

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 23, 1976

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

LAND TAX 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 (GIFT DUTY AND STAMP DUTIES) 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.

QUESTIONS

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Dr. TONKIN: Will the consultants' inquiry into accountability in Government departments include the Premier's Department, and will the Premier now release to this House details of the present staffing of his department? The matter of the staffing of the Premier's Department has been raised in this House recently. The figures for alternate years taken from the Public Service lists for his department show a steady increase from a total of 18 in 1966; 27 in 1968; 30 in 1970; 147 in 1972; up to 182 in 1974. I take this opportunity of correcting the figures for 1970 and 1972; I quoted them earlier as 26 and 148. Actually, there is very little difference. A political journalist's assessment almost 12 months ago in 1975 was that there were then 238 staff members, although he pointed out that the Premier's family tree was shortly to be pruned of its legal branch and a number of attached responsibilities. Inquiries by the Parliamentary Library research staff met with a refusal to disclose the present figures, and I understand the Premier himself vetoed the release. There may well have been movements of Public Service sections into or out of the Premier's Department over the years, but these movements will not result in erratic and meaningless figures (the reason given for not releasing the details) if the details are given. Full and complete disclosure of these staffing details would prevent any possible misunderstanding. The only inference to be drawn now is that the Premier wants to hide the figures from the public.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question originally asked of me was simply concerning a run-down of figures from year to year relating to the Premier's Department, as if the Premier's Department were in itself a static entity; in fact, it is not, because of marked changes in function within the department.

Dr. Tonkin: It's growing quite considerably.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For instance, at one stage the Premier's Department included the Government Motor Garage, but it no longer does. At one stage, the Premier's Department included the Builders Licensing Board and the office of the Minister for the Environment in the next year, but excluded the Government Motor Garage. Then, for a period it included the Tourist Bureau; then it excluded the Tourist Bureau and took over the Publicity Branch from the Tourist Bureau, but excluded the office of the Minister for the Environment. Then, it included the Ombudsman's office and the Planning Appeal Board from the Minister of Development and Mines. Then, it excluded the Tourist Bureau; then, it included the Parliamentary Counsel from the office previously of the Attorney-General. It included the Cabinet office from the previous Chief Secretary's Office, and excluded the Builders Licensing Board, which went then to the Ministry of Labour and Industry. The number of changes in particular units in the department simply means that, to contrast the figures of totals within the department from year to year, produces exactly the sorts of thing that the Leader, his Party and one or two journalists in South Australia have been deliberately responsible for—suggesting that there has been some undue growth in this department on the basis of figures that do not relate to comparable matters. For instance, under the Liberal Party the immigration office and the staffing of the immigration hostel were part of another department. They are now part of the Premier's Department. I notice that the Liberal Party and the journalists concerned have listed the staff of the immigration hostel as being my personal advisers. What the Leader has been told is that, if he inquires about changes in certain branches or sections of the department, those figures will be supplied without any difficulty. As to the rest, he has the means of obtaining the figures from the normal Public Service list.

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Premier say how many of the staff of his department are personal appointments, who they are, and what are their duties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know that I can give a complete answer to this question off the cuff. I will therefore obtain a reply for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say how many members of his staff are employed on a contract basis, and what are the terms and conditions of their contracts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From memory (and I will have to get an accurate check on this), I think only one officer anywhere in my department is employed on contract, and that is the Director-General of Trade and Development.

Mr. Chapman: It's a pity that they all weren't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member means by that, and I do not imagine that he does, either. I do not propose to table the contract of the Director-General of Trade and Development. It is a proper one and it can be surveyed by the Auditor-General. Naturally, it contains a number of personal matters that are no more properly discussed here than personal matters that come before the Public Service Board in the appointment of public servants.

Mr. Evans: Has Mr. Parkes signed his contract yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not certain whether he has as a matter of fact; but, when he does take up his duties, which he has not done so far so he is not with us yet, he will also be under contract, but the circumstances in which that has occurred I have explained previously in this House.

Mr. RUSSACK: Was the Premier's personal secretary appointed to a base grade position in the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau shortly before the last State election and, if so, what was the reason for his not taking up the appointment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he was not. My private secretary has been a member of my personal staff now since, from memory, 1973; I think that was when he joined my personal staff. Prior to that, he was a clerk in the Tourist Bureau. What the honourable member may be referring to is his superannuation, because he had been on secondment to Ministerial staff since 1973; it was taken up with the Public Service Board which, in order to confirm his rights to superannuation, confirmed him in the Public Service at the original base grade rate, which gave him entitlement to contribute to superannuation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier say when the position of Senior Publicity Officer in the Publicity and Design Services Branch of the Premier's Department was advertised, how many applications were received, and whether the person appointed was formerly a press secretary to the Premier? In recent times, as all members are aware, numerous questions have been asked about staff in the Premier's Department. I understand that the basis of this incessant questioning in the House is public demand. Therefore, on this occasion, I join with my colleagues in seeking the information outlined.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member suggests that there has been anyone in the public who has put to him, or to members of the Opposition, the case that there has been anything improper in the appointment of Mr. Mitchell to the Senior Publicity Officer's post in the Publicity Branch I would be grateful if he would tell me from whom he received that complaint, because I do not believe it for one moment. Certainly, Mr. Mitchell was a former press secretary of mine some years ago. Prior to that, he was a member of the *Advertiser* staff. He went overseas and was employed by Australian Associated Press and Reuters. Mr. Mitchell returned to a position in the South Australian Public Service—not to my staff.

Mr. Chapman: Don't get upset; we only want the facts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The kind of innuendo that the honourable member and members opposite are making about my staff and public servants today shows no doubt that they do not want the facts at all; all they want, and all that is on at the moment (we heard it from the member for Glenelg last night)—

Mr. Chapman: If the cap fits, wear it. We want the information.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is part of a little group on the Opposition benches, all of whom have been provided with a little piece of paper from which to ask a question. They say that the idea of this is to bring pressure to bear on the Premier. In fact, the member for Glenelg last night revealed the tactic. He said, "Here we were in this House (he was referring to yesterday), bringing pressure to bear on the Premier who was up there stuttering for an answer. We were doing this because he had been to a party the previous night, and we thought he would not be up to answering questions." That is what he said.

Mr. Chapman: Today it looks as though you are at another party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are at it again; but I can assure the honourable member that I do not mind a bit of this—I will give as good as I get, and a bit more besides.

Mr. Chapman: What is the innuendo in that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The innuendo that the honourable member has made clearly in this House is that the Public Service Board, in recommending the appointment of Mr. Mitchell, has acted improperly in appointing to the Public Service someone who was previously a member of my personal staff. That is the innuendo, and the honourable member is a disgrace to this House by attacking a public servant in this way. Mr. Mitchell applied for the position, and so far as my memory serves me (I will have to check this) there was one other applicant, who was also an officer in that department. Mr. Mitchell was recommended and appointed, and no-one can say that he is not an excellent officer, fully qualified for the post—he is. I reject utterly the kind of innuendo that members opposite are going on with. I do not mind it politically; the more that honourable members opposite descend into base personalities rather than deal with the policies of this State, the worse they will fare publicly.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say what part the Public Service Board played in the assessment of Mr. Parkes for appointment to the Publicity and Design Services Branch of the Premier's Department? I have some knowledge of where Mr. Parkes has worked. It has been put to me that Mr. Parkes's position in a Hong Kong and Macao tourist office was that he, to some degree, supervised the office that sells tickets to hydrofoil passengers. His job in the tourist industry might not be much greater than that however. I should therefore like to know from the Premier whether the Public Service Board had any say in the assessment of Mr. Parkes in the appointment that he is expected to take up at the beginning of December. Some people in the industry believe that Mr. Parkes is possibly not a suitable person to promote the tourist industry in the publicity field even though the Premier might think that he is suitable for appointment to his department. I therefore ask the Premier whether the Public Service Board had any part to play in this appointment or whether it was solely on the Premier's Department that the appointment was made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's reflections on Mr. Parkes are of the kind of innuendo with which the Opposition has been free today.

Mr. Evans: I asked you what—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has, under privilege in this House, made a gross reflection on Mr. Parkes's personal competence. He is doing that to a public servant who is not in a position to defend himself, and that is disgraceful behaviour.

Mr. Evans: Is he a public servant?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is employed in the Public Service.

Mr. Evans: At the moment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He will be, as soon as he takes up his contract position. Mr. Parkes was one of the applicants for the position of Director of the Tourist Bureau. He was one of those who, because of his qualifications and background, was on the short list to be interviewed by the interviewing panel.

Mr. Evans: And he was suitable for appointment as Director?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was not recommended for appointment to the post of Director of the Tourist Bureau and, in fact, no-one has been appointed to that position.

Mr. Evans: Will they be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: None of those applicants will be.

Mr. Evans: Will anyone?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is going to be recalled.

Mr. Evans: When?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as there is a sign on the horizon that there is someone suitable to be appointed. We will then recall it as a Public Service post, and get applicants anew. The fact is that on present indications we have not a good field of applicants, any one of whom will meet all the qualities required for appointment as Director of the Tourist Bureau. We are considering international advertising of the post and a possible reclassification of it to attract applicants of the kind that we need.

In the course of discussion with a Commissioner of the Public Service Board, Mrs. Stevens, in relation to the position in the Tourist Bureau and that in the Publicity Branch, Mrs. Stevens said that, from interview, and given Mr. Parkes's particular background, which has been an extremely successful one in establishing a whole series of international offices publicising Macao and being responsible for their operation, Mr. Parkes appeared to be not only a very experienced journalist but also, given his administration and experience in publicity, an ideal applicant for the Publicity Branch. However, he had not applied for that position. We had not found a suitable applicant for appointment as head of the Publicity Branch. As a result of that recommendation by Mrs. Stevens regarding her view of Mr. Parkes's qualities, which she had observed in her interview with him, Mr. Parkes was brought back for a special interview and asked whether he would be interested in the Publicity Branch post instead of the Tourist Bureau post. He indicated that he was interested.

Mr. Evans: Did he ask for a contract?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he did.

Mr. Evans: And he would not come in under that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he would not. He wanted a contract post, given the position which often faces the Government in recruiting people from the private sector. Numbers of people from the private sector want a contract post. I point out that the other person whom we had considered for head of the Publicity Branch also wanted a contract post. After interview, he was offered a contract post, and he has eventually, after negotiation, taken up the contract. He will take up his duties, from memory, I think at the end of October. I am not certain whether it is the end of October or the end of November; I will have to check that. However, later this year he will be able to transfer from his job in Hong Kong and Macao. Mr. Parkes is an Australian of very considerable experience in this area and with a great deal of experience in various forms of media presentation, as well as in the administration of publicity activities on a world-wide scale.

