplating such introductions are warranted. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act by inserting two new definitions—'premises' and 'vehicle'. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which provides for the prohibition by the Governor of the introduction of certain fruit and plants into the State. The effect of the amendment is to give this responsibility to the Minister. The scope of subsection (1) is widened to encompass soil in which a diseased plant has been growing, and the monetary penalty for contravention of the section is lifted to $5 000.

Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act which empowers the Governor to specify places through which host fruit and plants may be introduced into the State. This power is given to the Minister, and the monetary penalty for contravention is increased to $5 000. Clause 5 amends section 6 of the principal Act which enables the Governor to establish quarantine stations. This power is given to the Minister. Clause 6 amends section 7 of the principal Act

which enables the Governor to establish quarantine areas. This power is given to the Minister. The monetary penalty for a contravention under the section is increased to $5 000.

Clause 7 amends section 8 of the principal Act which enables the Governor to declare notifiable pests and diseases and requires persons to notify the chief inspector on discovering a notifiable pest or disease. The power to make a declaration is given to the Minister. The penalty for a contravention under the section is increased to $5 000. Clause 8 amends section 9 of the principal Act which provides for the Minister to require orchardists to take certain measures. The penalty for a contravention of a requirement has been increased to $5 000.

Clause 9 amends section 11 of the principal Act which sets out the powers of inspectors. An inspector may enter and inspect premises where he reasonably suspects there is fruit or a plant affected by pest or disease or soil in which a plant so affected has been growing. An inspector may stop, detain and inspect a vehicle the subject of such a suspicion. In the course of carrying out an inspection an inspector may—

(a) disinfect fruit, plants, soil, packaging or other goods;
(b) require the owner of fruit or plants to deliver them to a quarantine station;
(c) remove and destroy fruit or plants affected by a prescribed pest or disease and any packaging in which they have been packed;
(d) remove and dispose of soil in which a plant affected by a prescribed pest or disease has been growing;
(e) take photographs or films.

An inspector may be accompanied by such persons as he considers necessary or desirable. A person who hinders or obstructs an inspector in the exercise by him of his powers under the principal Act is guilty of an offence, penalty $5 000. The penalty for interfering with a mark or notice erected by an inspector under the section is increased to $5 000.

Clause 10 amends section 12 of the principal Act which empowers inspectors to require certain persons to take measures in relation to the eradication of pests or disease. The penalty for contravention of a requirement under the section is increased to $5 000. Clause 11 makes a consequential amendment to section 13 of the principal Act. Clause 12 repeals section 15 of the principal Act. Clause 13 makes a consequential amendment to section 17 of the principal Act.

Clause 14 repeals section 19 of the principal Act and substitutes new section 19 under which the Minister may vary or revoke a notice given by him under the principal Act. Clause 16 amends section 20 of the principal Act, which is the regulation making power. A new power to make regulations requiring certificates of identification of fruit, plants, soil or vehicles is inserted. The maximum penalty which may be imposed for breach of a regulation is increased to $1 000.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY PLANNING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 September. Page 886.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I make it perfectly clear at the outset that there are some proposals contained in the Bill which the Opposition intends to strenuously oppose. I refer to the provisions that will enable the Government to get its sticky figures on ETSA and the Pipelines Authority by placing them under ministerial control. We do not have much argument with the rest of the Bill. There is a long and tedious explanation accompanying this short Bill about the Government's action in relation to energy planning. The four clauses of the Bill seek to validate the appointment of a public servant, if required, to the Pipelines Authority, and to allow the Chief Executive Officer of the Pipelines Authority to be on it.

The Bill also seeks to require the Gas Company to supply, on written request from the Minister, information in relation to gas supplies. None of that is terribly earth shattering so we do not have much quarrel with that, but clause 2 *(a)* has no appeal whatsoever. It provides for the insertion of new subsection 4 (1a):

The authority is subject to control and direction by the Minister;

That is the Pipelines Authority. We also object to clause 3 which, referring to ETSA, provides for the insertion of new subsection 5 (1a):

The trust is subject to control and direction by the Minister.

With this Government's track record of interfering with ETSA in a most harmful way, no way in the world will we go along with that. Just what is the Government's track record in relation to its influence on ETSA? As far as the taxpayers are concerned, it has been particularly damaging. In the 1970s the Labor Government was the pacesetter that first imposed turnover tax on ETSA at a level of 3 per cent initially, which was then raised to 5 per cent. This is the Government of the working man! I had an interesting conversation last evening with a Labor voter who was completely disillusioned at what this Government is doing to the working man.

There is no better example of that than what it has done to ETSA. There are not too many households in South Australia that do not use electricity supplied by ETSA. I do not know of many, other than on the West Coast, where district councils have an arrangement, and ETSA is about to take over there. The Government introduced a tax on electricity. It was going to tax the tall poppies, but in fact it taxed every man, woman and child in South Australia. It imposed a gas levy to fund exploration to find gas for New South Wales, because it had given our gas away to that State without protecting our own interests. Last year it put a new tax on ETSA by unilaterally changing the interest arrangements and charging a guarantee fee for loans that did not need guaranteeing.

How is that for a record for a Government that promised at the last election it would not introduce any new taxes! That one went by the board with the Government's first budget. They said they would not introduce any backdoor taxes, but what did they do—they surreptitiously sneaked in the ETSA back door and mucked about with interest rates. They increased them unilaterally, when the loans had not changed in any way whatsoever, and last year pushed on to the long suffering public of South Australia an additional tax of $9 million, and more this year, together with a guarantee of $3.5 million for loans that did not need guaranteeing. All up, that was about $13 million extra tax affecting every electricity user in South Australia.

Here is a Government that wants even more to get its sticky hands on the Electricity Trust of South Australia. It has the gall to bring a Bill into the House, but it is not on. The last thing we want in this State is a meddling Government like this one, searching for new ways to screw money out of the hard working average man in this State. The Government wants greater control over the various authorities, but those authorities want the ability to operate as best they can in the way that private enterprise operates.

They do not want the Government to be making decisions to screw out of them more revenue, and they certainly do not want a Government that can announce a completely phoney tariff structure on the eve of a State election, as I will demonstrate in a moment, by, I suggest, screwing the arms of board members right up their backs to get them to agree.

How on earth the board of ETSA could agree, I do not know. The Premier announced to the wide world, 'We have reduced tariffs by 2 per cent,' which I think is the figure—$2 in $100. It is pretty small beer. He also said, 'We will hold electricity tariffs down to below the CPI rate for the next few years'—however long that may be. How on earth can a Government make that promise when we read in the paper the next day or so that it did not know where it would get the major supply of fuel for ETSA? Yet, it talks about converting Torrens Island to burn black coal because it does not know where the gas is coming from. I point out that 80 per cent of electricity in South Australia is generated by burning natural gas. I will refer to the history of Government efforts in that field in a moment.

However, here is the Government saying, on the one hand, 'We might have to convert Torrens Island to burn black coal' (a most expensive option even to the most casual observer)'for the major generating capacity of ETSA, because we have a continuing problem with gas contracts,' yet the Government is announcing a cut in ETSA tariffs, although it is paltry, and it knows what it will be and can announce what will happen with tariffs in the future.

The Government is desperate to try to recover some electoral credibility after having broken every financiai promise it made at the 1982 election—desperately scrambling to regain credibility—so what does it do? It puts pressure on ETSA, even with the legislation the way it is. It got the board—I do not know how—to agree to this phoney tariff regime. As I pointed out before, it is like saying, 'I know what it will cost me to run my car for the next month. I know I have to go a certain number of miles, but I don't have the faintest idea what the fuel will cost.' It is about as simple as that illustration.

I have been a little concerned about what has been happening to the board of ETSA, as I pointed out before. If we consider some of the personnel, one could be excused for thinking it was the ETSA branch of the Labor Party. The business expertise I had sought to put on the board was sacked at the first opportunity by the Minister. Whom did he appoint—Comrade Lesses from the Trades and Labor Council. On a board of seven at ETSA, we have former Labor Minister Virgo, former Labor Minister Broomhill, and the boss of the union movement in South Australia, Comrade John Lesses. So, all they had to do was twist the arm of another one and they could get them to agree.

I have respect for two or three members on the board of ETSA, because they have been there for a long time, but they are getting the nearest thing to a lame duck board that one could imagine. How that board could agree to a completely phoney tariff structure when it does not know the real position in relation to fuel, I do not know, unless the Government went to the board and said, 'We can assure you that next year you will buy gas for $1.50 or thereabouts. We have these negotiations signed up, so you'd better agree.' There is no other way that any group of board members with any vestige of credibility could agree to a tariff regime unless they had some assurances from the Government in relation to supply, particularly in short haul in terms of the price of natural gas.

What is the Government record? This Bill is all about energy planning. We have pages and pages about that—getting priorities right, setting up the right structures. However, the No. 1 problem facing this State has not changed over the last six years, I suggest. The one aim in energy planning is to ensure that we have a reliable supply of natural gas at a price we can afford. That is the problem if we are talking about energy planning and substitution of the Energy Council for the Energy Forum. The creation of the Energy Executive (as envisaged in the Minister's explanation) will be done administratively and has nothing to do with the Bill: it will do nothing in terms of energy planning if we do not solve that fundamental and pressing problem.

It has been pressing for the past five or six years. Nothing will change the priorities so far as this State is concerned—that is, to ensure a supply of natural gas to the State at a reasonable price so that, in the first instance, Torrens Island power station can see out at least the major part of its economic life. The Government's record on this score is abysmal. I realise the importance of it. We had negotiations well under way with the principals of AGL at the highest level. The Minister chuckles—

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad to hear that: it has been completely devoid of any profit for the State, from my observations and from what I know of where the Government is at at this precise moment, three years after it entered office. I drew the Minister's attention to this matter in this House back in 1983 and I questioned him about it. The Minister has always been travelling on a wing and a prayer in relation to gas supplies: he has always been a supreme optimist. He has always refused to face reality. By jingo, he has been going along! On 19 October 1983 he made a ministerial statement in this House saying that all was well, the garden was rosy, that we had no problems.

I will remind the House of what he said in that ministerial statement, under the heading 'Ministerial statement: Gas supplies'. The Minister sought leave and after leave was granted said:

> This afternoon I met with Dr John McKee of Santos and Mr George Essery of Delhi, representing the Cooper Basin producers. They delivered letters which attest that a further 1 667 BCF of gas is available to be added to the present production schedule which contains 2 177 BCF. This means that schedule A of the AGL agreement has been satisfied entirely, that is, to the year 2006, and that an amount equivalent to at least five years of PASA futures is also available.
>
> Both the Government and the producers are confident of ultimately establishing reserves in excess of all PASA futures agreement requirements. Today's announcement is a landmark—

a landmark, mark you—

> finally laying to rest the myth that gas supply to South Australia would cease in 1987. The Government will be seeking increased effort in gas exploration and development from the producers to further enhance the security of South Australia's long-term gas supplies. Security of supply and price will be the key issues for discussion with the producers in ensuing negotiations. The Government's efforts to pursue gas sharing, the establishment of a petrochemical plant and to deal with the question of the AGL/PASA price differential are continuing.