HEALTH FUNDS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain from the Minister of Health information for me regarding the overall effect of the Federal Government's cut-back in the field of health and hospitalisation on this State's ability to carry out further expansion, especially regarding hospitals? I am concerned that the cut-back could have an effect in relation to extensions that are urgently required at Whyalla Community Hospital. I am more concerned that the reduction in spending could effect other areas in the State as well.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can understand the honourable member's concern because, in company with other members I, when a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, inspected Whyalla Community Hospital. As the matter obviously concerns my colleague, I will bring down a report containing the information the honourable member wishes.

GOVERNOR'S SECRETARY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct my question to the Premier. Will Mr. John White be employed by the Premier's Department when he takes up his appointment as Secretary to the Governor, and, if so, to whom will he be responsible? As an integral part of the Constitution of this State, the Governor's position is traditionally one of complete independence, and the viceregal staff has been independent of Government departments. The appointment of Mr. White as Secretary to the Governor while he is still a member of the Premier's Department could seriously compromise that independence, and could possibly place Mr. White, a highly respected public servant, in a difficult position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply is "No."

MEDIBANK

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to inquire into and take the necessary action to assure members of the public that, by joining Medibank, they will be given the best possible service by the medical profession? In a report in yesterday's *News*, Dr. J. F. Harley, State President of the Australian Medical Association, said that most Adelaide doctors would tell their patients to insure with private health funds. The report continues:

"The continuation of private funds is essential for the continuation of private practice in Australia," Dr. Harley said. "Most doctors would suggest to their patients that they consider continuing in private funds or, when they are considering their choice for October 1, to patronise the private funds." Dr. Harley believes no doctor would give inferior service to Medibank patients. "I would deplore that idea and I don't think it could happen," he said.

It is apparent that some doctors have been fleeing Medibank, and the implication in this report is that some patients could receive inferior treatment by joining Medibank.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Of course, I would be alarmed if I thought that any person was going to receive inferior treatment from the medical profession because he was a member of Medibank. As Minister of Community Welfare, I think it is fair for me to say that in the House, even though the main part of this question involves my colleague. I expect that all other members would feel the same way. It seems to me that there has been a long period of silence in relation to Medibank from the medical profession generally over the past several months which, I think, indicates that what has been happening to Medibank presumably has been in accordance with the wishes of the medical profession. One would have to search quite a deal to find any comment whatsoever, even though responsible people throughout Australia have been critical of what has happened to Medibank over the last eight, nine, 12, 15, or however many changes that have been made to it since Mr. Hunt took over as Minister.

It seems to me that the Australian Medical Association has a grave responsibility in this area and, apart from Dr. Harley's suggesting as he did that no doctor would give inferior service, I would have been happier if, as President of the A.M.A., Dr. Harley pointed out that that organisation had specifically considered this question and made sure, at least amongst its members, that there was no likelihood of this happening. In fairness to him, it may be that Dr. Harley is quite confident that this will not happen, and I allow for that fact. However, regarding any inquiry that may be made, I will bring this matter to my colleague's attention, and I am sure that he will give it every consideration.

HOUSE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Regarding established houses purchased by speculators, does the Attorney-General intend to legislate for their inspection by a person well versed in the construction of buildings? Many old houses in inner-suburban areas are being bought by speculators who rehabilitate them at the cheapest cost and make a handsome profit. I have seen several of these houses in my district and, during the course of only one year, found that the houses had salt damp, and many of them constructional defects that are hard to remedy. This has been found costly and, in some cases, the work involved has cost nearly as much as the purchase price of the house. This has made many people heartbroken, having lost most of their savings.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government is examining this matter, although it certainly has not reached a decision on whether legislation is necessary. Personally, I doubt whether legislation is necessary, as it seems to me that the Builders Licensing Board has effective powers to enable it to deal with this matter when complaints are brought to its notice. If members come across this type of complaint about builders or speculators, as the honourable member referred to them, I suggest that they bring the matters to the notice of the Builders Licensing Board on behalf of their constituents.

RETREAD TYRES

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the regulations have been altered recently which affect the prohibition of retread tyres from being used on motor vehicles registered after January 1, 1973? I have a report from the Victorian Automobile Chamber of Commerce that I have not been able to confirm, but it states that the ban has been lifted but that dealers may not yet advertise the fact to customers. I have contacted several South Australian dealers who are concerned that they have not been informed of the change. I ask the Minister whether the rumour is unfounded. If it is not unfounded we think it rather regrettable that such information should reach South Australia via Victoria.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that there was so much noise over there that I could not pick up what the honourable member was talking about, so I will have to look at it in *Hansard* and give him a reply in due course. I am sorry, but I could not understand the honourable member.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is a fact that the message that I received across the Chamber yesterday afternoon was that he had no intention of providing me with the documents that last week he said were available to members? Following statements by the Minister last week, I invited him to provide me with several documents relating to certain union affairs. The fact that the Minister was in agreement with the discussion, which took place across the Chamber, is recorded in *Hansard*, and he also offered me statements of account for the Vehicle Builders Union. When I asked him for the information yesterday, I believe that I was told by the Minister that he would not be my messenger. I seek the information to ascertain whether the Minister was big-timing last week, and this week will not come forward with the goods as promised.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: First, I did not make any statement in relation to the Vehicle Builders Union.

Dr. Eastick: Look in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not care what is in *Hansard*. I never made that statement: it was made by another member, and that member knows very well he made it, and the member for Light knows who made it. Although it appears in *Hansard*, I did not make that statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister must be given a chance to reply.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was not sung out by me.

Mr. Wotton: *Hansard* is incorrect!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am saying that I did not sing it out: the member who sung it out knows it. I have no authority to speak for the V.B.U. I indicated last week across the Chamber to the member for Light that I would be willing to provide him with the balance sheets of trade unions, but I have now changed my mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will not be the message boy for the Liberal Party; I am not paid as a courier.

Mr. Chapman: You can't get them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You put some money up, and put that to the test.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the Minister's attention to the fact that the term "you" is unparliamentary.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Honourable members are now claiming that I am unable to get this information. I tell them that I am unable to get it for them; if I want it for myself, I will procure it, but I will not be the message boy or courier for the member for Light.

ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill this session to give legislative effect to the City of Adelaide Development Plan? I understand that the powers of the City of Adelaide Development Committee under the present legislation expire on December 31 this year, and that the Adelaide City Council is now operating under interim development control. If the Bill is not passed a chaotic position could arise. I am involved in this, because I represent part of the city of Adelaide. We are now well through September, and it is likely to be an important and voluminous Bill, and one which is likely to be a hybrid

Bill (and therefore would have to be referred to a Select Committee). Because of its size, and the consideration that will be required of important matters for the first time, will the Minister introduce this measure immediately so that members can consider it fully? Can the Minister say specifically whether it will be introduced this session, and when?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is "Yes". I hope it can be introduced in time to give members time to consider it. As the honourable member said, it is an important Bill, and I gather some comfort from the way in which he addressed his question to indicate that he is likely to support it, especially as interim development control phases out at the end of December. Certainly, I shall be pleased to have the support of the member for Torrens. I do not think the Bill is a hybrid Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: That's a question I'm asked.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member said he thought it might be a hybrid Bill, so I am not putting words into his mouth.

Mr. Coumbe: I was talking about—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry that the honourable member perhaps does not intend to support the Bill. I should have thought that he would support it.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't put words in my mouth.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It seems that it will not be a hybrid Bill and will not have to go to a Select Committee. The previous city of Adelaide Bill was not required to go to a Select Committee, and I do not think it will be necessary for this one to be so referred. Certainly, the shortness of time available before the end of the year is a factor of concern to the Government, and we are making haste.

Mr. Coumbe: When are you likely to bring it in?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As soon as practicable, I would hope relatively early in October, certainly before the middle of October.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report on the planning of the Highways Department regarding the reconstruction and widening of Grand Junction Road between North-East Road at Holden Hill and Anstey Hill? The Minister will be aware that I have raised this matter previously, by correspondence, and by questions and speeches in this House. I refer the Minister to the last occasion, on September 7 in the adjournment debate, when I elaborated on the reasons why this work needs a higher priority. A deep open channel exists on a part of one side of the road, and the reconstruction and widening of the road would cause this open drain or creek to be filled in, which is also desirable.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Highways Department and get the information she seeks.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Transport say what route the Highways Department has planned for the South-Eastern Freeway from the crest of the range in the Measday Hill area to the junction of South Terrace and Glen Osmond Road? I understand that nothing will be done in the matter of reconstructing the freeway in this area until it reaches the junction of White Hill and the new bridge area, the by-pass near Murray Bridge. I am fully

aware that probably nothing will be or can be done until that time, but, following that time, I believe some change could be made at this end of the freeway. Are plans in hand for the route of the freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the best way to handle this matter would be to see whether the Highways Department could provide me with a sketch, map or drawing of some description. I could bring that down for the honourable member, together with any other information I can obtain.

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport look into a matter that is causing concern to many motorists who travel on the South-Eastern Freeway through the Adelaide Hills in relation to what seems to be an increase in spillage, causing slippery conditions on the road surface? Will the Minister take up this matter, perhaps through the Road Traffic Board, with the South Australian Road Transport Association and kindred associations, seeking their co-operation in pointing out to their members the concern being expressed and the hazards resulting from this spillage? People who travel extensively on the freeway have expressed their concern to me, and I am personally aware of the situation, because I travel frequently on the freeway. I am aware of at least three accidents that have occurred recently on the freeway as a result of spillage. One involved a relatively new car that was almost written off as a result of an accident caused recently by spillage. I have taken up this matter with the police, and I am informed that the spillage is often caused by overflowing fuel tanks on transports negotiating the hills. Will the Minister investigate the matter and, if it is not proved to be the result of such conditions with the transports, will his department investigate alternative causes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the honourable member said, this is a real problem. I do not think I need to follow the honourable member's suggestion, because an investigation has been under way for a considerable time, as far as I am aware. The Road Traffic Board is very conscious of the problem. Whilst the matter referred to may be an offence, the difficulty is in preventing it, rather than taking action afterwards. I will have a further discussion with the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board, who holds the dual position of Commissioner of Highways and has dual responsibilities, to see whether there is anything further I can add to what I have said or whether there are any further developments that the board has been able to undertake. I know that there have been discussions to try to solve the problem but, regrettably, there are still further occurrences. I do not think they are quite as frequent as it would appear. Of course, even if there is only one occurrence, it is one too many. I will discuss the matter with the Commissioner and see whether anything further can be done.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER AGREEMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House when he expects to have a meeting with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) to clear up the outstanding issues relating to the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways in South Australia to the Australian National Railways Commission?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I confess that I do not have a crystal ball and, therefore, I am not able to look into one. Further, I am not able to read Mr. Nixon's mind. I have asked him on no fewer than three occasions recently to expedite a meeting, assuring him that I am ready to talk with him wherever and whenever it is suitable to him.

Regrettably, Mr. Nixon must have a scarcity of office staff, because I do not even get an acknowledgment of my letter, let alone a reply.

Mr. Becker: You take two months to reply to me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that that is quite true. The member for Hanson is being unfair when he says that. I will again be writing to Mr. Nixon urging him to do something, because it is not a joke: the lives of about 8 000 railway employees are being humbugged around, and we want to get this matter cleared up, in accordance with the agreement, to the satisfaction of all concerned—the employees, the State and the Commonwealth. I have done my level best up to now, and I have not given up trying. I will continue to press Mr. Nixon to resolve the outstanding matters but, regrettably, even when he was in Adelaide to attend a National Country Party meeting a fortnight ago he did not even have the courtesy to let me know he was coming to town. Had he let me know, I would have travelled with him in his car to Angaston or Nuriootpa or wherever he was going and used the hour of travelling time to resolve the matter, but he did not even tell me he was coming.

GLENELG TRAFFIC

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say how much longer the road widening and the provision of pedestrian crossing lights will take at the junction of Brighton Road and Jetty Road, Glenelg? If it is to be a matter of weeks, will the Minister instruct his department to divert traffic to make the situation less chaotic than it is now? It has now taken between five and six weeks to work on this crossing, which is still nowhere near completed, from what I can gather. Half the road is closed, and people trying to cross Brighton Road (even young people) are experiencing difficulty in doing so. The other day a lady told me that it took her between 15 and 20 minutes to cross Brighton Road at this point. If the Minister would agree to divert traffic down Pier Street, Partridge Street or maybe High Street, the bottleneck at the crossing referred to would be greatly eased.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what chaos there is in the area, but I will certainly ask the Commissioner of Highways to discuss with the Glenelg council the matter of traffic flow; after all, it has the principal responsibility in that area. If there is a problem, I am quite sure that the council will do as it has always done and will adopt a realistic and co-operative attitude.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Fisheries for what purpose the fishing research vessel to cost \$300 000 that was referred to in today's *Advertiser* will be used? The vessel is obviously of considerable dimension. The announcement is timely for the fishing industry. In the past few years a vessel costing about \$60 000 was used for fishery research. It now seems that, with the appointment of a permanent officer as head of the Fisheries Branch in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, research will be carried out. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will confer with his colleague and bring down a report about the extent to which this research vessel will be used.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do that.

SUN ECLIPSE

Mr. VANDEPEER: My question, which I direct to the Minister of Education, is a serious question on a serious subject. What action has the Minister taken to alert the teaching staff of the Education Department to the dangers involved to the eyes of the people of South Australia, on October 23, during the eclipse of the sun? We have been alerted to this danger, because the total eclipse can be observed in the South-East of South Australia, and Mount Gambier and Millicent are centres in this area. There will be a great influx of tourists, scientists, and many people interested in star-gazing, etc., into this area but the danger to the eyes of the general public is extremely great. It is the first time we have had a total eclipse in South Australia in anyone's lifetime and, until today, when we had lunch with two optometrists, I myself must admit I did not completely understand the danger involved in viewing the eclipse. We have had it explained to us today. We have been studying it previously and it has now been brought home to us completely. Can the Minister say what action he is taking in this direction because of the great danger to the eyes of the people of South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As a keen amateur astronomer, I regret that the honourable member did not receive your call, Mr. Speaker, earlier in Question Time; I feel it is incumbent upon me to be fairly brief in view of the imminent onset of Government business.

Mr. Vandeppeer: It is much more important than Government business.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The matter has already been raised in Parliament, by the member for Victoria and the Minister of Health. Teachers generally are very much aware of the problem. I understand that the *Teachers Journal* has already run one article on this subject; also, the Science Teachers Association has been very active in the same respect. It should be made clear, of course, that no more danger is involved in looking at the sun during an eclipse than there is at any other time in looking at the sun, but most of us are not so stupid as to look at the sun at normal times because there is nothing to see, anyway. Of course, a person can look at the sun at ordinary times but it has the same devastating effect on the eyes as it does when looking at the sun during an eclipse. It is only at the point of complete totality that viewing the sun would be safe, except, of course, under extreme meteorological conditions, such as a mist or something like that. The fact is that totality will be available only for a brief few minutes in a very small area of the State, and for the rest of the State and outside that area, of course, there will be no totality; it will be only a partial eclipse, and viewing the sun during a partial eclipse is as dangerous as viewing it normally. People must be made aware of this fact. There is some sort of feeling abroad that, because the eclipse is taking place, somehow there is a lessening of the light from the sun and that this will mean that marginally it is safer to view it; but that is not so, except at the point of complete totality and with the exception—

Dr. Tonkin: That is not true; a lot of work has been done on this.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think it can be demonstrated that many people have viewed complete totality without an injurious effect on the eyes.

Dr. Tonkin: But, if they look at it—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course, it is necessary that there be proper instruments to demonstrate when totality occurs. The corona, which is the only part of the

sun visible at totality, produces only a very feeble light. There is so very little light available from the sun that the stars are visible then. But none of this will happen in the metropolitan area or in any other part of the State except in a small portion of the honourable member's electoral district, the electoral district of the member for Victoria, and the electoral district of the member for Mount Gambier. I hope to be one of those who will have time to be in the zone of totality at that time. I will endeavour to ascertain from my departmental officers whether they feel any publicity through the schools, over and above what has already been given, is necessary, and I will provide a further answer to the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MEMBER'S
REMARKS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Last night, during the adjournment debate, the member for Florey brought to the attention of this House the complaint by Mr. G. W. Bailey of Angaston against his former employer, Mr. R. H. Angas of R. H. Angas and Company—

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage I fail to see how this is a personal explanation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am about to point out to the House my involvement in this case. Last night, the member for Florey criticised my behaviour in relation to a complaint from this constituent. I am about to point out the exact facts of what happened, and, if the Government does not like it—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not a personal explanation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Of course it is; it is a personal explanation of my involvement in this case.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow any new matter to be discussed at this stage; I want that to be understood.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I accept that. I am not going to debate the matter of the complaint lodged; I am simply going to raise before this House my involvement in this matter, which last night was criticised by the member for Florey.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will stick to that section on his own part and not in any way debate the matter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: During that debate, the member for Florey launched an attack against me. The assumptions upon which that attack was based were completely false. The facts are as follows. In late July, Mr. and Mrs. Bailey met me in Parliament House, having been referred to me by the Hon. J. Dunford. The couple related three matters to me. The first matter concerned the circumstances surrounding Mr. Bailey's dismissal by Mr. Angas. The second matter related to the behaviour of certain agents who inspected the house Mr. Bailey occupied on the property of Mr. Angas. The third matter concerned the lack of a pastoral award for farm managers. After discussing these problems for about 30 minutes, Mr. and Mrs. Bailey left for an appointment with their solicitor. Before they left, I asked them to return to Parliament House after seeing the solicitor so that we could discuss what further action should be taken.

Late that same afternoon they returned for a further discussion lasting about 45 minutes. They reported that

the solicitor had advised them that no action could be taken on the first two matters, namely, the dismissal and the behaviour of the agents. Naturally, they were disappointed. In answer to a specific question from me, Mr. Bailey said his only remaining request was that I examine the need for a pastoral award for farm managers. He left with me a scrap-book of letters he had written to the news media on this subject.

I investigated the need for such an award. No action was taken, but on August 31, 1976, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Bailey:

Thank you very much for the loan of your material relating to the need for a new award for farm managers and for a revision of the existing award for farm-hands and station-hands. I have discussed this matter with several people and will continue to push for some action to be taken as quickly as possible. Forwarded under separate cover is your project book. Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

About two weeks ago, I received correspondence from Mr. Bailey, including a statement concerning his dismissal. The letter is undated but the statement is dated September 2, 1976. The purpose of this letter and statement was to supply further information on the need for a new award. The letter concludes, "Thank you for your time over my problem." That correspondence, only two weeks old, is still receiving my attention. I emphasise that prior to receiving this letter I had never received a written statement from Mr. Bailey. I am willing to show to any member all correspondence and notes I possess on this matter.

The member for Florey made two accusations against me: first, that I had had the correspondence for two months; and, secondly, that I had done nothing about it.

As to the first accusation, I had possessed the correspondence for only two weeks. As to the second accusation, I had taken action on the one and only aspect on which Mr. Bailey had asked me to take action. It was on the legal advice of his own solicitor—

The SPEAKER: Order! Without further leave of the House, the honourable member cannot continue.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I seek further leave so that I can continue, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It was on the legal advice of Mr. Bailey's own solicitor that we jointly concluded that no action could be taken on the other two issues. I refuse to defame people from the protection of this Parliament, especially after a solicitor has recommended that there are no grounds whatsoever for action. I emphasise again that only two weeks ago Mr. Bailey thanked me for my help. At no stage has he been the least bit critical of my efforts on his behalf. The member for Florey has now admitted to me that he did not even know that a legal opinion had been given in the case. The accusations and attack on me were malicious, baseless and disgusting, and obviously were made without even consulting Mr. Bailey. I am surprised that the member for Florey has accepted this story from the dubious Mr. Dunford, in another place. I would appreciate a withdrawal and an apology.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WELLS: Last night I made a contribution in this House in which I castigated a certain Mr. Angas and defended the position of Mr. Bailey, who had been an employee of Mr. Angas. During that contribution, I was critical of the actions of the member for Davenport, who has just referred to this matter. The member for Davenport had this matter before him in July, and

admitted it, by correspondence that was dated September 15 from the Bailey family and did not emanate from the Hon. Mr. Dunford as was suggested—

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. My point of order, which is taken very gently, is that the honourable member is debating the subject.

The SPEAKER: I feel that at this stage the honourable member is rebutting a charge that has been made against him.

Mr. WELLS: The information I disclosed did not emanate from the Hon. Mr. Dunford, but the truth of the matter is that Mr. Dunford referred Mr. Bailey to the member for Davenport, and the member for Davenport admitted to Mr. Dunford that, in fact, it appeared that intimidation had occurred. I want to say no more about the matter other than that I do not withdraw one word that I uttered last evening but that I would add to it this statement, that I am prepared—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the matter.

Mr. WELLS: I will not debate the matter further, other than to reject entirely the accusations made by the member for Davenport today and say that I would accept the word of Dunford rather than dubious Brown at any time.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think the honourable member has added insult to injury by describing a member on this side as being dubious. I do not believe that that is Parliamentary. I believe that it is a reflection on the honourable member concerned and I ask that that reflection be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. It is unparliamentary, and I ask the honourable member for Florey to withdraw that remark.