That was two years ago. Let us see what he said later. We got good news: AGL had got gas to the year 2006. None of ours: well, enough for five years, he suggests. The Minister said that it was a landmark and that we had security of supply. But security of supply has not yet been established—two years later. As I understand it, an independent assessor is in the Cooper Basin trying to find out just what the truth is in relation to gas reserves.

Reserves have been a movable feast ever since I have had any real knowledge of the Cooper Basin. It depends on the time one goes to get information as to what the answer is. If there is a price discussion, the reserves are always limited. However, if there is talk of moving down another track, there are plenty of reserves. The Minister was confident that there was plenty of gas, so security of supply was no problem. I believe that it is still a problem, but we will

not know the answer to that question until the findings of the independent assessment are made available. The Minister went on to say:

Price is another key issue for discussion with the producers—

and that was two years ago—

The Government's efforts to pursue gas sharing—

That is the concept of sharing the gas: New South Wales was fixed up, as I said, under the Dunstan Labor Government, until the year 2006. We are fixed up until 1987. They are pursuing those sharing arrangements. They are also pursuing the establishment of a petrochemical plant, which requires gas and ethane. They are also dealing with the question of the differential in price.

I submit that there has been a significant lack of progress (in fact, no real progress) until this time in relation to all those matters. The petrochemical plant was to be the great new bonanza development, a development that was announced and reannounced by the Labor Party in the 1970s *ad nauseam*. That was the bonanza which justified throwing off gas, flogging it off to Sydney, without any real thought about this State's future. Where are we now in regard to the petrochemical plant? South Australia is no nearer: it is probably further away than when the first announcement was made in the early 1970s.

Where are we with gas sharing? Nowhere! AGL has gone off to arbitration: it is going down its own track. Where are we in relation to security of supply? Nowhere, under this Government. An assessor is in the Cooper Basin trying to ascertain whether what the Minister said two years ago was true: that is where we are. So we have this fancy energy sharing Bill designed to let the Minister get his sticky hands onto ETSA and PASA so that he can manipulate them politically on the eve of an election. However, the Government has not come to grips with the major energy planning problem facing South Australia.

We pursued the matter further in the House on that occasion and I asked the Minister a question about gas prices. The Government appeared to have backed off: it had been on the eve of reaching an agreement which I suggest would have institutionalised the differential between South Australia and AGL. The story I have been telling this House over the past three years has been quite consistent. However, here is the Government about to take this great leap into agreeing a series of prices without having done anything in relation to what is happening with the Sydney contracts. I was appalled by one of the commentaries on the ABC *National* program the other night when it was said, 'What does it matter? By the time the gas gets to the Sydney end of the pipeline it is about the same price as it is in Adelaide.' He had been fed that line by the Government, no doubt, but what an argument!

As a matter of fact, it is cheaper at that end, but it is a lot cheaper at the South Australian end. It is like saying that we ought to be able to buy coal from New South Wales and ship it around the coast of South Australia, and it should cost us $15 a tonne, the same as it costs in New South Wales. What an absurd proposition! Just because it costs more to get the gas down the pipeline to Sydney we ought to sell it cheaper at the wellhead than we have to pay ourselves—what an absurd argument! If the gas is worth $1 at the wellhead to New South Wales it ought to be worth $1 at the wellhead to South Australia.

Two arbitrators came up with two different prices, so we ought to be doing something about that. I asked about gas prices on 19 October after the ministerial statement had been made. I asked the Premier (but the Hon. Mr Payne answered):

What discussions has the Premier or the Minister had with the New South Wales Premier or with others in relation to rationalising the gas prices paid at the wellhead in South Australia and in New South Wales? The Premier was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* on 18 September [1983] as saying that a satisfactory conclusion of the matter would be reached within a couple of weeks.

That was two years ago—he was going to fix it within a couple of weeks. The Premier said:

Now that we have a firm decision and know precisely what figures everyone is working to, we can get down to business. South Australian consumers should not be paying higher wellhead prices than New South Wales.

That is what the Premier of South Australia said two years ago. And now, here they are, about to sign a contract to institutionalise the difference. The Hon. R.G. Payne went on to say:

If ever I needed proof of what I was about to say it was just demonstrated from the other side of the House. What I am attempting to say is that the statement I gave the House indicates that there has been some reasonable progress in a matter which has dogged the people of this State for very many years.

He further states:

I am not saying that this question is totally solved to date. I am saying there has been some progress in a matter which needed to be solved.

He wound up his lengthy answer by stating:

I have indications from Mr Williams of AGL—

the Sydney people—

that it is very happy to enter sharing negotiations—

here is the eternal optimism which the Minister seems to have displayed—a complete lack of realism—

and these matters are inextricably linked: the question of price, the price paid, and the question of sharing. So, I indicate, in answer to the question, that the matter is being addressed, that the proper time for disclosure of what is proposed is when it is commenced, and that at that time the Deputy Leader can expect further information.

Here we are, two years down the track. Everything with Mr Williams of AGL was rosy, they were having meaningful discussions, and in due time the Minister would let me know. That was two years ago. I also questioned the Minister during the Committee stage of the budget in 1983. I questioned him closely and got the same cheerful response to my queries. In 1983 during the budget debate I asked:

When will the Minister commence negotiations about this matter? Whom does he intend to negotiate with? Does he believe such negotitions are worthwhile? When will he start negotiations with AGL and whom will he be dealing with?

That was just prior to the questions we asked in October 1983 after the budget. The Hon. R.G. Payne answered, 'At the appropriate time.' That is what we got! When was he going to get on to the business? At the appropriate time! I do not know when the appropriate time is likely to be, because the Minister was to advise of any efforts (and I doubt whether there have been any meaningful efforts at all), but he has not let me know yet—two years down the track.

On the eve of a State election, this Government can announce a phoney regime for electricity tariffs, without knowing what is the major source of fuel and what it will cost. The deception is absolutely breathtaking. I will not pursue the point any further. I spent quite some time in 1983—two years ago—pursuing this question, because I understood (and I thought that the Minister understood) that there was no more pressing problem facing every man, woman and child in this State in terms of energy planning: we had to come to grips with that problem. Where are we? We are nowhere in terms of coming to grips with the gas flowing cheerfully to Sydney to the year 2006, as agreed by the Labor Party.

So much for what this Bill is about! We had the enormous tax slug which the Labor Party imposed on ETSA from the early 1970s and again last year and which has been reflected in tariffs. I have mentioned that the only reason I could understand for the board agreeing to that phoney tariff

regime was that it was peopled in the main by fellow travellers of the Labor Party, although I would think that some people on that board must have been very concerned at having to agree. We are still getting the same sort of noises from the Government in terms of 'All is well.'

I refer to a press release in the *Sunday Mail*, written by Randall Ashbourne, the political writer for the *News*. He has tended to put a fairly cheerful complexion on this matter for the Government in articles he has written for the *News*. However, in the *Sunday Mail* of 18 September 1983, under the bold heading 'Settlement soon on gas prices', Randall Ashbourne wrote:

> The Premier, Mr Bannon, hopes to settle the gas price row within a fortnight. Neither he, nor the Energy Minister, Mr Payne, would be drawn yesterday—

and they are still not being drawn on any darned thing in this regard, but two years ago they would not be drawn—

> on Government efforts to equalise the price paid by South Australian and New South Wales gas users. However, it is not known at this stage whether South Australians will pay less for Cooper Basin gas, or New South Wales consumers will pay more.
>
> Early last week, an independent arbitrator set New South Wales 'gas gate' prices up to 1985 well below what South Australia pays the Cooper Basin producers.

That, of course, was before this last year of the agreement that we entered into applied. The article continues:

> Mr Bannon said yesterday the issue was complex and was not being assisted by public speculation raised by the Opposition.

I contend that the public has a vital interest in this matter and still has a continuing and vital interest, because decisions made now will affect us well into the next century in terms of our energy planning. Decisions made now are of critical importance to the future of this State. The article further quotes Premier Bannon as stating:

> I hope we will have a satisfactory conclusion within the next couple of weeks. The issue has been under examination for the past year—

the first year of the Labor Government—

> but until the New South Wales decision was finalised, much of it could be only speculation.

That brings us up to the present, and where are we? We are facing an election with no resolution to this problem—a resolution which was a fortnight away two years ago. Where is the Government?

We had another optimistic report in the *News*, written by the same journalist, Randall Ashbourne, 10 days ago about a gas price settlement soon. It has been widely rumoured that the Government is on the eve of settling a range of gas prices. The first indication I had was from the Gas Journal, which reported a speech by Mr Drew Polglase, General Manager of the Gas Company, earlier this year, whereby he postulated that a range of prices was being considered, from $1.52 per gigajoule to $2.50 per gigajoule in 1985 prices—over 10 years. So, in 10 years, we take $2.50, build in the inflator and that is what the price would be—a very significant increase in gas prices.

There have been a lot of other rumours about an impending settlement, some fuelled by the Government, seeking to put a rosy gloss on it again, but they are the sort of figures that have been mentioned. Some have talked about an 8 per cent reduction in the first year. That is what the Government would want, namely, to announce gas price falls, but it would not say what is down the track and that it has not managed to fix up the Sydney contracts. There is no mention of the fact that the Government let them come along from behind with cheaper gas from South Australia. The Government desperately needs to get over this problem of making no progress whatsoever in relation to the gas issue. So, at the end of 1985 we have a Government facing defeat at the polls and desperate to be able to say it has done something. It is about to sign this agreement for gas prices. There is some validity in those rumours.

I have had precious little first-hand knowledge, but plenty of people talk to me and they tend to confirm that this is going on. How on earth would the Government have the nerve to tell ETSA what it should charge for electricity unless it believed that it was on the eve of signing a gas price agreement? The Government has made absolutely no progress in what I think is the fundamental problem besetting this State, namely, the rationalising of those Sydney contracts. Why else would AGL be going off to arbitration? I read in an article in the *Advertiser* by Richard Anderson, I think, that arbitration started on Monday.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is under way. Does that indicate that the Government has got even to square one in relation to some joint arrangement with New South Wales to rationalise the supply and the price? Of course, AGL is intent on minimising the price that it must pay—that is a legitimate business requirement. The Government does not have that pressure on it: the only pressure on the Government is that it is on the skids and looking down the barrel in relation to the forthcoming election.

The Government does not have a legally binding arbitrator's decision for South Australia telling it that the Government must pay 80 per cent more for the State's gas. The Government is faced not with that, but with a record of absolute inaction and lack of progress over three years. There has been no progress at all. AGL has been off doing its own thing in relation to price, the Government is facing an election, and there is no arbitrator's decision in relation to South Australian gas prices.

I have been castigated up hill and down dale for the agreement made previously, but it was in black and white—a legally binding arbitrator's decision that South Australia was going to pay 80 per cent more for its gas, and it was retrospective to 1 January, under those appalling contracts written by the Labor Government. There it was: what could we do? I could wear the criticism because I have been around politics long enough to have a skin thick enough to wear the misrepresentations of the Labor Party. That was the position then.

What is the present position of the Government? It has no legally binding request that it must pay 80 per cent more for gas, but what it does have is an appalling record of inaction, and the prospect of the forthcoming election. So, the Government got its sticky fingers on ETSA and told ETSA that it would announce a cut in tariffs, thinking that that would appeal to the voters of South Australia, that we would have 1982 revisited. The Government thought that it could tell the public a pack of lies, dupe the public as it did in 1982, when the Labor Party maintained that there would be no increase in taxes, no new taxes or backdoor taxes.