Mr. WELLS: If it causes offence to the honourable member I am forced and required, with all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw the remark, so although I realise that I cannot utter the fact that I consider that he is dubious, at least I cannot be prevented from thinking it, so I withdraw the remark.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order: I believe that the honourable member would do better and would justify his reputation more if he were to withdraw unconditionally.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has withdrawn his remark.

RUNDLE STREET MALL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 9. Page 927.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I indicate my support for this short Bill which provides several amendments to the principal Act, passed in 1975, some of which amendments were forecast at that time. The three amendments are, first, a change of name from Rundle Street Mall to Rundle Mall, and I have chosen to use the pronunciation of the hard A and call it mall, as in "tall". Other purists may disagree with me, but that is the way I am going to pronounce it. The Bill sets out to remove "Street" and to call it Rundle Mall, instead of the Rundle Street Mall, and this has been unanimously recommended by the steering committee. I pay a tribute to the committee for the work it has carried out. It has done a remarkably good job. I think that we have become used to the term

"Rundle Mall" instead of "Rundle Street Mall". Signs labelled "Rundle Street" still appear to be there, but I presume that they will be removed after the Bill has been passed.

The other two amendments increase the maximum liability of the Government from \$100 000 to \$400 000, and the Adelaide City Council's special borrowing powers are increased from \$200 000 to \$800 000. The last two amendments were to some extent foreshadowed in the report of the Select Committee, which, in 1975, recommended to the House of Assembly the adoption of this measure at that time. The committee realised that there would have to be some increase in these two lines, but it was uncertain at the time to what extent these increases would have to go. The matter was left in the air, and this Bill sets out to satisfy those requirements. Since the 1975 measure was passed and the Select Committee took evidence, I have had the opportunity (as no doubt other members have had) to see other malls in Australia and overseas. I refer particularly to the Martin Place Mall, in Sydney, and the Hay Street Mall, in Perth.

Mr. Mathwin: Have you seen the mall in London?

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member can have his chop in a minute, if he so wishes, but I appreciate his support.

Mr. Mathwin: This is a mall (as in pal), though.

Mr. COUMBE: Let us agree to differ on pronunciation, but I am speaking Australian.

Mr. Mathwin: I'll report you to the Queen if you do that.

Mr. COUMBE: I was referring briefly to malls I had seen in various parts of the world. Possibly, the one which I saw most recently and which I think is most successful is right in the heart of Tokyo, in the Ginza district, and it is open sometimes on Saturdays and Sundays for limited periods.

I watched with considerable interest the construction of the Rundle Street Mall, namely, the paving, the services being provided, the installation of the street furniture, etc., and the movement of people and shoppers in that area. The use of the mall must be a popular kind of exercise, and the recent opening day certainly attracted a large crowd: not because of the person who performed the opening but because of the occasion. Whether they were there to get free champagne, I do not know, but I do know that many people did not get free champagne on that day.

Mr. Langley: How did you go?

Mr. COUMBE: I did not get a drop. The mall has, I think, caught the imagination of many people. I hope that it flourishes. I have received one or two complaints from people whose properties are subject to the special rate provided in the parent Act, that is, from occupants of premises that do not abut the mall directly, people back as far as Grenfell Street or North Terrace. Another complaint concerns the insufficient availability of taxicabs for shoppers, the aged or infirm, expectant mothers and others who seek an improvement in the taxi service.

However, it is a fact that the mall is here to stay, and I hope it flourishes. In the previous debate it was made clear that, for the mall to be a success, not only was it essential for after-hours and other activities and entertainment to be provided but also during trading hours the mall had to be successful as a trading place. I have not been able to ascertain what effect the creation of the mall has had on the trading position of shops directly abutting it. Perhaps that information will be obtained by the Select Committee, or perhaps the Minister already has it and can indicate the position in this matter. I

hope the mall proves successful for these businessmen because, after all, they have to pay the special segment of the rate provided under the parent Act. That is all I want to say at this time, because the matter has to be considered by a Select Committee. I indicate my support for it.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise briefly to support the Bill. I, like the member for Torrens, was a member of the Select Committee that inquired into this matter. At that stage we were discussing the word "mall". The member for Torrens pronounces it with a long vowel, as in "tall", and that sort of "maul" is something I associate as happening more often than not in the dark. Certainly, in referring to the Queen's English, one would say that she would refer to it as a "mall" as in "pal". Presumably, we speak English here and would have the same pronunciation as would apply in relation to the London Mall. The Select Committee examined this matter. Concern was expressed about the shifting of sewerage mains and other services in Rundle Street. After investigation it was found that the existing Doulton mains were in such good condition that it was decided to leave them as they were, because they were in better condition than would be any newly constructed mains. I have seen several malls around the world. I refer to the Rotterdam Mall.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the mall in Canberra?

Mr. MATHWIN: I think Mal Fraser is pretty good. The Rotterdam Mall is used to great effect, as are all the malls of which I know. I have seen malls in other States; certainly, I have seen one of the Sydney malls. To me, the construction of the Rundle Mall was a step in the right direction. It is a great improvement, and should have taken place years ago in South Australia. If I were to criticise anything about it at all, I might refer to the type of fountain that has been put into place. The fountain is small and insignificant.

True, perhaps we could not have had a high and wide fountain, but a somewhat larger and more beautiful construction, say, with a cascade, could have been built providing a better atmosphere than the existing fountain, which is little more than the equivalent of a bird bath. Unfortunately, I suppose it will be there for all time, or perhaps until someone provides something better and more gracious than what we have now in the centre of the mall.

I think the biggest problem will be at the eastern end, when the car-parking station is erected. The Minister will be faced with difficulty when the traffic is using that car park, and he will have to decide how to get rid of the many vehicles that will use the parking station, which will be erected on what was the site of Foys building. I also hope that the many protesters around the place, some of whom protest about minor things, will not use the mall for this type of activity, because to do so would detract from the pleasure and enjoyment of many people who use the area. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Harrison, Mathwin, Virgo, and Whitten; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 2.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved:
That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.
Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D. W. Simmons:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from September 22. Page 1184.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): First, I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, a document that has been neglected by this Parliament for many years; only in the past few years have members found the true worth of this report. On page 1 of the report for the year ended June 30, 1976, the Auditor-General states, in part:

... it is clear that a serious responsibility must rest on those who have the authority at various levels to expend public moneys. It is essential that the nature and extent of this responsibility be properly defined so that accountability can be determined; however, first-class financial management procedures are a prerequisite to accountability. Such procedures, which I have advocated in this report for several years, should, wherever possible, incorporate information on planned objectives and actual operational results, together with financial reporting that compares actual with planned expenditures.

I understand that a number of departments are moving in this direction, and that the Treasury is in agreement with this approach and is currently reviewing its accounting procedures to assist in achieving improved control of expenditures. If in some cases additional staff may be required, the savings that would result should far outweigh any additional costs involved.

I have been advocating this for some years since I entered this House, and I have read year after year the Auditor-General's remarks in this regard. In studying the report department after department, we find that little has happened about accountability in some departments. I place the responsibility fairly and squarely on the Ministers of those departments: Ministers are elected by this Government to oversee the operation of the departments within their portfolios. It is pleasing to note that there is an announcement in this afternoon's press that the Government intends to hire a financial expert. The report states:

The State Government is hiring a private consultant as part of a \$44 000 programme to improve financial management of Government departments.

One would consider that \$44 000 was extremely cheap, and one wonders why it has taken the Government so long to do something about it. The report continues:

He is Mr. Jim Dunkley, who has initially been appointed by the Public Service Board on a 12-month contract.

I do not object to that: if he is any good and if he is worth his salt, he will save more than he will be paid. The report continues:

Public Service Board Chairman, Mr. Graham Inns, said today there was nothing novel about a public body utilising expertise from the private sector.

Why has it taken so long? Why has the Chairman not heeded the previous reports of the Auditor-General? When we consider the accountability of some departments and the handling of the finances, we realise the arrogance of some departments, especially the Marine and Harbors Department (where the Auditor-General drew attention to the poor accountability), which stated that it had higher priorities than attending to accountability in the department. The South Australian Craft Authority has accumulated losses of \$437 000, yet we find year after year that the Auditor-General has stated that there is a lack of supervision and provision of vouchers for moneys spent, and of stock control. This would be the greatest rip-off of all time: moneys are being poured into the

organisation by the State Government but no-one seems to be controlling that money. We find that the State Government has obviously wasted not thousands, not tens of thousands, but hundreds of thousands of dollars by poor handling and poor supervision in some departments. It can be pin-pointed to the credibility of the Ministers who have the responsibility and control of the various departments. One wonders what they do, and whether they have the ability to understand and appreciate that they are handling taxpayers' money.

Mr. Mathwin: They farm out the responsibility.

Mr. BECKER: They can farm it out as much as they like. I do not know what happened when the Minister of Mines and Energy was Minister of Education, but he has messed up the education processes in this State by simply introducing change for the sake of change. He is now in charge of Monarto, and the Auditor-General's Report shows some interesting figures in relation to that town. We find that \$18 697 000 has been spent on Monarto to date, and that in that town about 14 990 hectares has been acquired, and in the area adjoining it 4 280 hectares has also been acquired. In all, about 17 270 hectares of land has been acquired.

That land, according to the Auditor-General's Report (and I do not doubt his statement), has cost \$8 127 000. However, the Monarto Development Commission has cost \$18 697 000 to operate. Planning and investigation costs to date have been \$1 400 000, and included the cost of consultancy work performed by State Government departments and private consultants for a variety of projects. Design costs total \$1 004 000 to date, and include work predominantly in the areas of the initial residential areas, housing, arterial roads, and engineering head-works. A total of \$1 305 000 has been expended to date on site development, mainly for tree-planting and nursery establishment undertaken by the Woods and Forests Department and the South Australian Housing Trust. That is an awful lot of trees! A total of \$4 780 000 has been expended on capitalised expenses to date, including interest, administrative and management expenses. The land has cost about \$420 a hectare to acquire and about twice that sum is involved in supervision by the Monarto Development Commission. We are getting a poor deal.

One wonders what the price of a block of land in Monarto will be if the project ever comes to fruition. In my opinion, the \$18 000 000 spent on Monarto has been wasted. We have only \$8 000 000 worth of land to show for it, and the price of land at Monarto will be in the bracket of high-class metropolitan allotments.

Mr. Wardle: Will it be \$4 000 a block?

Mr. BECKER: The price, on those figures, will be more than \$4 000 a block. The member for Davenport told the House 12 months ago that he estimated that, by the time the commission was ready to get under way, land would cost about \$15 000 a block.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you a fan of Hans Christian Andersen or of Grimm?