However, the public knows perfectly well that they were duped, and the Government knows that the public knows that they were duped. The sneakiest of all backdoor taxes was the tax that was imposed on ETSA last year—there is no other name for it. It mucked around with interest rates and charged a guarantee fee for a loan that did not need guaranteeing. However, the Government did not get away with it. That is the scene that we have at the moment, the scene in which we discuss this energy planning Bill.

The Government is facing a record of three years of non-achievement. There has been no progress in relation to the No. 1 energy planning problem for South Australia. I make perfectly clear that, if the Government gets its way with this Bill, the Liberal Government will reverse it. In this State we desperately need to get more private enterprise expertise, and there should be less Government meddling

in utilities such as ETSA, which should be run along business lines. If we are going to do anything for the hard pressed public of South Australia in relation to the levies that are imposed on the public in terms of these basic commodities, of which electricity is one, we must get away from political meddling and from making short-term decisions for perceived political gain, and make sound economic judgments. We must have vision and be able to foresee the results of decisions that we make.

Unfortunately, the record of successive Labor Governments is far from reassuring on that basic count—far from reassuring. The principle followed has been, 'spend now, pay later' and do not worry about the debt down the track. The new tax imposed on ETSA last year not only led to an increase in tariffs, an unnecessary increase in tariffs which the public is now rebelling against, but it also pushed ETSA into deficit. Pushing instrumentalities into deficit will cause problems down the track. It does not encourage instrumentalities to pay their way now. On looking at the Auditor-General's Report one does not have to be Einstein to realise that this message is jumping out from the pages. One does not have to be a genius to understand this in relation to ETSA. I think that every woman running a household budget or every man paying the monthly bills understands that the 'buy now, pay later' principle always has a day of reckoning. But Labor Governments are most adept at spending money now and giving concessions now, and thus exacerbating problems further down the track.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: None of these housewives use bankcard or anything like that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, they do, but they know where they are going. They do not spend other people's money, as the Government has done, knowing full well that further down the track there will be larger problems than would otherwise have been the case. Those housewives do not spend other people's money like this Government is spending the public's money.

I reinforce the point that ETSA needs all the autonomy and expertise it can gather so that it can make sound economic judgments, free from unnecessary governmental interference of the type that we have seen displayed so blatantly in recent months. ETSA must be able to make sound economic decisions for the future planning of electricity supplies at reasonable cost to South Australians, without the unnecessary meddling of Governments, as has happened, without unnecessary imposts being imposed by the Government (as has occurred with Labor Governments in this State), and without stacking the board with union comrades and retired politicians—and I refer to jobs for the boys, whose only interest is keeping the unions happy. That is not what is needed for ETSA.

As I said earlier, I enlarged the board of ETSA from five to seven members to try to achieve just that. Traditionally that had been done and, to my everlasting shame, when I was in government I agreed to continue the tradition of putting on the board a retired Labor politician. So, I was the one who appointed the Hon. Glen Broomhill, little thinking that he would be joined by the Hon. Geoff Virgo and Comrade Lesses in due course. But at least I enlarged the board of ETSA to seven, seeking to bring in a bit of expertise in areas in the trust that needed it so that sound economic judgments could be made.

I appointed the Hon. Glen Broomhill, and I also put on Mr Bernie Leverington. The Minister says 'But he was Treasurer of the Liberal Party.' What happened was that at the first opportunity the present Minister sacked Mr Leverington and put on comrade Virgo. The only sin that Mr Leverington had committed was that he had been fairly outspoken. He was also President of the Chamber of Mines—offering a bit of expertise that the trust needed, because the trust mines coal at Leigh Creek to a significant extent. I thought that a little mining expertise as well as business expertise would be quite useful on the board. However, Mr Leverington discharged his duty to the public of South Australia as President of the Chamber of Mines and criticised the Government for its phoney uranium policy. Two mines that were about to start, Honeymoon and Beverley, were closed down, while under electoral pressure, having done their damnedest in this Chamber to defeat the Roxby Downs indenture, with all the hoo-ha to which the Minister put his name in the dissenting report—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: This must be a very wide ranging Bill that is before the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is looking for protection from the Chair, because he does not like hearing what I am saying, but it is true. It pertains to ETSA because the Government sacked the man who had the gumption to warn the public that mining exploration would fall off as a result of this Government's phoney uranium policy which closed some mines but let another one operate because it was afraid of the political backlash. That board member spoke out, as President of the Chamber of Mines, and the Minister had his scalp as soon as he came up for reappointment. So, it was a matter of out with one member with business expertise and in with friend, comrade, and former Labor Minister, Virgo.

Mr Hamilton: Do you say he had no expertise?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Albert Park gets very testy. He is a very irritable member. He spends much time in a state of irritability because he does not like what he hears. I do not deny that the Hon. Glen Broomhill and the Hon. Geoff Virgo have first-class qualifications in union affairs and would have no problem in looking after union affairs at board level with their expertise. Nor do I deny that, as a Minister, Mr Virgo was one of the better performers in the former Labor Government, but that is not necessarily saying much. However, when it comes to running a utility such as ETSA, that needs a little more background and knowledge, some administrative skill, and the knowledge of union affairs possessed by Mr Virgo. When it comes to making the sort of decisions required, we could get a much stronger board than ETSA has at present.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the comrades stick together, that it is a matter of jobs for the boys, and that members opposite look after one another. However, when it comes to looking after the public of South Australia, we want more of the sort of expertise that I am talking about on the board of ETSA and far less Government interference of the type that we have had in recent days. The announcement to which I have referred is pure election bribery.

Mr Hamilton: At least we do not bankrupt the State.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that, if the honourable member is competent to do so, he should study in detail the Auditor-General's Report and that gentleman's warnings in relation to the phoney bookkeeping of this Government to inflate this year's revenue, with dire consequences down the track. He should absorb that fact and he will then understand what I said earlier about the Labor Government not being interested in what happens down the track. It is only a matter of trying to delude the public now with the myth of a balanced budget so as to get over the election hurdle. So, I commend the Auditor-General's Report to the honourable member for his close perusal and, if possible, understanding.

The rest of the Bill is fairly harmless. It is not of enormous significance in relation to energy planning. I agree with the Minister that the Energy Council was cumbersome. As I pointed out previously, the bigger a committee or group

becomes the less real progress it seems to make and the less it achieves. The Energy Council was a large body and I wonder whether the energy forum will be much more successful. I hope that it will be. That matter is not provided for in the Bill: it is to be done administratively. However, it is part of the Minister's lengthy explanation of the Bill, and I had no argument with that. It is peripheral and small beer in terms of what is the fundamental problem and the way in which the Minister seeks to address it.

I have no argument with the Energy Planning Executive. If the Minister wants information from the Gas Company, perhaps he should spell it out in legislation but, as Minister, I had no trouble in getting information from the company: I did not need to spell it out in legislation. I did not find the company obstructive. When we were seeking to ameliorate the effect of the 80 per cent binding judgment from the arbitrator, the Gas Company was completely cooperative in providing information to help me in certain difficult negotiations. If the Minister wants to provide in a short Bill that on request the company must give him information, I do not object: that is peripheral.

No way will we on this side allow the Government any more latitude or make easier the path for it to interfere with ETSA in the way that it has done. By putting ETSA under direct ministerial control that is what we are doing: we will introduce all the inefficiencies that have surrounded this Government when it has meddled in business affairs. We will introduce all that politicking and short-term decision making for motives that are either to placate the union movement or to get over a short-term hurdle. In no way will the Opposition facilitate such an action.

I was in two minds whether to oppose the Bill, but I realised that the rest of it was harmless. The Opposition will let the Bill get into Committee and move the simple amendments that I have requested the Parliamentary Counsel to draft. I would indicate what those amendments are, even if the Parliamentary Counsel has not drafted them yet. One does not need to be Einstein to understand them. In clause 2, I seek to strike out paragraph *(a)*, which seeks to place PASA under ministerial control, and clause 3, which provides for ETSA to be placed under ministerial control. Those amendments are crucial to the Opposition. If the Government does not agree to them, and if the Minister is not prepared to keep his sticky fingers off ETSA (sticky fingers that have done so much damage at ETSA), the Opposition will vehemently oppose this Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I did not think that it would be necessary for me to stand in this House and vigorously oppose this measure because, even in my wildest imagination, I did not think that this Government would introduce a Bill to place the Electricity Trust under ministerial control. When one considers the utter chaos, mismanagement, concern and confusion that has reigned in New South Wales, where there has been political interference with the counterpart of ETSA in that State, one is left with a deep sense of concern. The prime role of ETSA is to ensure that adequate supplies of electricity are available to every person in South Australia who needs it, and the Minister's getting his sticky fingers on ETSA will not help achieve that objective.

I am horrified to think that this Government wants to get itself involved in what could be the day-to-day administration of the trust. I do not say that the trust is 100 per cent perfect. I know something about its activities and I have had considerable discussions with employees of the trust on a regular basis. Certain things must be done, but the first thing that this Government has done successfully is to starve ETSA of funds. Government members are the victims of their own propaganda. It was the present Premier and one or two of his cohorts who stood here day after day and tried to sheet home to the Tonkin Government the blame for increasing electricity tariffs.

The Government has now achieved office through the most devious and untruthful promises ever made to the people of this State. Of course, the price of electricity has risen—blind Freddy could see that. It is as a result of that skulduggery that they are now saying, 'We'll put the Electricity Trust under direct ministerial control and play ducks and drakes with it.' I will refer to an example of that exercise in a moment.

I am appalled to think that an organisation whose sole charter is to provide electricity to the people of this State at reasonable rates will be controlled by the Minister. I believe that, if people have an opportunity to vote at a referendum on the matter, they would overwhelmingly reject this proposition. This Bill attempts to involve the extreme union movement and its cronies in the administration of the trust. It is all very well for people to laugh—we know how this Government operates, and members on this side of the House will not let the matter rest—make no mistake about that. If the Government wants a fight and wants to lose office, that will happen, because my great concern, as someone who represents an isolated community, is to ensure that those communities do not suddenly have their electricity cut off.

To this stage we have not had a lot of undue industrial strife in the Electricity Trust. The trust was set up in 1946 and has supplied electricity to the length and breadth of the State, even though some areas still do not have it. My concern is to guarantee supply. We all know that the Government, by introducing the surcharge, has helped to increase the cost of electricity. At page 363, the 1979 *Year Book* states:

> In 1946 the Electricity Trust of South Australia, a public corporation, acquired the assets of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and since then the trust has been responsible for the electricity supply throughout the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY PLANNING) BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr GUNN: Of course, the Electricity Trust has successfully developed the Leigh Creek coal fields. Sir Thomas Playford took over the Electricity Trust, in the public interest of this State, in order to ensure adequate supplies of electricity. Reading the speeches concerning that legislation, we see that one of the important aspects was to ensure that the Government would not get its sticky fingers on day-to-day administration.

The Government has already politicised the board. The Deputy Leader has referred to the composition of the board. One could say a lot more about that, but at this stage I do not think it is necessary. In relation to the scale of fees, I will outline the history. Under the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Bill 1971, ETSA's statutory contribution to the Treasurer was an amount equal to 3 per

cent of the revenue gained from the sale of electricity. Payments were to be made quarterly and, in the financial year 1970-71, payments were made in respect of only two quarters (that is, those ending 30 March and 30 June), amounting to $488 007. The first full year of operation was 1971-72, when $2 080 629 was paid into general revenue.

In 1972-73 the amount paid was $2 241 096. In 1973 another amendment to the Act required the Electricity Trust to pay the levy at the higher rate of 5 per cent of revenue gained from the sale of electricity. This requirement applied from the December quarter 1973, so the amount transferred to the Treasury in 1973-74 included two quarters levied at 3 per cent and two quarters levied at 5 per cent. The amount transferred was $3 755 000. In the first full year of payment at the rate of 5 per cent, the amount transferred into general revenue was $4 862 000.

In 1974-75 the amount transferred rose to $5 810 000. The levy is still payable at 5 per cent. In 1983-84 ETSA transferred approximately $22 366 000 to the Treasury and in 1984-85 it was approximately $26 787 000. Of course, we also have to take into account $13 686 000, which was another charge imposed by the State Government. That raises the total payment, in the immediate past financial year, to some $40 million. Reading the Auditor-General's Report, I was concerned to see that ETSA has been running at a deficit. When one considers that the Government has ripped off $40 million this financial year—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's more than that—it's closer to $50 million.

Mr GUNN: According to my reading, the Auditor-General's Report discloses that some $40 million has been taken directly out of the coffers of the Electricity Trust. In my electorate there are still areas that do not have power connected. There are also areas in my electorate that are still paying the Adelaide tariff plus 10 per cent, even though action has been taken to rectify the Eyre Peninsula situation. Some people in outlying areas are paying exorbitant rates for power.

The Government, in its wisdom, in the glorious Dunstan days, when we had a prima donna who was going to tax the tall poppies, managed to tax every citizen of the State. ETSA has now become the victim of that sort of legislation, culminating in the Government wanting to take direct day-to-day charge. We will soon have the whiz-kids of the Labor Party conference wanting to be involved. Instead of having a general manager and a committee, there will be an industrial democracy racket imposed on them, and we will then parallel New South Wales.

This organisation, which has some 5 565 employees, had 599 000 clients in the last financial year. The Electricity Trust has spent some $5.5 million on concessions. It administers the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act and a number of other matters. At this stage the Minister has not given any logical explanation for this course of action.

He has not supplied any detailed criticism of the management; he has not given us any examples of where the trust's administration and management have broken down. It is bad enough having to put the Electricity Trust under direct control, but I believe that if the Government is to take that course of action the public is entitled to know when and why directions are given.

At least it should be a requirement that any decision should be made by the Governor in Executive Council and tabled in this House, so that we know what is taking place. It is my intention to have an amendment drawn up, if we are not successful with those other amendments of the Deputy Leader. No reasons were given, except typically the Labor Party wants to get control of it and get its sticky fingers into general administration, but surely an organisation as important to this State as the Electricity Trust, which has, to make decisions, should make them purely on the grounds of supplying economic electricity to the people of this State.

This has not been necessary since 1946—nearly 40 years ago. No Government has needed that power. If the Government takes it upon itself to arm itself with that authority why should not the public of this State be made aware that these sorts of directions are given? The Government would have to publicly justify those decisions in this House, as it should.

This Parliament is supposed to represent the popular will of the people. This decision was not canvassed at the time of the last election; no indication whatsoever was given to the people of this State. I am appalled that, in the dying hours of this Parliament, suddenly there is an attempt made to rush through Parliament a measure of this nature.

I want to talk about a number of other matters in relation to electricity. The Government is not yet in a position to tell us which coalfield will be developed—Sedan or Lochiel. What role will there be for employees of the Electricity Trust at Leigh Creek? Those people have experience in developing large scale mining operations and many of them are very concerned about their jobs.

Quite a few of them are hopeful that they will be able to move to Lochiel after spending a considerable time at Leigh Creek. Those people who live in good accommodation at Leigh Creek will find that their friends in Canberra have given them a nice whiz under the ear with tax on perks. They have that coming to them.

I will have no alternative but to inform those constituents what will happen to them with a tax on perks. But I want to know from the Minister in reply where he stands in relation to development of the next coalfield in this State. A great deal of material has been supplied by the people who are endeavouring to push the Wintinna coalfield. I am not in a position to say whether they are right or wrong, but the time is ripe for a detailed answer to be given to some of the claims made.

I believe that one must accept the advice of experts in these things. Therefore, I am not prepared to make any comment when approached by that organisation. However, in relation to Lochiel or Sedan the Government should make available to the House and people of this State far more information than is currently available. First, we want to know—and I have been advised that there is not adequate information so far available—the ratio of coal to overburden both at Lochiel and Sedan and whether it would be better to further develop Leigh Creek.

I know the energy people are looking at that. I want to know whether the Government, since it stopped development at Honeymoon, is trying to get sweet with that company. This matter has been canvassed with me on a number of occasions. The Minister can laugh. I have had it put to me that they want to get sweet, so let them develop Sedan.

What role has the Electricity Trust in relation to that field? Will it have any involvement whatsoever? It has also been suggested to me that this Government has been caught out and embarrassed. It has to do something about privatisation. Here is an example where it could get on the privatisation band wagon and do something about it. It could allow a private company to operate the Sedan field.

There were two schools of thought in relation to that coalfield operation. I certainly do not intend to support the provisions of this legislation which attempt to put these organisations under direct ministerial control. The Electricity Trust board should consist of people with experience in mining, such as engineers, and people who know about business and finance.

To have three former members of Parliament on the board is not only unnecessary but, in my judgment, smacks

of political patronage. I believe that the Government itself has not done the Electricity Trust any good by having on the board three former politicians, plus the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. I suppose there could be some argument made for putting him on the board, because at least his role is to represent those people who are employed. However, there is no justification for three extra politicians. It has always been the accepted practice that there should be one from each side of the political arena, but to put three on is amazing.

In conclusion, I have no argument with certain provisions of this legislation, but those provisions which set out to bring the trust under the direct control of the Minister appalls me. I read in the Minister's second reading explanation that the boards of those organisations did not object. Of course, they could not object. What would happen to them if they jumped up and down or went to the media? Blind Freddy knows that they would not be reappointed. As I understand it, to get appointed to the board of the Electricity Trust is the best Government appointment one could have. Of course, they will not risk being put off the board. Surely, the Minister can do better than that.

Mr Becker: How much do they get paid?

Mr GUNN: I do not know; it would be interesting. That may be a matter for the honourable member who is good at ferreting out that sort of material. He is an expert on questions on notice. Perhaps this is an area to which he should direct his attention. I completely reject the suggestion, because if the Chairman of the board was to make a public statement, that would be the end of him. The Pipelines Authority people would not make any statements because the same thing would happen there, so I am really looking forward to the Minister's giving a detailed explanation of the reason.

I am concerned to make sure that people of this State have adequate long-term supplies of electricity and that the board is efficiently and effectively run. From time to time, if the board is doing its duty in guaranteeing those supplies, it will have to make some tough decisions which, on occasions, will not please the Government. Because of the action of the Labor Party they have seeded in the minds of people that it is the Government's fault each time electricity charges increase. The Labor Party caused that problem. It will have to wear it. However, that sort of circumstance should not be used to undermine the management, authority and ability of the board to raise revenue.

Unless the Electricity Trust has adequate supplies of funds and revenue it cannot properly discharge its duties. The cost of purchasing mining equipment is astronomical. With this technology they must have people to make sure it is properly maintained and serviced. That is essential. No-one likes paying high electricity bills, but as one with a little experience in generating my own electricity I would not go back to doing that under any circumstances and I do not think anyone who has had that experience would.

Therefore, if one is to have reliable supplies of electricity, there will be a cost involved. If the people of South Australia were given an opportunity to see the chaos in New South Wales and the industrial disruption in Queensland, compared with what we have here, I think they would opt for our situation.

Sir Thomas Playford set up the Electricity Trust under current arrangements to guarantee supplies of electricity across the State and to help industry. He developed the Leigh Creek coalfield so that we were not dependent on the activities of irresponsible seamen and wharfies and would not be relying on New South Wales coal. People said that it could not be done, but he did it and it has been very successful.

Governments of all political persuasions up until this time have virtually allowed the Electricity Trust to get on with the administration and management of supplying electricity for the citizens of this State. I am therefore most concerned about the current direction that the Government is taking in this State. As one who wants to see powerlines extended to places such as Blinman, Wilpena Pound and Parachilna and to other parts of my electorate saddled with other problems and inadequate supplies of energy, I do not think that this provision will do anything to help them. I do not believe that, in the long term, it will do anything to assist the rest of the citizens of this State. I therefore oppose those provisions and support the comments made by the Deputy Leader. I look forward to a vigorous Committee debate on this measure.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I object to putting these two authorities under the control of this Minister, or any other Minister. That matter concerns me more than anything else: once that is done, it will be nigh on impossible to get any future Government to come back and say that it is not necessary so it will not do it. It does not matter what promises the present Government or the Minister make, because they, unfortunately or fortunately (depending on which side of politics one is on), will not hold that position forever. If they did, they would most probably be embarrassed because of age. I refer in particular to a part of the Minister's second reading explanation, which states (page 885 of *Hansard*):

The Bill defines the relationships between the Government and the major energy supply organisations with respect to energy planning. Both PASA and ETSA are Government instrumentalities. Whilst they operate autonomously their major planning and development decisions must be taken in the context of the Government's energy policies. Since this Government came to office these two organisations have consulted with it on major issues and have shown a degree of responsiveness to its policies which is appropriate. It should therefore be recognised that the Government is not taking this action out of frustration.

There are, however, increasingly instances where the management and boards of these organisations must reconcile a variety of competing objectives, for example in respect of tariff policies and the implications of competing energy supply options for the economy of the State. These require consideration of broader issues than are the province of the energy supply organisations alone. Resource utilisation, particularly in respect of natural gas, requires a degree of coordination which can only be effected by Government.

Making PASA and ETSA subject to ministerial direction provides the appropriate mechanism by which these organisations will contribute to a coordinated and comprehensive energy planning process, incorporating broader objectives, such as welfare, environmental protection and economic development in its implementation. It is the Government's intention that the exercise of ministerial control and direction will concern matters of major policy and not the general administration of the undertakings on a day-to-day basis.

The last part of that explanation is important. It does not matter what guarantee the Government or the Minister gives today; it means absolutely nothing in the future. It means something only while this Government, or more particularly this Minister, has control of this portfolio. That statement means nothing so far as the Parliament is concerned.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Is the honourable member saying that I am all right?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am saying that I expect that the guarantee given by you, Mr Minister, would stand. But that is no good to the Parliament, because no Minister today

can give any guarantees on behalf of a future Minister or Government. Therefore, once ETSA or any other authority is placed under the control of a Minister, a future Minister can interfere in the day-to-day operation of that body as often as he likes: that is quite clear.