Mr. BECKER: I am a fan of anyone who believes that it is about time the Minister brought practical economics into the situation of the departments that have come under his control; their financial management has not stood the test. In the Education Department, according to the Auditor-General's Report, glaring examples of incompetence and waste of public money are evident. This should not happen in our Government departments if Ministers were on the ball, and these ridiculous errors should not occur. The Minister is looking for \$9 500 000

to buy shares in the pipelines for the gas fields. That should be given to the public. If he had not wasted all this money and if he had not kept on bumping up—

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I shall direct my attention to the abysmal failure of the Minister of Labour and Industry in this Government to fulfil promises he has made to members in this House, promises based on his own statements of ability to perform. Quite obviously, following the debacle of a reply he gave to my question this afternoon, he is unable to support those statements.

Mr. Wardle: He was bragging.

Dr. EASTICK: Certainly, he was bragging when he said he could get access to these matters. Was he suggesting that he can direct the President of the court? I do not believe that to be so, because I respect the court and its officers far more than I can respect the word of the Minister, following statements we have heard in this place in the past week. Obviously, the Minister failed to recognise the ambit of the legislation he is commissioned to supervise. The member for Torrens, after the Minister had spoken, clearly indicated to him the various features of the legislation involved. On September 15, the Minister said (*Hansard*, page 1041):

I think that every South Australian is at liberty to examine the balance sheets of all trade unions because, under the legislation, the balance sheets are available.

I point out that the Minister is responsible to the people of South Australia for the administration of the legislation. The Minister also said:

Opposition members can find from the Arbitration Court all the things they are concerned about—

The member for Torrens subsequently drew the Minister's attention to the fact that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, had something to say about this matter, as follows:

The Registrar or any officer of the court or the commission shall not, except by direction of the President, divulge to any person other than an officer of a registered association the name of any member of that association or the financial position of that association.

Again this afternoon the Minister said that he could get this information, but he would not make it available to other members. The same Minister last week said in the House that he would put so many balance sheets on the desk in front of me that I would not be able to see over the top of them. What is the importance of this matter? Government members consistently say, when Opposition members say anything about union affairs, that we are union bashing or plaguing the union movement. However, when Government members involve themselves in the activities of business and companies, they are, according to what they maintain, not at all interfering with industry; they are not bashing business and companies! They are simply making political points!

Mr. Nankivell: Nor reflecting on personalities!

Dr. EASTICK: No! The reason why I wanted the information from the Minister is that a union member in my district was recently put out of work. The notice of termination of service said:

Service terminated by the company due to breach by Mr. Edwards on rule No. 1 of the works rule; that is, "Failing to belong to a trade union recognised by the company."

Government members will appreciate that that is no reason for termination of service. No doubt this matter will be the subject of a court action. Mr. Edwards's solicitors informed him as follows:

The main ground on which we based our application is that you were illegally dismissed, in that the company terminated your services for your alleged failure to belong to a trade union "recognised by the company". Section 157 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act makes it illegal for an employer to dismiss any employee for his membership or non-membership of any association. A trade union falls within the definition of "an association" under that Act.

The letter then informs the gentleman of what court action has been taken to bring the matter forward. When the gentleman first approached me, he informed me that he was in some difficulty because he was over 50 years of age and to lose employment at that age, particularly in an industry of fairly limited opportunity, was a real difficulty. He had been the State President of a union, but he seems to have lost his presidency because the Secretary and others held meetings without his knowledge. He provided me with copies of letters he had forwarded to the Federal Secretary of his union, and he also provided me with copies of the reply he received from the Federal Secretary, which in part gives a clear indication of the depth of the problem that exists, as follows:

It is somewhat difficult to answer your questions other than to say—that the question of S.A. branch financial statements have been the bane of my life for a long time and reports have been made to Federal council. I probably will be the one who has to answer to the court when the matter is raised in February, 1976. It probably goes back to when a public auditor company charged \$175 for a \$300 branch income and I yelled and then—

and a person was named—

had an accountant friend who did the work for a couple of years for a nominal sum and I believe he then moved and—the person was named again—

I suppose Einstein would find it difficult to work out now, but I informed—

and the man is named again—

is now battling with it. I wish to Christ you had not raised it now with all the strife we are having with the M.W.U., it has been impossible for me in a one-man office to cope properly with other things which need to be done, as the M.W.U. drained my office funds through forced legal costs, and I have had to seek advances from the Victorian and New South Wales branches to ensure my own wages.

That is only part of the reply. When a person delivers into my keeping information of that nature I try to ascertain whether the detail is legitimate. I wrote to the union of which this man states he was a member and to another union of which he became a member. I was advised by both unions that I was not allowed to have detailed information about his membership of the union unless he expressly desired it. Subsequently, I provided that, and I have answers from both unions. Only last evening I received yet another letter from a union officer in which it was indicated that Mr. Edwards had filled in an application to join the A.M.W.U. on June 27, 1976. The letter stated:

This form was handed to me some time later by a shop steward with the instruction that he thought—

and the person was named, and it was stated that he thought that person was a member of another union. The letter continued:

On August 22 Mr. Edwards phoned me at home asking if I had received an application form . . .

The long and short of it (I am running out of time) is that they failed to sign him up even though he had the right, according to the information contained in the letter, to be signed up. That person is out of a job. He was a member of a union, and was not receiving any proper support from his union colleagues.

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

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I wish to raise the matter of shack owners and shack sites. Some shack sites are on the sea coast and others are on riverfronts and at the edge of waterways. Shack owners generally like to get away from it all, perhaps from the rat race, and in so doing these people have made themselves comfortable and are able to meet with friends on sites on our long South Australian coastline as well as on the waterways. I know of some areas where there are no waterways but where these holiday houses abound. During the last State election campaign, the then Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Eastick, announced at Port Lincoln that the Liberal Party would stand by its formerly announced policy to give shack owners affected by Government interference a 20-year stay with their present buildings. After the 20-year period, existing shacks would be considered individually on their merits, and every consideration would be given to the owners concerned. In the interim, new approvals would be subject to stronger controls than in the past.

That was a simple statement which recognised the rights of the individual and that there would be discussions with the people themselves or their representatives regarding what was wanted. In April this year, members were circularised with a copy of the South Australian Labor Government's policy regarding shack sites. The policy, which categorises shack sites into four groups, states:

Shack sites on sea, river and lake frontages fall broadly into four categories, namely:

- 1.1 Sites on Crown lands over which the Lands Department has issued annual licences to shack owners. These are subject to the full measures of this policy.
- 1.2 Sites on Crown lands over which district councils have been authorised to issue annual licences to shack owners. These are subject to the full measures of this policy except for that relating to conversion of annual licences to miscellaneous lease tenure (paragraph 2.6).
- 1.3 Sites on reserves the control of which is vested in district councils by proclamation specifying a particular land use. These sites are let by councils to shack owners pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Act. The terms and conditions of leases issued by councils over these sites are not known to the Lands Department. Apart from tenure aspects, councils have been requested to apply all other measures of the policy to these sites.
- 1.4 Sites on private property, that is, freehold and Crown leasehold land. These are not subject to any of the measures of this policy.

There are not many shacks in that category. Other Opposition members and I have been told recently of the concern about the administration of this policy, and many shack owners wonder how long they will be able to enjoy the privileges which have become part and parcel of their lives. Representations have been made to me that in some areas shack owners have been told that they are not permitted to enlarge their structures, perhaps by erecting a lean-to in which they can store their vehicles or caravans, or even to construct a boat shed. This type of construction is vital for people who set out to preserve what represents a large part of their capital, such as a boat or motor car, during a period at the seaside.

It is not uncommon for families to go to the beach perhaps from November until April, which is a considerable time. This type of construction is a form of protection for valuable pieces of equipment. This is only one aspect that leads me to believe that perhaps the Government or the department is taking a hard administrative line in this regard. However, I am not suggesting that there should be open slather, because the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the environment, waterways, and so

on, are not polluted. From discussions I have had with shack owners, I believe they are only too willing to co-operate and carry out the wishes of the Government, provided it is not too restrictive. Restrictions or requirements such as those to which I have referred are against the interests of the preservation and the full enjoyment of the shack sites. I hope that the Minister will note that and perhaps take a more lenient view in this regard, because I imagine that, if one cannot construct a shed for his motor car or boat, perhaps he should not be there at all.

Last night, I was interested to hear the member for Florey handing out a bashing to all members on this side, and he seemed to suggest (I do not want to be unfair to him, but I think he said this) that members of the Opposition lacked guts to do certain things and we had no regard for people on the pay-roll of the rural establishment. He did not actually say that but that is the way I took it. I say to the member for Florey that those are fairly objectionable and sweeping statements to be made against the Opposition, because I think I can say for every member on this side of the House that we do have mercy in our breasts and consideration for people who work for us.

I cite my own case: I have had no difficulties with people who work for me. We have had a long and continued understanding and we have mutual respect. The type of case that the member for Florey brought up last night is certainly isolated (I do not want to canvass that) but perhaps in the heat of the moment he made a nasty implication about members on this side, that we chose to represent the plutocrats who wanted to live in the mansion on the hill while perhaps those in the valley could have a bone thrown to them and wear sackcloth. That does not make good reading and, what is more, there is no essence of truth in it.

If we are to have that sort of thing said in the House, it does not make for good government or for Parliament to work as it should. Irrespective of which side of the House one serves on, one should show some concern for people in all walks of life. We should all be equal to each other in this regard and have some consideration for Tom Jones, Dick Brown, or anyone else, irrespective of his station in life or whatever his task in this world may be.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): So that we can have this matter thoroughly ventilated (and I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman), do I take it that estimated payments, for which this appropriation is authorised in various Acts, are not considered at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing only with the schedule of the Bill. The procedure to be observed is contained in Standing Order 314, which states:

Provided that in considering an Appropriation Bill or Public Purposes Loan Bill, the clause or schedule containing the several appropriation votes shall be considered first.

Legislative Council, \$203 000—passed.

House of Assembly, \$355 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding the item "Oversea visit of the Leader of the Opposition, Leader's wife and officers", I note that that item was previously included in Legislature, Miscellaneous. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for this? I understand an estimate of \$18 000 was included at one stage for a contemplated trip that was cancelled. Is

that the reason that that figure was taken? I think the Treasurer quoted a larger sum than that earlier in the press.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The figure was simply taken as an estimate of the likely cost. Obviously, there could be considerable variations from that sum. It is there in order to establish a figure on the line.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$137 000.