We have learnt the lesson since I have been here that it does not pay to accept those sorts of guarantees, not even when they come from one's own side of politics, because a future Minister or Cabinet can have a different point of view: this happens. Therefore, I cannot accept the guarantee that is given. More particularly, the Minister said (and I get disappointed with Ministers, Governments or Parliaments, when these words are used—particularly in relation to this Bill):

> The boards of ETSA, PASA and Sagasco have been consulted on these aspects of the legislation and have raised no objections to these amendments.

That sounds nice, and is a great use of the English language. However, there is no indication in that statement about whether or not any queries were raised or concerns expressed by those organisations. One can express a concern without having an objection. One can have a great reservation in one's mind and raise it with a Minister, but not formally raise an objection by way of letter or minute.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That is true. As my colleague says, one may have an objection and not raise it. That is why I am talking about reservations. I would imagine that, if the representatives of the three organisations had any reservations, they would have raised them with the Minister. If a Parliament is to be properly informed, a Minister of the day would say, 'That is fair enough. Representatives of this organisation have doubts and I will tell the Parliament what they are, but they did not raise any objections and my answers to those queries were . . .' The Parliament would then be fully informed.

It is impossible for a member of Parliament to take a shot in the dark about what the objections might be. I do not think that the boards of those organisations would appreciate every member of Parliament ringing up and saying, 'Jack, Tom, Bill, or Mary, what concerns do you have about these amendments?' It is for the Minister of the Crown, or the Government of the day, to tell the Parliament what are the feelings of any particular representative group when we are amending the law to have some bearing on a particular organisation's operations.

I have another objection to placing these bodies under ministerial control. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is directly under ministerial control. Whenever there is a suggestion of extending any service in that field, there are usually long delays. There is also the difficulty of convincing people that a service is required. ETSA might charge quite high fees to extend services because it is an expensive operation. They have the attitude, in the main, that the consumer eventually pays either in a lump sum or over a number of years—sometimes up to 10 years.

ETSA also takes into consideration whether other consumers draw power from an extension. I know that there is a pretty steep cost for new consumers, but ETSA is usually reasonably responsive in terms of time slotting for extending a service.

The E&WS Department, of course, under ministerial control, does not really run at a profit. I suppose the Minister's answer to that statement would be that if it charged full tote odds there would be a lot of complaints from consumers. One could say the same about the STA; the same thing occurs there. The Minister could argue that consumers get a fairly cheap service, because if they had to pay full tote odds to make it a viable proposition the State would be better off so far as general revenue is concerned but consumers using public transport would be a lot worse off.

That comes back to the 'user pays' principle. It is not applied in the case of the Engineering and Water Supply Department or, more particularly, STA operations. That alone convinces me that whenever Ministers want to, for example just before an election, they can say that they will not put up bus fares or increase water or sewerage rates. However, immediately after an election to try to catch up the leeway the jump is so severe that the poor old consumer starts worrying about what is really going on. A Government can have some bearing on ETSA and say that it does not want to hike up the prices too much as an election is around the corner—and that has happened a few times in the past under different philosophies. Pressure can be brought to bear, but at least it is within reasonable bounds. It is not as bad as if the Minister had the opportunity to say, 'You cannot do that: you cannot increase prices at all.' The present Minister will say that that is not the intention, but we as a Parliament are passing an amendment that gives the power to interfere at any time on any aspect of gas or electricity supply.

As far as Sagasco is concerned, the Minister makes the point that, apart from Sagasco having to lodge material with the Minister if he asks for it (under the provisions of the last clause of the Bill), the measure has no effect on that company. The Minister makes the point that it operates reasonably efficiently, but I wonder how far down the track we would be if we took the first step and, according to the same philosophy, said, 'Let us look at the gas company and see what we can do with it. Should it be a private operation as it happens to be?' The member for Eyre made the point about the people of the State wanting electricity delivered to their homes at a reasonable rate and in an efficient manner. In the main I believe that ETSA does that, except in some of the remote areas, about which the member for Eyre is concerned.

I am not thrilled at the cost of electricity. The cost of power is starting to seriously affect much of our industry. It is affecting much of our primary industry and I know that a lot of people just outside what one might call the poverty area have become concerned about the cost of power and other charges in relation to their homes. They are probably the most unfortunate people in our community, as they are not the rich and they are not the pensioners who get a subsidised rate in many areas. Yet, when they spend all their money on the charges with which they are faced, they are worse off than some of the pensioners: that is the injustice of it all.

This Bill has no direct bearing on that, except that the Minister of the day might claim that the trust will give concessions to a bigger group of people and that will push up costs further for our primary or secondary industry. The other alternative is that the authority will run at a loss and the opportunity of picking up that loss will come from general revenue, so there will be some form of increased taxes or charges in another area. There is no way that the Minister is saying that his proposal will decrease the cost of services. He is saying that the main concern is to coordinate the brains of those people in the energy area on what potential we have for gas and electricity generation and energy in general, and what resources or potential resources we have.

That could be done without changing the Bill. The Minister has admitted quite openly that he has no problems in those areas, and that a body was doing this for him. That may be cumbersome for the Minister and he may not like the way it occurred, but he is still suggesting a coordinating committee with up to 20 members to carry out a similar

role. I do not support placing organisations under ministerial control.

I am not thrilled about the cost of electricity. Many of my constituents are concerned about it, especially the aged. My district has a longer cold period during winter than other areas and people need heaters. They may not use air conditioners as much, but my constituents find that their power bills are getting higher. I do not know the answer to it. No-one can prove to me whether or not ETSA is efficient. I cannot prove it and would not argue if that was proved to be the case. To my knowledge it is as efficient as any other producer of electricity in this country, and I do not know about other parts of the world.

Parliament should never have accepted former Minister Hudson's proposition to apply a tax on ETSA. If there was an argument that ETSA was borrowing money at lower interest rates and thereby obtaining some benefit, we should have looked at that; instead a 6 per cent levy was applied. That still applies, although a recent move will remove some of the burden. Consumers are taxed on one of the most vital commodities in relation to the quality of life, that is, power. In fact, the Government rips off millions of dollars a year in this area.

Parliament did not think this issue through as well as it should have at the time. I hope that at some time in the future this imposition will no longer prevail and that ETSA can operate as best it can to keep costs down within its available resources. The Pipelines Authority is an independent operator. There needs to be cooperation between all energy producers, as has happened in the past. ETSA should not be under the direct control of the Minister. I oppose that part of the Bill, but will support the second reading in the hope that the Deputy Leader's amendments succeed.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): If a Government gains total control of ETSA on a day-to-day basis and becomes involved in the management of it, I fear for the long-term costs of power in this State. If the bottom line is cheaper power for South Australians and, if the Minister assumes ministerial control of the trust, I am prepared to look at the Bill in more detail. I cannot believe that by having ETSA under the control of the Minister it will result in cheaper power for South Australians. Placing ETSA under ministerial control will not improve its efficiency.

As a member of the Public Accounts Committee I have visited ETSA on occasions and have discussed its activities with senior management. There is no way that the trust's administration, engineers and staff will be improved, because we will not improve the trust by placing it under ministerial control. This move will affect the long-term price of electricity. Negotiations on the price of gas (which affects the long-term price we pay for electricity) will not be more effective if we place ETSA under ministerial control.

It will not make the trust more accountable. The operation of the senior management of the trust ensures that it is an accountable organisation. Its method of accountability, which I will go into in a moment, stands out as a model in this State. Accountability will not be improved by placing ETSA under ministerial control. Such a move will not strengthen the hand of the Government in gas price negotiations that it may be attempting to put together. I think that the administration of the trust at the moment is perfectly capable of achieving the desired result. Having the trust under ministerial control will not persuade the Queensland Government, for example, to move more gas across the border, nor will it determine the long-term fuel source for power generation in this State.

The methods by which the trust conducts its long-term fuel source negotiations are perfectly in order. The suggestion that ministerial control will enhance such matters is simply looking at moonshine. By placing ETSA under ministerial control we will not stop the Government from reimposing the 2 per cent levy (which was removed recently—just prior to a forthcoming election). Further, it will not reduce the cost of industrial or domestic power in the future—which is what both consumers and those in industry are looking for in the long term.

During this debate I have been asking myself, 'What really is the Government trying to achieve by placing ETSA under ministerial control?' All I can think of is that the Government perceives it as a way in which it can strengthen its hand in forcing the board down a certain track. However, politicians should keep well clear of that area. I do not think that a Minister has any right to get involved in the day-to-day running of the trust. Under existing legislation a Minister has all the power in the world to make directions. The Government appoints the members of the board, and we all know that there are other methods by which the Government can seek to influence the board. However, we do not want a board that is dominated by the Minister on a day-to-day basis.

I refer to some of the factors that have contributed to the large tariff increases in South Australia since 1981-82. First, there was an abnormal increase in gas prices: costs have increased from 52c a gigajoule in January 1980 to $1.62 in January 1985. In 1980 capital expenditure amounted to $76 million, but by 1982-83 costs had risen to $237 million. We have also had to contend with a higher capital expenditure resulting in much higher new loan borrowings. In 1979-80 costs amounted to $40 million, and by 1982-83 costs had increased to $178 million.

Further, the trust had to contend with costs for the post-bushfire tree trimming program and fire insurance which, last year, amounted to $17 million. It also had to contend with a 5 per cent reduction in the consumption of electricity in 1983-84, causing a revenue loss of about $14 million. Given those figures, one asks, 'What respite has the Government given ETSA to help it keep down its tariffs?' I have referred to probably one of the five major costs with which the board of ETSA must contend in determining the tariffs that it will charge.

In helping ETSA to keep down its tariffs, there are two areas in which the Government can help. Of the total expense, Government charges amount to about 6.1 per cent, and this must be met by ETSA. Secondly, there is the cost of gas, which accounts for about 18.3 per cent of ETSA costs. The Government can help in both these areas. It could certainly rebate those charges. We all know that the Government has been using Electricity Trust tariffs as a source of revenue.

It could have an involvement in trying to do something about the cost of gas, which is 18.3 per cent of ETSA's expenditure, but these can be achieved without the Minister's being the titular head of the Electricity Trust. The administration of the trust is perfectly capable of undertaking the gas negotiations in consultation and cooperation with the Government, but we do not need the Minister there.

On that other area of Government charges, the Electricity Trust should soon be given some respite other than this 2 per cent rebate and levy, which we all know the Government has chosen not to enshrine in any legislation so that it does not have to give that money back again. The few words that I want to say on the subject are encapsulated in the fact that the sound economic decisions that will be taken in the trust must be free of political interference. The trust board now is getting top heavy in the area of political interference and it must be revamped. We need a new board free of political interference, with sound economists, managers and those who have been familiar with the financial

world all their lives. We do not need on it political aspirants of bygone years who have sought a seat on the board to fill in some time in their retirement. That is not what the management of a big private organisation is all about, and it should not be what management of the Electricity Trust is all about.

To leave the board as it is and then put the Minister in as a political head leaves the administration of the Electricity Trust wide open to Government domination in all areas of day-to-day management. It leaves the Government free to use the Electricity Trust as a source of tax revenue for the State. The bottom line is that the industrial tariffs and the tariffs for houses around South Australia will go up.

In conclusion, I remind the House of what the staff think about this whole move. We have heard what the Opposition thinks about it; we know that the management is opposed to it; but, also, the staff and the unions are opposed to it. We had a Bill before the House the other day on the subject of the reorganisation of the Public Service Board under Government management. On that occasion, the unions came out very strongly. I have a *News* cutting here headed '18 unions back Electricity Trust of South Australia workers on new Public Service law', which said:

> The unions representing about 5 500 ETSA employees have won backing from the UTLC in their opposition to draft legislation.

Without my going into it in depth, the article says that the unions do not want any suggestion of the Electricity Trust's coming under the Public Service. They see great difficulties in that.

Another article that I read in the newspaper only this morning talked of the engineering staff association from the Electricity Trust saying exactly the same things. The employees at ETSA do not appear to want to work under a Minister, nor do they want to become public servants. That is very clear in the two articles that I have referred to.

They are concerned, according to the reasons that they have given the press, at the potential for the deterioration of industrial relations. If it worries the unions, it certainly worries me that there is to be a deterioration in industrial relations because the Minister has taken over the trust. The engineering staff believe that it will create industrial instability. If anyone has any reading at all of industrial matters, they know that the bottom line for industrial instability means strikes, increased costs, and the consumer ending up paying more.

If the bottom line of the Minister taking over the department is that, in the view of the unions, there will be industrial strife, I say: pity help the era that we are about to enter if the Government decides to take over control of the Electricity Trust. The article goes on to state that the engineering staff believes it could lead to an effect on the continuity of power supply and therefore an increase in the cost of power. If this happens in South Australia when we are attempting to recover from a recession, it would be a disaster.

The bottom line at the conclusion is dearer domestic tariffs and dearer industrial tariffs which will have a deleterious effect on business. It also means that we are looking down the barrel of a period of industrial strife brought about when the unions start flexing their muscles and resisting the changeover. The last thing we want is inter-union arguments that cause industrial disputation, which once again is the bottom line of an increase in power, because every business in this State relies very heavily on the cost of power to meet its profit and loss account at the end of the financial year.

The cost of power is the major source of expense to a business and, if it rises, then the profitability of the business is lowered and its ability to employ staff is also lowered. I oppose this move. The Electricity Trust is well managed at the moment by an extremely competent board comprising senior management. I am not so sure about some of the political appointees and I believe that they should be replaced by men or women from the private sector who have specialised knowledge in the management of a multi-million dollar organisation which has engineering overtones. I believe that those political appointees should be replaced by people who also have a proven record in running a big business at times when costs have to be considered. I oppose this legislation.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The concern for the need to protect the future energy resources of South Australia is commendable. This Parliament would be remiss if it did not take all steps necessary to ensure that its major suppliers of energy in this State, that is, the Electricity Trust and the South Australian Gas Company, were protected in relation to their source and also the supply to the consumers.

This Government, as have previous Governments, has undertaken a considerable amount of work in the formation of committees to ensure that the interests of the consumers are protected. I support that attitude wholeheartedly, but I cannot see the reason for the Government wanting to place the Electricity Trust and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia under ministerial control. The Minister has not really put forward any valid reason other than to say that the Government wants to be assured that consumers will receive electricity or gas and that it can be in a position of strength to negotiate with the suppliers. I do not think that that is necessary.

I think at the moment there is cooperation from the major organisations, namely, the Gas Company and the Electricity Trust, with the involvement of the Pipelines Authority. Departmental officers, if necessary, can all be involved and the consensus of these people on a voluntary rather than a forced basis serves the State well. I see little reason for placing the Pipelines Authority or the Electricity Trust under ministerial control. I see that as being bureaucratic interference. I think that it is fair and reasonable to say that many of the Government instrumentalities or statutory authorities, where there is ministerial control, tend to be subjected to ministerial interference. Political decisions are made irrespective of the economics of those decisions. The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee has witnessed that occurrence on many occasions and that is what is really costing the taxpayers money in the long term.

Decisions are made for pragmatic political reasons rather than for economic reasons and commonsense. It would be a dreadful shame to do that to the Electricity Trust. There is no doubt that, in the past, attempts have been made to interfere with the management and operation of the Electricity Trust. There is no hard evidence to prove that there has been ministerial or Government interference.

There is no doubt that, when we look at the accounts of the Electricity Trust and the situation the Trust faces at the present moment, one could be suspicious that there have been certain political overtones coming through the board or the management level, through the Minister or through the Government of the day, as to the operations of the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

The cost of building the new town of Leigh Creek went from $32 million to $64 million; I think that computes at approximately $80 000 per house per employee. I am not going to deny the employees of Leigh Creek the opportunity of a good standard of living accommodation; I think they deserve it. Anyone working in that region deserves first-class accommodation and the air-conditioned comfort they are entitled to. There are many other Government support services that have been provided for this new town and it

is environmentally and planning-wise a credit to those who were involved in it, but it was a very costly exercise, because it went from $32 million to $64 million—

An honourable member: That is Leigh Creek South?

Mr BECKER: That is Leigh Creek South. I believe there are some reasons for that, and some of them were industrial. The trust was put in an awkward situation, which it virtually had to accept. It had no option but to accept certain conditions that were laid down. However, Leigh Creek South is something that should be a showplace of the North. Not enough is being done to show the people what has been achieved. The majority of people in South Australia would not have any idea of what can be done, given the resources and the will to plan, environmentally, a town that has to depend on very limited water supply. That is a plus for the Electricity Trust in that respect.

I would not like to see ministerial control or interference in the planning, building and development of that town, because I like to think the employees of the Electricity Trust had quite considerable input into its planning and design. Of course, what worries me is there is no room to expand. The town cannot expand without the trust's authority and approval. I get the impression that it is a closed town (I might be wrong), and that strangers are not wanted. We have a town in existence and we do not know what its future will be in relation to expansion and development. It should be a jumping-off location for the Far North.

We then come to the necessity to build a new power station at Port Augusta. The cost has gone from something like $240 million to $450 million. Given the size of the project, the timing, and the time it has taken, of course there had to be escalation in the cost and there would have been considerable cost in relation to the funding of that development—a massive development in South Australian terms which has been well carried out and managed so far. It is hard to know whether or not the decisions made were the right ones. Again, it is best to leave it to the experts in the Electricity Trust, which has served the State well for the past 40-odd years. Again, I would hate to see ministerial interference brought in. I am not saying the current Minister would do it, but a future Minister might decide that he was going to have not Mitsubishi generators but some other generators which were inefficient and far more expensive. That is why I am always a little suspicious when we move into these areas of administrative control.

Of course, the huge capital works component involved in removing the overburden of the opencut coalfield at Leigh Creek is something in the vicinity of $110 million. All up, the Electricity Trust has spent several hundred millions of dollars in development in the north of this State, let alone meeting the cost of building new power lines.

The capital expenditure is massive. It is a huge operation, funded by the Electricity Trust management. In the short period since the current Government established the South Australian Government Finance Authority we have found that the State Government has benefited considerably through that authority. It has pushed up the cost of financing charges quite considerably.

At page 282 of the Auditor-General's Report, under the heading 'Electricity Trust of South Australia', we see that ETSA paid $100.35 million in financing charges for the year ended 30 June 1985, whereas to 30 June 1984 the cost was $87 million. Looking at page 286, under the heading 'Financing charges (net)' we find the breakup of these figures: interest payable on borrowings and finance leases to 30 June 1985 was $101.776 million, compared to $92.86 million in 1984.

The loan raising expenses for 1985 totalled $8 000; in 1984 it was $205 000. The South Australian Government guarantee fee on borrowings was $3.776 million for 1985 and $3.454 million for 1984. For foreign exchange net gain loss on principal and interest there was a loss in 1985 of $5.074 million, compared to a profit of $2.287 million in 1984. Forward exchange contracts in 1985 yielded a profit of $2.661 million compared to a loss of $2.255 million in 1984.

These figures refer mainly to financing the Northern Power Station. When one considers the large sums involved the amounts are not so high, but one should be concerned at a loss of $5 million on principal and interest. When one takes that figure of the forward exchange contracts into consideration the loss is about $2.4 million, which is still a lot of money. That $2.4 million could have provided much benefit, warmth and electricity to the welfare recipients in our community.

The other cost factor is the net cost of forward cover, which has been increased in 1985 to $1.304 million, compared to $384 000 in 1984. That gives a gross figure of $109.277 million in 1985 and $96.871 million in 1984. However, we have to take off interest receivable on funds invested. Because of the large cash flow of the Electricity Trust, it is wisely placing surplus funds, no doubt on the short-term money market, rolling over their bills, and in 1985 they made $8.927 million which, taken from the gross figure of $109.277 million, brings in a net $100.35 million. In 1984 the amount of interest receivable on funds invested was $9.791 million, which gives a net figure of $87.08 million. The average interest rate for the year ended 30 June 1985 was 12.8 per cent on borrowings. All this means that the Government interference in management of the Electricity Trust has cost consumers of electricity several millions of dollars. The Government guarantee fee on borrowings has pushed up the interest rate considerably.

No longer does the Electricity Trust have an ETSA loan. I can remember that only a few years ago people were invited to deposit money with the Electricity Trust and the people of South Australia loyally and solemnly supported the Electricity Trust. The South Australian Government Finance Authority does it now, but charges a top dollar. It charges a Government guarantee fee. This has had a tremendous impact, about $13 million in the past financial year, and over the past two years considerably more.

That is what we have seen when we get Government interference in a statutory authority. That is why I do not like it and that is only just one of the many arguments that can be brought forward in this debate. Others have already been covered quite competently by other members on this side. In the future no-one is to know what can happen—what type of government it would be, or what type of Minister there would be. There are no guarantees on this type of control, and I always believe that it is best to err on the side of caution. If the Government is concerned, it should look at the management and the make-up of the board. The Government has been terribly remiss in not appointing a consumer on the board. There should have been a—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Don't you think—

Mr BECKER: Well, the Minister could argue that every member of the board is a consumer. The General Manager should be on the board. A woman should be on the board, and perhaps she could be of top management ability, or a consumer; she could come from a whole range of areas, as should other members of the board. Of course, management expertise is also necessary. The whole structure of the board needs to be looked at. I would give the General Manager a managing director role, and I would do that as first option. What the Government has done so far in its various committees and councils is commendable because the future of this State depends on the source and supply of energy at the lowest possible cost. If we are going to have any com-

petitive advantage, that is one of the areas at which we must be looking.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I support the Bill. I believe that ETSA must be differentiated from other undertakings and statutory authorities in the State in the sense that ETSA is a public utility which provides a public service to the people of this State and which is not a business undertaking, as might be the SGIC or the State Bank. While it is required to act in a businesslike way, to all intents and purposes it is granted a monopoly by this Parliament to supply electricity in South Australia. That places it under quite different constraints. However, accountability is critical, and in my view the time has long since past when the accountability of the Electricity Trust must be strengthened. At the moment ETSA is almost accountable to no-one.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order!

Mr M.J. EVANS: This was perhaps acceptable in times of rapid economic expansion and cheap energy. However, those days are long since gone. Total energy conservation and management concepts are essential if South Australia is to emerge into the 1990s and beyond with a stable and efficient supply of energy, particularly electricity, given the broad consumer base that electricity enjoys.