Dr. TONKIN: I note that the library staff payments have been considerably increased this year. Is that because of the employment of additional research staff for a full year? I pay a tribute to the work of members of the research staff in the library who are doing a remarkably fine job. Can the Treasurer say what other plans the Government has for providing further research services in the library?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members of the research staff were originally appointed on the basis of an estimate by the Public Service Board as to the requirements of research staff. Since then, no submission has been made to me on the requirement of additional research staff. If a submission is made, it will have to be justified on a report to me by the board, but I have not had it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The two library research officers sit in the main part of the library at desks in between the bookshelves. As they are often interrupted by school-children and other visitors to the library, it must be difficult for them to undertake their research work. Can the Premier say whether new facilities in the basement will be provided for these officers this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know, but I will inquire for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Joint House Committee, \$143 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Treasurer say whether there are plans to alter present staff arrangements at Parliament House, bearing in mind that new kitchen facilities are to be provided early in the new year? Also, when new car-parking facilities are provided and other alterations are made, will any alteration be necessary to the caretaking facilities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, provision has not been made for a significant alteration to the staff, given the figures shown here. I am not aware of any proposed change in staffing, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to provide a non-members' bar for the large staff working at Parliament House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I agree that this would be desirable. In fact, it was provided for in plans that were originally prepared some years ago for considerable alterations to this House. A non-members' bar was provided in those proposals.

Mr. Rodda: And a refreshment room.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; however, the proposal turned out to be very expensive and, because of the general position of the Loan funds at that time, plus the fact that the proposal would have destroyed a number of the historic aspects of this building (inter-flooring, which was necessary, would have changed markedly the design of the building and the interior), it was not felt that it was reasonable to proceed with the plan. We could not find the money at that time. The proposal would have involved the construction of an expensive further wing of Parliament House which had been planned, and it was felt that, rather than do that, we could lessen the pressure on Parliament House by providing members

with offices in their own district. That has proved to be a successful venture, and it was much less costly than were the alternatives. Unfortunately, that meant that we undertook only a minor series of alterations and it was not possible, in those minor alterations, as I am told by the Public Buildings Department, to provide the additional refreshment areas and bars for non-members as originally proposed. I assure the honourable member that the Government would desire to do what he has mentioned in future, if we are able to find a feasible way to provide it.

Dr. TONKIN: Regarding the plans for the restoration of the old Legislative Council building next door, I understand that there is talk about part of it being used for general Parliamentary purposes and part for a Parliamentary museum. Will that come under the jurisdiction of the Joint House Committee or of the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any proposal now to use the old Legislative Council building for Parliamentary purposes. At one time there was a suggestion that, during the course of the alterations to Parliament House, the old Legislative Council building should be used temporarily for Parliamentary purposes, but I am not aware at the moment of any proposal that it be restored to Parliamentary use.

Mr. Jennings: Since then there was a proposal for a block of Parliamentary offices there, but the National Trust opposed that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a proposal for an additional wing on the rear portion of land abutting the old Legislative Council building, but that has not been proceeded with. As my memory serves me, the proposals are that, when the Railways Institute vacates the old Legislative Council building, which hopefully it will do not long after the Motor Registration Division occupies its new building, that building will be provided as a historical museum particularly concerned with the development of Parliamentary institutions in South Australia; that it will house the museum and interpretative centre on the quite unique history that South Australia has in this way; and that some of the old outhouses will be demolished but that the historical part of the building will be retained as a major museum of South Australian historical interest. I am sure this will be a valuable addition to the facilities of the city as well as providing a marked increase in the educational opportunities that children have to learn something of the quite unique history of this State.

Mr. GUNN: I refer to what the Treasurer has said in reply to the member for Victoria about the old Legislative Council building. I understand that a suggestion was discussed and that certain suggestions were put to the Joint House Committee that a museum be established in the old building, that there could be other space available, and that suggestions were being sought about what use it should be put to. Will the Treasurer examine the matter to find out whether the suggestion made by the member for Victoria could be incorporated in some of the areas that may not be required for a Parliamentary museum?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly consider the matter. If that suggestion has been made, I think it has been made on the basis of some lack of understanding of how much space will be needed for the kind of interpretative centre and historical exhibition that it is planned to provide. Work already has taken place in the Art Gallery, in preparation of the historical exhibition, and the preparation of an interpretative centre there.

Line passed.

Electoral, \$356 000.

Mr. EVANS: Last year \$76 900 was allocated for elections and \$96 892 was spent. As it seems evident that the Treasurer is heading for an election, can he say whether the \$14 000 allocated this financial year is enough?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's crystal ball must be better than mine.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say when members can expect to obtain rolls of the proposed new electorates (assuming they have been prepared) or, at worst, copies of rolls that were prepared on the basis of the old electorate at June 30, when the computer programme for the advice of new enrollees went back to zero and then would proceed forward again?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): To date the Government has been prudent in this matter, because boundaries have not been finally determined. It has not spent funds on preparing rolls based on the new boundaries, as this will be done when boundaries become fixed and then operate. In the meantime the Government does not intend to issue new rolls. Members will know that the lists of new enrollees are continuing to be made available to them on the basis of the existing boundaries, and that will continue until the position arising out of appeals to the Supreme Court has been clarified.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney considered providing lists of deletions for the districts? Members receive details of additions but not deletions, and this list would help when people seek information. How expensive would it be, and how much work would be involved to provide details of deletions?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will examine the suggestion. It is easier and more accurate to provide lists of additions, as they are prepared from enrolment cards, completed and lodged with the Electoral Department. Details of deletions would have to be obtained from many sources: they are not readily available, and in many cases may be inaccurate.

Mr. EVANS: I accept that the list of deletions would not be complete, but the information on the list would be accurate because the department would have been informed why the names were being deleted. The member for Hanson makes the point that, when people transfer to other areas, they fill out a card and state their previous address. Automatically, that gives a record of the deletions and additions. Most members check the lists of additional names in their districts and they could also go through a list of deletions, because those of us who are active in our districts know many of the people who move out. If someone had moved out and if the name had not been deleted, the member would be able to inform the department. This could assist the department, as well as helping members of Parliament and others in the community. I hope the Attorney will look keenly at this; it is not a matter that should be brushed aside.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have said that I will look into the matter.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$24 000; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$6 000—passed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$862 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What items are included in "Administration expenses, minor equipment, and sundries"? This seems a large sum to be spent under "Miscellaneous". Can the Treasurer say how this sum will be spent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the administration expenses of the Legislature. Given the size of this establishment and the administration of the place, I do

not find it a surprising figure. I have not got a breakdown, but I will get one for the honourable member if he wishes.

Mr. EVANS: Is the supply of stationery to members for their electorate offices included in this line?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: I understand that members are allowed a certain number of photostats of any one document, using the machine in Parliament House, if the document is not too large. I made a request of the Speaker, which was refused. I asked whether I could be barred from using the facilities at Parliament House (a decision I would have been happy to accept) but be provided at my electorate office with an amount of paper equivalent to the amount I would have used had I taken advantage of the Parliament House facilities. I was not looking for any advantages, but the distinct benefit of not having to travel to Parliament House when Parliament was not sitting to have photostat copies taken if one could take them at one's electorate office and if one could provide one's own facilities, as regards a machine. Another point I wish to raise is that a member may have bought his own electric typewriter because it gives a better product, and I am wondering about payment for servicing the typewriter where the departmental machine is not used. I would be happy to return the departmental machine under those conditions. Will the Treasurer consider those two matters?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matters with my colleague and bring down a report.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say why there has been a reduction in the insurance premiums for members of Parliament? Has consideration been given to increasing the amount of cover, which at present is far below the normal standard? I suggest that it should be \$100 000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why there has been a reduction in the insurance premiums, but I will get a report for the honourable member. The amount of cover was originally fixed at \$20 000 at a time when it was aimed to cover members, in effect, for the equivalent of workmen's compensation. At that time the maximum workmen's compensation figure was, I think, \$12 000, and we were covering members for \$20 000, and it was increased about three years ago, from memory, to \$40 000. I will further consider the matter, but I would not have thought the figure was low.

Mr. VENNING: Following the redistribution of electoral boundaries, the areas of some electoral districts are now about 50 per cent greater than they used to be. Is it intended that there will be an added work load on electorate officers? Perhaps it will be necessary to establish a second electorate office in some of the larger districts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Except in one case, it has not been thought that there is any reason to give special extra electorate office provision. Metropolitan members have been servicing from one electorate office 18 000 or 19 000 constituents and, in one case, 33 000 constituents for some period. As far as the new Eyre District is concerned, whoever the new member is, there will be a case for special assistance that can be made to the Government. That case will be duly considered when a new member is elected for that district.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Some time ago a group of us debated whether members of Parliament are employees. Each time I receive a Medibank exemption form or a taxation deduction exemption it is always clearly stated that my employer is the House of Assembly. Are members of Parliament covered by the provisions of the Workmen's

Compensation Act? From what the Treasurer has said, I suggest that we are not so covered. In addition, what would happen if a member incurred high medical expenses of, say, \$150 000? I know members are covered for death or the loss of an arm or leg.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe that we are employees within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Act. An opinion was sought about this matter before the insurance scheme was introduced. I cannot help what appears on a group certificate, because the Taxation Commissioner's view does not involve State law regarding the Workmen's Compensation Act. The limit of insurance cover is the limit of the insurance policy covering members.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about medical expenses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They would be considered if a member was injured whilst on the job. To date there has not been a substantial claim.

Mr. RODDA: Last year at Millicent the Treasurer, in reply to a question by the Mayor, Mrs. Smith, when she said that she hoped that Millicent would not be disadvantaged by legislation with electoral redistribution, stated that the commission had a job to do and that it would do it. He added that he believed Millicent would have a district under that redistribution. People will be disadvantaged by the commission's decision, not members. The Millicent District and the Victoria District merge, with Millicent at one end and Naracoorte at the other end. Both towns have electoral offices. If the new member lives in Millicent, Naracoorte people will have the additional expense of telephoning him at Millicent, or vice versa. The same situation will apply to Mallee, part of which runs along the Coorong. Perhaps there is some justification for both offices being retained to serve the people.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has raised two questions. The first relates to the representation of the Millicent area. During the last election I answered a question at Millicent following statements made by members of the honourable member's Party, including the Hon. Renfrey DeGaris, that in fact Mount Gambier and Millicent would be combined. I said it was obvious that this was gross misrepresentation, because that could not happen under the terms of reference of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. Given the figures in each of the areas, there was no way in which Millicent and Mount Gambier could be in the same seat: Millicent would have to be in a different seat from Mount Gambier. Obviously, it would be in a larger area than the existing Millicent District. Millicent and Naracoorte were combined in the same seat, as they always had been before the 1954 redistribution. The honourable member knows that Millicent was in the old seat of Victoria, with Naracoorte and Penola. If it was all right in a redistribution which was provided for by the Liberal and Country League to combine those areas, it seems strange to me that the Liberal and Country Party members should now attack the Government on the ground that an independent commission, on terms of reference for which every member of this House voted, has recombined them in the same seat.