However, energy management cannot be taken into isolated chunks. It must be looked at as a broadly based exercise. Coordination in this area is absolutely critical. It may be, for example, that one authority, such as ETSA, the Gas Company or the Pipelines Authority, may be disadvantaged by a decision which benefits the State as a whole. One must be in a position to take coordinated decisions, even when one part of the jigsaw perhaps suffers as a result but when the total package for the benefit of South Australia as a whole is improved.

Energy management is certainly an area in which this type of juggling act, and trade-off, are well proven as effective means of providing a better package for the people of South Australia as a whole. We can certainly see this in the context of the present negotiations over gas prices. The gas pricing saga has been well canvassed in this House by other speakers and I do not intend to go over that ground again, certainly not to allocate blame or responsibility. However, we do find ourselves in an almost impossible position.

I trust that the Government will be in a position shortly to make an announcement on that issue that will be of some benefit to South Australians. It had better be in that position, or there will be diabolical difficulties in this State, because the price of gas is of critical importance to a whole range of enterprises as well as to ETSA. I, for one, believe the Parliament must be able to hold the Government of the day totally accountable for energy management. The only way I can see in which the Parliament can hold the Government of the day completely accountable in this area is if the Minister does gain control over all the constituent parts of that energy management.

I do not believe that the Minister will use his new-found power, should Parliament choose to grant it, to interfere in the day-to-day operations of ETSA: he would be foolish, indeed, to undertake that course. One can gather from the way his second reading speech focuses primarily on energy management, planning and co-ordination that that is the main thrust, not the detailed interference in the management of ETSA. Management can well be left to the highly qualified, competent, and no doubt well paid General Manager and his staff, who are in an excellent position to manage the affairs of ETSA.

I have some doubts about the ability of the board to effectively discharge those duties, but if one looks closely at the Act one sees that the board has very few powers and responsibilities. I am sure that the General Manager undertakes far more of the day-to-day management of ETSA than the board ever does. I agree with the previous speaker that, in fact, it would not be inappropriate to examine closely the membership, make up, duties and responsibilities of the board. It is many years since that task was undertaken. I certainly commend to the Minister a proposal that it might be a reasonable time to review the role, powers and functions of the board, and one might go so far as to include the make up and membership of the board, as well.

I certainly commend that aspect of the previous speaker's comments to the Minister. To my way of thinking, there is no alternative in the 1980s, given the crisis of energy management which we face and the multiple facets of that crisis—the way in which the various parts of the jigsaw link together to produce the final effect—but for this Parliament to grant the Minister power over ETSA and the other corporations that he seeks because to do otherwise would leave him in a position where he could legitimately plead that he was being frustrated in one aspect or another of his energy management policy because he was unable to exercise full control over all constituent parts of it.

If we are to achieve proper energy planning into the next century there is no way of achieving that result without a unified and coordinated approach. Certainly, the Government of the day, and therefore the Minister responsible for that portfolio, must have control over the various constituent parts of the energy management jigsaw or he will not be able to provide that service to the people of South Australia. For those reasons, I support the Bill before the House.

Whilst there is no doubt some concern, which members opposite have expressed, about the degree to which the Minister might choose to exercise his power in relation to day-to-day management, I believe that one must look much more closely at the energy coordination side of the business and, if Parliament in future discovers the Minister is acting in a way contrary to the best interests of the people of this State, there are speedy and certain remedies to that concern. With those remarks, I support the measure.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): First, I thank all members who have spoken in the second reading debate, because it has indicated at least something pleasing to me, that is, the degree of interest in energy planning for South Australia. The last speaker, the member for Elizabeth, displayed easily the most accurate perception of what this Bill is about. In a few words he was able to sum up what the whole measure is really about. Although some of the remarks made might have been made in good faith they were wide of the mark and completely in error and need to be corrected. For instance, the member for Eyre talked about his concern at the Government's having any involvement with bodies such as ETSA, and at the Minister's having control, and in general he expressed a kind of abhorrence of that occurring.

However, that very same member has on the Notice Paper two measures calling on the Government to intervene in ETSA affairs. This is the same member who is greatly concerned about these matters. For example, a 'Notice of Motion: Other Business' calls on the Government to concern itself with an ETSA matter, as does a further matter on the Notice Paper to be moved by the honourable member concerned. That indicates the degree of concern really felt by him when he was speaking.

That same honourable member was at some pains to give as little credit as possible to the Government for the recently announced major step in assisting those electricity consumers on the West Coast who for many years have paid an additional cost for their electricity. The Government, in

conjunction with ETSA, has made an offer to those people through the local government bodies concerned and in one case a private electricity undertaking which I believe will be accepted and which will see the end of that impost on those consumers. The honourable member concerned mentioned it almost with his head turned to one side and as softly as possible so that he would not have to give any credit for the fairness displayed by the Government in that area.

Indeed, I suggest that the geographical location indicates that the Government is unlikely to gain any electoral benefit from such a move, which demonstrates that it was initiated on the basis of proper energy planning and the supply of energy in South Australia, and how it should be paid for and costed. I can understand the chagrin and annoyance that the Deputy Leader displayed when he spoke, because the Premier was able to announce, in conjunction with ETSA, that there would be a reduction of 2 per cent in electricity tariffs in 1985. That is something that was never achieved during the regime of the Government in which the Deputy Leader was a Minister.

The other curious effort of the Deputy Leader when he was speaking concerned the amount of time he dwelt on the differential existing between the field gate price for gas in South Australia, for New South Wales and for South Australian use respectively, when the very member who was speaking (the former Minister) set up that differential about which he was complaining when he negotiated a three-year pricing arrangement and tied up the State legally to that differential.

I would have thought that that was an area where the Deputy Leader might have adopted the tactic that was adopted by the member for Eyre, that is, to not mention it much and quickly skate away. I recall a previous occasion when the Deputy Leader confessed to the House that he was the Minister for dopey contracts, and I guess that this was another example of his conscience perhaps pricking him in this area and grudgingly and unwillingly he found he just could not get away from that particular topic. So, I suggest that, when the people of South Australia look at this matter, they will be well aware who put the State int his position.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It is the Labor Party and they know it.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Labor Party did not take that action at all: it was the famous—or, as the press sometimes refers to it, the infamous—Goldsworthy agreement that put the State in that position from 1983 to 1985. The Leader, the member for Morphett and certain other honourable members seem to be very concerned about what happens to a body or a structure headed by a Minister: for some reason or other, that makes it not work as well. Great concerns were presented to the House. I was a bit surprised by the Deputy Leader, a former Minister, as I cannot recall that he ever came into this House when he was a Minister and said that he would absolve or remove himself from being in charge of any of the bodies with which he was concerned, including the very departments. If he really believes that is what happens under ministerial control, he should have been consistent and taken such action.

This is a sham on the part of the Opposition. This measure being proposed by the Government is one which it would normally support. But, of course, because it is respondent to certain groups in the community, it is required to at least exhibit in this Chamber the attitude that we have been witnessing today. The remark was made several times that somehow or other there must have been almost arm busting or twisting of members of the ETSA board to get a reduction of 2 per cent in electricity tariffs this year.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: How much do they have to pay for their gas?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That is a shocking indictment of the Deputy Leader and I am pleased that it will appear in *Hansard*, because he was saying that Mr Bill Hayes (the Chairman of the ETSA board), the Hon. John Carnie (a former colleague of the honourable member concerned), Mr Ron Barnes (a former State Under Treasurer), and Mr Lee Parkin (a former Director-General of the Department of Mines and Energy) are susceptible to pressure and would not function in the way in which their duty as members of the board calls for them to act under State laws which lay down the way in which members of boards and so on must act. The Deputy Leader was suggesting that in some way they could be suborned into cooperating in an action other than that which they believed was in the interests of the trust. I leave the Deputy Leader to think over what I have outlined. That was the import of his remarks: he was suggesting—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I will send them a copy of the speech myself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that if the honourable Deputy Leader sends a copy of the speech he leaves out the interjections.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I wanted to stress that point, as there is no argument whatsoever that board members function in the interests of the trust and that they bring a wide range of expertise to their task. The fact that a person is a former member of Parliament should not preclude him from performing a duty for the State as do members on the board of the trust. If one was to analyse the members, one would find that they have a wide range of formal qualifications and interests and I am certain that they bring the range of expertise necessary to the board.

The member for Elizabeth raised one other point of substance to which I will give some consideration. The matter also involves the Pipelines Authority, namely, the position of members of the board and the executive operation of the structure. That, of course, is one of the reasons why the Pipelines Authority has been included in the Act—apart from the necessity to tie up all the strands so that energy planning in this State can proceed.

When the member for Morphett spoke he appeared to be in some doubt about certain figures. He displayed that same inaccuracy in a letter that he distributed in parts of his electorate. The letter, signed by him, and I presume placed in letter boxes, states:

> Set against a 41 per cent increase in ETSA tariff under Labor . . .

I suggest that the honourable member's arithmetic needs attention. There should be fairness in these matters, and the increases that have taken place under the Labor Government are 12 per cent, 12 per cent, and 12 per cent. Unless my arithmetic is as faulty as his, that adds up to 36 per cent, not 41 per cent. I would appreciate it, if the honourable member gets an opportunity to distribute another letter, if he shows the courtesy of correcting that misstatement of fact.

Mr Oswald: It is a good letter, you must admit.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Some elements of the letter are quite sensible, I agree. In view of the time I will leave other remarks I might have to the Committee stage, except for the matter of how honourable members know that the boards have agreed to what is contained in the Bill, as alluded to by a number of members.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: The Premier said so.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: For the benefit of the honourable member who has just interjected, the minutes of the trust's meeting dated 23 August state:

> Resolved—that the acting Minister of Mines and Energy—

and this was during my absence with illness—

be advised that the board appreciates the acknowledgment in the second reading speech of the trust's past cooperation with the Government. The board is of the opinion that in view of this established relationship the Bill will simply formalise a situation that already prevails.

There is no suggestion whatsoever of any objection to what is proposed by the Government. I urge all honourable members to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Amendment of Pipelines Authority Act 1967.'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

Page 1, lines 15 to 19—Leave out all words in these lines.

The effect of this amendment is to delete from the Bill the provision that seeks to put the Pipelines Authority of South Australia under ministerial control. I can see no reason for this provision, other than this phoney explanation given in the second reading explanation, that it will help the Minister in his energy planning, precious little evidence of which has been evinced during the three years of his occupancy of his present office. I canvassed the major energy planning issue at length, and do not intend to repeat it. Instead of more Government intrusion there should be less. I move the amendment for that reason.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I oppose the amendment. I can think of no better way of demonstrating why I oppose it than to quote from the proceedings of the Estimates Committee of Wednesday 26 September 1984, when the Deputy Leader said to me:

Other than putting the trust under direct ministerial control—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I am not talking about the trust.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: This is germane to the whole area, and the honourable member knows it. To suggest that we could have ministerial control of one body and not another and still be able to have the degree of sensible energy planning that is proposed as a result of these measures clearly will not stand up. I thought that the member for Elizabeth put that matter before the House in an extremely cogent and succinct way.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Where is the rest of my quote?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am accepting what the honourable member is saying at the moment, that it may be more germane in respect of ETSA. I always listen to what the Deputy Leader says, although I do not necessarily accept his comments. However, in this case I believe that he was right in drawing my attention to the fact that I should address myself to the Pipelines Authority amendment rather than the amendment in relation to ETSA. There is really no need to go over ground that has already been covered. The Government believes that the proposed legislation is the sensible way in which energy planning should be undertaken in South Australia. I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3—'Amendment of Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946.'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I oppose this clause. It seeks to put the Electricity Trust of South Australia under the direction and control of the Minister. In my view this is absolutely a move in the wrong direction. The Association of Professional Engineers of Australia (South Australian Branch) has prepared a submission, and it supports my opposition to this clause. The submission raises a number of pertinent questions. It states:

1. The 1945 Royal Commission into Electricity Supply in South Australia included the following:

The possibility of unnecessary political interference would be removed if the undertaking is vested in a public utility trust 'clothed with the power of Government, but possessing all the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise'.

The Government of the day accepted this and set up ETSA which has performed better than any other Australian electricity authority for 39 years. It still retains most of the dedication, drive and enthusiasm that were the recognised features of the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. Pty Ltd.

What has happened now to make the Government want to amend the Act?

How many times has the Minister clashed with the board of the trust?

What direction does the Government wish to go in but about which they are so concerned that they think that the board of the trust may not wish to go with them but will have to be told?

Why do they not take Parliament and the public into their confidence and let these issues be openly debated?

Have they discussed these issues with the board of the trust?

Who is advising the Government and for what purpose?

All of these questions should be asked and answered and only when satisfactory answers have been given should the amending legislation be passed. It should be noted in passing that the amending legislation was drawn up some time ago but has been handled with great secrecy—

This is the much vaunted open government!—

For what reason has the Government concealed its actions?

2. If the amendment is passed these further questions need to be asked:

Who is going to advise the Minister? *(a)* his staff; *(b)* his ministerial advisers; *(c)* the Department of Mines and Energy; or *(d)* the board or General Manager of ETSA?

In the case of *(a)* and *(b)*, how did they get to know so much about electricity industry matters that they can tell people what to do who have spent their working lifetime in the industry?

In the case of *(c)*—we need to be very careful . . . Their expertise is related to the exploration and development of resources by private or public enterprise. They have a vested interest in high prices for gas and coal. It makes their department look good and brings greater revenue to the State. This would be another way of increasing the backdoor taxation on electricity consumers. The Department of Mines and Energy should not be involved in pricing matters nor should they move out of the area of exploration and mining in which they have expertise.

That leaves us with *(d)* which is the *status quo*—therefore the amending legislation is unnecessary.

3. If we assume the amending legislation is passed and the Minister gives a direction to the board of the trust with which they disagree, how can the board reconcile that direction with the statutory obligations placed on them under section 15 (2) of the present Act? The amendment as drafted is not competent and should not have been put before the House without such ramifications having been thought through.

The present Act stipulates the obligations of the board. If they are in conflict with the view of the Minister, the members of the board are in breach of the terms under which they were appointed. That is what the submission is saying in that regard. It states:

The amendment strikes at the very heart of good management because no longer would it be possible to find who would be accountable for decisions. At present members of the board are accountable and if the Minister is displeased he can replace them with others as their terms expire.

The Minister did that: he did not like some of the things that Mr Leverington said publicly, so he dispensed with him and put in a fellow traveller—a retired Labor Minister. The submission continues:

Under the amended Act would the Minister be accountable for every action of the trust and its employees, would the board be accountable as at present or would it be the General Manager and/or his staff or a mixture of all these people or groups? Once again, the effects of the amendment have not been thought through and the amending legislation should be deferred or withdrawn until the Government can give a rational explanation of its actions.

4. ETSA has been under attack from various sources for its tariff increases, but if these are analysed it can be seen that most of them are within the grasp of the Government to fix, for example, gas prices: the Government has been labouring for the whole of its term to try to secure promises of longer-term supplies

at prices that are not extortionate. No results of this labour have yet been disclosed.

That is the point that I made during the debate. The submission continues:

Capital and financing charges and other Government charges: Government charges alone are in excess of $40 million this year and have been frequently used by the Treasurer to raise more tax revenue.

All of that was Labor Party imposed. The submission goes on:

In addition, the restructuring of the trust's debt to the Treasury in 1984 had the effect of adding over 2 per cent to the tariffs without either justification or warning.

That is another way of saying exactly what I said during the second reading debate, on which the Minister was strangely silent. The submission continues:

Bushfires and insurance: again the Government could fix these problems by passing legislation to give effect to preventive measures related to proper land management and control of tree growth, natural fuel, etc., and the SGIC could be directed to carry the insurance or the Government could limit the liability of ETSA. None of the above problems have been solved.

Particularly, the gas problem has not been solved. The submission goes on:

5. Cross-subsidies: this is another favourite measure of socialist Governments: to fleece the public for those services which are indispensable and which can run at a profit and use the profits so gained to prop up loss-making schemes. The trouble with this philosophy is that you finish up never knowing what anything is really costing and how efficient it is. We submit that ETSA should be left to run as the efficient commercial venture that it is and that the Government should seek to raise its taxes in more open ways.

Again, that is a reference to the backdoor taxes that the Government sneaked in even as late as last year. The submission goes on:

6. Finally, the Government should consider the effect that the amending legislation is having on the morale of ETSA employees and, if passed, the effect it would have on efficiency, safety and costs. For instance the amending legislation would permit the Minister to appoint his own political allies to any staff position in ETSA. There are not the safeguards present in the ETSA Act that exist in the Public Service Act and, although the Minister has said that such directions are not his intention, the amending legislation makes it possible. There would be an adverse effect on safety, efficiency and morale if a Minister's political allies of no ability or experience were appointed to positions ahead of others of greater merit. Senior officers (who are in an award-free position) would find it difficult to resist ministerial direction which was wrong and ETSA would very quickly become demoralised and inefficient. It would be highly likely that ETSA would become industrially destabilised with a consequent effect on the continuity of supply and an increase in costs.

Summary:

At a time when there are world-wide moves towards smaller government, greater accountability in the public sector and privatisation, no rational explanation has been given as to why the Bannon Government is going the other way. It is generally accepted that private enterprise is efficiently structured and for this reason the founders of ETSA stayed with that type of organisation. After 39 years ETSA is still running more efficiently than any other electricity undertaking—

the member for Eyre mentioned New South Wales and what happened over there under ministerial control and the enormous problems that it has in terms of its debt structures—

as the comparison published by ETSA shows. The amending legislation raises very considerable doubts as to whether ETSA can continue that way and the Government should be called upon to state its further intentions for ETSA so that they can be publicly debated. It is believed that there is sufficient disquiet for the matter to be deferred until the coming election so that the electors can be given the chance to express their wishes.

Those notes were prepared by the Secretary (he describes himself as a union secretary) of the Association of Professional Engineers, Australia, South Australian Branch. I read that into the record because it adds weight to everything I said during the second reading debate. I oppose this clause so as to give effect to what I said then and to what was said in that submission.

Mr M.J. EVANS: While I support the general principle and thrust of the concept (as I said in my second reading speech), the nature of the Bill is very simplistic. It simply provides that the authority is subject to ministerial control and direction and, as the Deputy Leader has quite rightly pointed out, that raises a number of questions.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Are you backing off now?

Mr M.J. EVANS: If the Deputy Leader will allow me to continue, I am sure that he will come to understand the point that I am trying to make. The Bill obviously raises a number of questions, about which I would like to hear the Minister's views. I want to know how legislation, which is now some four decades old, will be adapted to provide ministerial control. The parent Act is structured on the basis that ETSA is a statutory authority independent of the Government, even though it holds its assets on behalf of the Crown and all of the operative powers and functions are designed in terms of the board.

Presumably, the board is to be subject to ministerial control and direction. Can the Minister indicate how that will work? For example, does the Minister propose to operate on the basis of issuing periodic directions in the form of policy undertakings and directing ETSA to act in a certain way in relation to certain matters of policy; or is he proposing to operate on the basis that he can veto decisions of the board? If that is the case, how will that apply in relation to the board's contractual obligations?

If the board enters into a contract, does the Minister contemplate that he will be in a position to abrogate that contract in any way? How will the system operate, and will the Minister review the basis of the legislation so that it is structured more in line with the revised concept of ministerial control?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The matters raised by the member for Elizabeth do not lend themselves to a long dissertation at this time of the day. I can only suggest—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: No, I do not think that that was the point being raised at all. I think the member for Elizabeth is looking for an assurance that what is mentioned in the second reading explanation will apply, that there will not be day-to-day ministerial interference with ETSA's normal operations. It is expected that, wherever energy policy is involved and where the trust is involved in those matters of energy policy, that is when the Minister will work in conjunction with ETSA to ensure that those policies are being met. That is really all this measure is about.

I do not know why some people are concerned about this measure. I heard what the Deputy Leader put forward—a very long diatribe supplied to him suggesting that the Minister was going to agree to all sorts of things. That is not the intent at all. I support the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (19)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Payne (teller), Slater, and Trainer.

Noes (17)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunket, Whitten, and Wright. Noes—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Ashenden, Blacker, Mathwin, and Rodda.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.
Motion carried.
Clause 4 and title passed.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This Bill comes out of Committee in a quite unsatisfactory condition. It allows the Minister and the Government to get their sticky fingers into the ETSA till to an increasing extent. It is bad enough now—it is costing the public upwards of $50 million per year. The Bill is totally opposed by everyone associated with ETSA. The Government has secretly brought this measure to the House: ETSA was not consulted, apart from its board members. For that reason, we vehemently oppose the third reading.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Obviously, the Government has not heeded the warnings given by members on this side of the House during the earlier stages of this debate. The matter before the House is very serious. We are talking about handing one of the most important public instrumentalities, which is supplying basic everyday necessities of life to the people of this State, over to the whims of the Labor Party conference. That is what this Bill is doing. Members opposite will have the greenies and other political activists passing resolutions at Labor Party conferences, directing weak Labor Ministers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is going far beyond the bounds of what is permitted in a third reading debate. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: This is a most important measure. It will have far reaching effects on the everyday lives of every citizen of this State. I would be remiss if I did not stand and make a final protest in relation to this matter, because my constituents who are affected by ETSA operations have complained bitterly about it. They are unhappy about many other matters. I would be quite remiss in my duty as a member of Parliament if I did not make this final protest. All I can say to the member for Elizabeth is that he has adopted a very naive attitude.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is definitely going beyond the bounds of a third reading debate.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, I would be happy to come back to the provisions of the third reading, but if the member for Elizabeth votes for the third reading—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I have specifically directed the honourable member that he is not to enter into debate with the honourable member for Elizabeth. He is to stay within Standing Orders.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, surely I am permitted, in speaking during the third reading stage, to say to the member for Elizabeth that, if he supports the third reading, he is part of this devious plan, too. He cannot escape the consequences; he will be judged. His electors will judge him. This will be the second occasion when he has to face up; otherwise, he will be nothing more than a rubber stamp for the Labor Party. This Government is committing a most serious offence.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Of course, he is. This Government is inflicting upon the people a course of action which is unnecessary. It will do nothing for the welfare of people in this State. I oppose the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (19)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Payne (teller), Slater, and Trainer.

Noes (17)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Whitten, and Wright. Noes—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Ashenden, Blacker, Mathwin, and Rodda.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall), the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins) and the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) were granted leave to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill if they think fit.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 October at 2 p.m.