Dr. Tonkin: We tried to amend them. Now, come on, be reasonable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member moved an amendment which he knows was quite incompetent, because it simply could not have worked and, having lost that amendment, he then voted for the terms of reference.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Having looked through the Budget papers, I assure the Leader that I allowed too much

latitude to the member for Victoria. As honourable members know, there is nothing about electorate offices or the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission in this line, which relates to administrative expenses. Perhaps those matters will come under the Public Buildings allocation. I do not intend to allow any honourable member to elaborate on the matters of electoral offices or the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission.

Mr. EVANS: Under the "Miscellaneous" heading appears the items fuel, lights, rates, cleaning, and so on, for Parliament House. Will the Treasurer say what rates are paid on Parliament House? I was always under the impression that buildings owned by the Government did not attract the payment of rates. If that is so, the word "rates" should not appear in this allocation. However, as it is there, there seem to be some areas in which rates are paid, and that is why I ask the question. It would be unique, in my experience, for rates to be paid on a public building. Also, what is the contract price for cleaning Parliament House, and is it an annual contract, or one of a shorter or longer duration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am informed that the rates referred to are the payments made to the E. and W.S. Department and that, in fact, Government departments are charged accordingly by the department so that, in our accounting procedures, the costs fall where they properly should fall. That is what "rates" refers to; town or council rates are not paid on this building, but we would pay moneys to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As a matter of fact, the Government pays town rates on homes that are occupied and are the property of the Government; so it is not true that the Government does not pay rates on properties: it does pay rates on some of them.

Mr. EVANS: The other question related to the contract to clean Parliament House, whether it is an annual contract or a shorter or longer contract than that. Does Parliament House get special consideration in relation to the amount it pays for water and sewer rates, as the total amount on this line is \$85 000 and, taking an estimate of what the Valuer-General would place on the value of this property, I would say that \$85 000 would not be far away from the sort of money that would be expected to be paid for water and sewer rates? I accept that buildings like this pay water and sewer rates but do they get special consideration, because \$85 000 is not enough to pay those rates under what is considered to be the normal method of capital valuation of the property?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report on that for the honourable member. I believe the cleaning contract is annual but I do not know the exact figure.

Line passed.

State Governor's Establishment, \$196 000.

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the answer that the Treasurer gave earlier this afternoon, does the line "Private Secretary" relate to Mr. John White's appointment or will some other Private Secretary be appointed? If the former happens, what exactly is the position of Mr. White; is he taking over the position now occupied by Mr. Henderson in exactly the same way? Do I take it that we have seen a reversal of the decision made originally, as I understand it, that Mr. White would remain a member of the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was no decision that Mr. White would remain a member of the Premier's Department. There was some discussion originally, when Mr. White was to take the position of Private Secretary,

about the relationship between his continuance in the Public Service and his superannuation, but that was completely resolved during the discussions. Mr. White will retire from the position of Agent-General, on superannuation, and will be paid a separate salary as Private Secretary; he will occupy the same position as Mr. Henderson occupies, and he will be employed at a figure of \$8 000 a year plus an allowance; he will reside at Peppertree Cottage, at Government House; he will not be a part of the Premier's Department.

Line passed.

Premier's Department, \$4 192 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Earlier today, we have seen the matter of the Premier's staff ventilated, without much satisfaction. But, now that the Premier has his documents with him, perhaps he can tell us how many people are presently employed in his department generally. I notice, for instance, that in the line "Director-General" no provision is made for the office of Deputy Director-General, an appointment which, I understand, is in the process of being created, and the Public Service Board, I understand, has already made a recommendation. The figure here is patently not accurate, so could the Premier, first of all, clear up the matter of the Deputy Director-General, what salary he will be paid, and whether the appointment has been confirmed? Secondly, what is the total number of people presently employed in the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the position of Deputy Director-General, it is not necessary to provide a separate line. The amounts are included in the total of the provision for "Policy Division, Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Economic Intelligence Unit, Publicity and Clerical Staff". The post was created in Executive Council last week. There has been an examination of applicants by a selection panel in the Public Service Board, and I believe that a recommendation has been notified to the board. The process then is that the board will publish that recommendation, which will then allow any public servant in the appropriate circumstances to appeal against that proposal before any final decision on the post is made. From memory, I think that the post is at the E.O. 4 level.

The Leader asked about the number of people employed by my department, but that depends on what the Leader means, because, if he is talking about the office of the Premier, I can give him those figures, and I will try to give him the figures in other areas, but I cannot tell him how many magistrates and stipendiary magistrates we have at present, because I do not have that figure. These magistrates have only just arrived in my department as a result of a Full Court decision. In the office of the Premier, apart from the Director-General, 93 people are employed. There are 14 Ministerial staff (including the inquiry section and the ethnic affairs officers who are also inquiry officers); there are 30 staff in the Administration Section; 14 in the Policy Division; five in the Economic Intelligence Unit; 10 in the Committee Secretariat; and 20 in the Publicity Division. The Administration Section also includes the Cabinet staff, which has been taken over from the Chief Secretary's Department.

Dr. TONKIN: I understood the Premier to say earlier today that there is only one contract appointment. Is he able to confirm that for me?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have checked on that in the interim and, at present, there are three contract appointments.

Mr. Becker: Is Bill Davies one of them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he is a contract appointment. Miss McCulloch, the women's adviser, is another contract appointment. That was necessary, because she could not, under the provisions of the Education Act, be seconded to my department from the Salisbury College of Advanced Education. In order to protect her it transpired finally that the only way to protect her superannuation position was that she come to the Ministerial staff on a contract arrangement. The other contract appointment is Mr. Bentley, who is the head of the Industrial Democracy Unit and who replaced Mr. Lindon Prowse, who was also a contract appointment. Mr. Bentley came to us from the Institute of Labor Relations at Flinders University. He had university provisions and emoluments that were different from those that could be provided within the Public Service structure. It was simply not possible to obtain his services without a contract appointment which would have given him different provisions and which covered him for superannuation by contract.

Mr. EVANS: The salary of Mr. Parkes is to be \$22 000 with a maximum of \$1 500 for entertainment expenses. Will this officer also be given unrestricted use of a vehicle? If he has, has he been provided with a driver or will he drive the vehicle himself? In an earlier reply on this matter the Premier said that in a case of breach of contract four weeks written notice was required to terminate an agreement. In the case of mutual agreement, the parties could give not less than three calendar months notice in writing. Is any specific monetary amount provided in the case of the breaking of a contract, whether by breach of contract or by notice of termination of the agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the latter point, I do not believe so—not according to my memory. A breach of contract would simply mean that damages were provided in the normally assessed way. In relation to the car, I do not recollect whether it is intended that Mr. Parkes should have the use of a car, although I imagine that would be the case. Certainly, I would expect it for the head of the Publicity Branch, given the kind of duties he will have to perform. I do not know whether such an arrangement has been made. If there is an arrangement for a car, certainly no driver would be provided. Drivers are now provided only for Ministers and certain other officers in this Parliament, apart from certain officers who traditionally had a driver at the time of their appointment. The provision in the Government is that no new appointee to a post, other than the Commissioner of Police, will be provided with a Government driver.

Dr. TONKIN: Now that we have cleared up, to some extent, the office of the Premier and its staffing, can he say how many people are currently employed in the Development Division of his department, including promotion, research and clerical staff? There seems to be an anomaly in the sum allocated for this year compared to the actual payment made last year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is 35.

Dr. TONKIN: What are the duties of the 20 people employed in the Publicity Branch? Are press secretaries for all Ministers included?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are 20 officers in the Publicity Branch. The branch was taken over from the Tourist Bureau, where the Publicity Branch of the Government had always previously been located. There has not been any significant change in the numbers of the branch, which is still not accommodated outside the Tourist Bureau and will not be until there is a transfer to the new Grenfell Centre. There may be some qualification to what I have

just said, since the information services section is now incorporated in the Publicity Branch and, that, I think, was formerly under the Public Buildings Department. I refer to the service section that sold Government publications and things of that kind, located on the ground floor of the State administration block. That is now part of the Publicity Branch and would account for portion of those numbers. However, there has been no significant addition to staff from where these officers were previously. It is simply a shift in the area of administration.

Dr. TONKIN: What are the qualifications of those senior people in the Publicity Branch and could he also tell us whether the change from the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department has meant a change in emphasis of duties? Are they still performing the same duties, or are they being used to promote all activities of the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They certainly are not confined to the tourist side of things, nor have they ever been. Certainly, previously their emphasis was on tourism, but under all previous Governments they have given publicity to other activities of government. The reason for a change to a separate division of my department was to ensure that we got the best use of publicity services and to see that the publicity activities of all departments were properly co-ordinated. In the past, Governments have spent much money on publicity, but what tended to happen was that these publicity matters were fragmented and standards were often not particularly good.

Members know that Government departments publish many publications, but their effectiveness in communicating to the public the information that they have been supposed to communicate has been poor. A recent study of certain Agriculture Department publications showed that there was little effect from the expenditure we were putting out. The Publicity Branch was then heavily involved in the new publication by the Agriculture Department on our farming methods in South Australia, a publication which has won wide acclaim and which is sought after keenly. The branch is there not only to do tourist work but also to serve all Government departments with expertise in producing the material that a department needs to publish and communicate to the people.

Dr. TONKIN: Are outside public relations agencies and publicity agencies used by the Government and, if they are, are they under the direction of or at the request of the Publicity Branch? Also, how much has been paid to advertising agencies and public relations firms, and what are the names of the firms that have been used?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot do that, because there is a myriad involved. Members have had a similar question answered previously. There are many governmental agencies that from time to time employ advertising agents or place advertisements through them. They are by no means always the same advertising agents: different agents are used, and often for small contracts. It would be quite impossible for me to detail every one of these. In relation to the Tourist Bureau work, the advertising agency used previously is Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson Proprietary Limited, which has been responsible mainly for the preparation of particular campaigns. It was responsible for the preparation, on instructions to the Film Corporation, of television advertisements.

The Publicity Branch at present has not got staff who are fully qualified in the preparation of television material. It is mainly in written publication, photogravure work, and things of that kind that they are qualified, and they are used in those areas. Sometimes, according to the view of the head of the Tourist Bureau, the advertising

agency is used. We expect, however, that, with the organisation of the Publicity Branch under its new head, we will be able to save some of the money presently spent through advertising agencies. For instance, the placing of simple, normal day-to-day advertisements in newspapers we intend should be undertaken by the Publicity Branch now, which will save the Government money, because all previous Governments have in fact placed those advertisements through advertising agencies.

Dr. TONKIN: What part did the Publicity Branch take in the production of the Premier's two series of films, the first series being the tourist films which I understand have been shown widely in other States, and the second series being the Government information (a euphemism, in my opinion) films, in which he has starred with such monotonous regularity, shown over a few months this year? Those films cost a tremendous amount of money. Whether or not they are doing any good for the State is one thing; they are certainly intended to do some good for the Government. I believe the Premier has a great deal of explaining to do. He has not explained to my satisfaction, nor to that of most members of the general public, what was intended by those propaganda films and what was his justification for using public funds on them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is that the Publicity Branch took no part in the preparation of either series.

Dr. Tonkin: So it must have been consultants.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the case of the Tourist Bureau films, the Publicity Branch was not involved: it was the advertising agency and the Film Corporation. In the case of the Government information films, it was the consultant to the Premier's Department and the Film Corporation.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Mr. Speaker, last night in this House we witnessed one of the most scurrilous abuses of Parliamentary privilege that I have ever known, certainly during the six years that I have been a member of this House. The member for Florey made a vicious attack on Mr. R. H. Angas, making allegations which in no way could be substantiated and without even seeking to hear Mr. Angas's side of the story. He also sought to denigrate the member for Davenport, who answered the allegations earlier. Even if there was some substance to the allegations (and all evidence available to me indicates that there is not), if the member had any respect for fair play he would have attempted to check such damaging statements. In fairness to Mr. Angas, I now present the facts which indicate that Mr. Wells has been deceived.

Mr. Angas emphatically denies each of the allegations raised in this House. It is alleged that Mr. Angas sought to avoid his responsibilities under the Pastoral Award. A scrutiny of Mr. Angas's station diary and wages and salaries record, which is a record required under the award and which I have seen this morning, indicates that this claim is false. The records also show that Mr. Bailey was paid at award rates, when he started in 1970, for 40 hours work a week when the award prescribed 44 hours; that he was paid overtime; and that as he was promoted over

the years he was paid over the award salary. When he was made overseer he was paid \$5 over the award, and when he started as a manager in training he was paid \$15 a week above the award for a station hand. Mr. Angas was not obliged by law to pay these increases, but Mr. Bailey was being given further responsibilities on the property, and these arrangements were by mutual agreement.

The records indicate that Mr. Bailey was paid overtime and took holidays or was paid in lieu of holidays by mutual agreement. The claim that he was required to work 16 hours a day, seven days a week with no annual leave, no public holidays, and no sick leave is patently false. Mr. Angas also states that the claim that he was kept waiting for his pay is false. When Mr. Bailey was acting as a manager it had been agreed that he be paid monthly, and he was able to draw, and did draw, pay sometimes in advance throughout the month. The pay book verifies this, and it can be further substantiated by bank statements. The claim of the member for Florey outside the House that Mr. Bailey had been paid \$100 a week less an allowance of about \$20 also appears false. For example, the pay book shows that Mr. Bailey was paid \$643 a month since February this year (that is, \$148 a week) and that the only deductions were tax and petrol he used over and above his agreed allowance of 10 gallons a month supplied by Mr. Angas.

Mr. Angas states that he was, as in most cases with farm stockmen, not charged rent for his house and was supplied with meat. The history of Mr. Bailey's employment as relayed to me should be recorded. He was employed as a station hand in 1970 at above award rates when Mr. Angas was recovering from a stroke. As Mr. Angas' health was indifferent, requiring major surgery over the period of Mr. Bailey's employment and requiring several months hospitalisation in that time, he was given added responsibility and substantial pay rises.

The relationship between Mr. Angas and Mr. Bailey appears to have been quite amicable until the beginning of this year, when it was decided that the property was to be sold and Mr. Angas' lease of the property was to be terminated. Since then the relationship has deteriorated dramatically. On July 14, Mr. Angas wrote to Bailey in the following terms:

Dear Gavin,

It is with a very real sense of disappointment that I write you this formal letter. Some six years ago, you were engaged as a station hand when I was recovering from a very serious illness. As soon as possible a manager was appointed. You will remember that a catastrophic situation was avoided only because within a short time I was fit enough to take on again a fully active role as manager. In recent years I have had two other near-fatal illnesses. Clearly someone able to act for me was necessary in view of the possible uncertainty of my health. As the most capable stockman of my experience and a hard worker with some aptitude for bush mechanics, I had hopes of you as potential managerial material. I had every expectation that you would learn as I was able to help you in this new field. I gave you promotion and increase in pay and status.

However, I have never been able to give you full responsibility as manager to the extent of handling the financial affairs of the organisation, as, for various reasons, I have not had sufficient confidence in your ability to do so. Early this year the company from which R. H. Angas and Company leases this land, decided to sell more than half of the property, including all the houses, station facilities, stock yards, and woolshed. I was, however, able to persuade the company to continue to lease to me the land on the eastern side of the main road, and also to provide for the establishment there of new facilities. The decision was made suddenly, and selling agents were almost immediately appointed. Most regrettably, and without my knowledge or approval, information regarding the land sale decision was leaked locally at about the same time as I myself was sure

of the decision. Thus, you no doubt heard in the "pub" and all the district knew of the proposed land sale at about the same time as I did, and certainly before I was able to discuss with you and other staff what lay in the future. It was quite clear that I would be involved in a great deal of extra work this year, and that after the sale of the property and surplus stock, my staff requirements would be very much reduced. As soon as I was able to do so, I explained the situation to you and pointed out that obviously in the future there was no place for a manager in your category and salary scale. That is still the position. However, I offered continuation of your position here for as long as possible and to advertise on your behalf for an alternative position. This offer was made in good faith and on the assumption that your performance would continue at past standards and would rise to the requirements associated with the sale.

It has become painfully obvious that as a result of the changed future for us all, you have adopted an attitude of bitter resentment towards me. Work standards when controlled by you have dropped to a very low level; even when I have been in attendance only a pretence of efficiency has been maintained. It is quite clear now that a position has been reached, which, if allowed to continue, will destroy my business and your job at the same time. The fact that my hopes of your succeeding as manager have not materialised, coupled with your obvious lack of confidence in me as exemplified by your attitude to me, the standard of your work and your rudeness when you lost your temper with me—late on Wednesday afternoon, July 7—leave me no option but to ask for your immediate resignation.

If you do resign with effect from Thursday, July 15, 1976, I would be prepared (in lieu of notice) to pay you two months salary at full rates of \$659.91 per calendar month plus an estimated valuation of quarters at \$20.00 per week for two months, and together with any accrued annual leave entitlement. I would also expect that within seven days of resignation you put into effect the following:

1. vacate the house made available for your use;
2. remove all your goods and chattels from the property;
3. remove all your pets, dogs, cats, sheep, poultry and the four horses which have been agisted here free of charge.

I repeat my distress and disappointment at having to suggest this course to you but the trust and mutual confidence so necessary in a relationship of this nature seems to have disappeared. This is not a notice of dismissal, but an opportunity for you to terminate the relationship with honour. Would you please let me know within 24 hours of your intentions.

Mr. Bailey accepted the offer and was paid the two months full salary plus accrued leave entitlement (including 17½ per cent loading), plus \$20 a week for eight weeks rent allowance. The statement by Mr. Wells outside the House was grossly inaccurate and I believe could be actionable. What I have said indicates the scurrilous abuse of Parliamentary privilege, which indicates clearly that Mr. Angas is the victim of a disgraceful, unsubstantiated and damaging attack. I hope that we will not see this sort of attack repeated.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): In common with other members I have examined the programme outlined by the Minister of Transport for traffic signals, etc., for 1976-77 and have noted that, under the heading "New intersection signals" and the subheading "Contract let", amongst other locations, appears North-East Road/Tarton Road, Holden Hill. The project is estimated to cost about \$20 000, and the lights are expected to operate by mid-October. I have received representations over the years from parents of schoolchildren and from elderly citizens who are concerned about crossing this busy road because of the traffic volume. These lights will be welcome to these people as they will reduce if not eliminate this hazard and potential danger. Under the heading "Modified intersection signals" and the subheading "Plans and specifications being prepared" is

North-East Road/Sudholz Road, Gilles Plains. Under the heading "New pedestrian-actuated signals" and the subheading "Plans and specifications being prepared" is Grand Junction Road, near Wandana Avenue, Gilles Plains. Because representations have been made for these lights in the past for schoolchildren having to cross the road and citizens wishing to shop in the area, I am pleased there has been some movement in this regard. Under the heading "Council installations" and the subheading "New school crossings" is Elizabeth Street, Banksia Park; Hancock Road, St. Agnes; Milne Road, Ridgehaven, and Valiant Road, Holden Hill. In three of those cases I have had representations made to me because these schools are situated on arterial roads. I am pleased to say that the crossings concerned have been installed and are in use. It is stated that further installations may be added during the year. Only today, I received from a constituent a letter stating that some form of crossing is required over the Lower North-East Road at Highbury, not only for schoolchildren but also for members of the public. I draw that to the Minister's attention, and trust that it will be considered.

Although I cannot see it mentioned, pedestrian actuated traffic signals have been erected on Grand Junction Road, Hope Valley, at the Paroola Avenue intersection; its cost was expected to be over \$7 000. These lights were principally to serve the Modbury South Primary School, the Modbury High School and, to a limited extent, the Modbury South Special School, as well as other pedestrians. The installation of these lights was necessary, and it has certainly been appreciated. Again, representations were made to me for some time before those lights were installed.

I now refer specifically to school crossings. I believe that, where it can be shown that the provision of such crossings is justified, they should be installed simultaneously with the opening of the school. This has been the subject of some complaint by school councils in my district. I now turn to intersections which require traffic signals but which are not referred to in this programme. I refer, first, to the intersection of the North-East and Hancock Roads, Tea Tree Gully. In reply to a question I asked on September 16, the Minister of Transport informed me on September 21 that the priority for the installation of traffic lights at this intersection had advanced. The Minister said it was expected that traffic lights would now be installed at this intersection in late 1977-78, subject to the availability of funds at that time. That reply is indeed heartening, although naturally I would prefer these traffic signals to be installed now. Nevertheless, this is an improvement on the reply to my representations last year, when I was told on July 3 that, based on existing priorities, there were 59 intersections in the metropolitan area that had a higher priority for the installation of traffic signals than this intersection had and that, on the current rate of installation, it could well be four years before they were installed.

I now refer to another intersection, that of the Lower North-East and Valley Roads, Highbury. The Minister of Transport informed me on September 21, only two days ago, that this location has a low priority for the installation of traffic lights, and that no other improvements are proposed at present. I place the following information before the Minister in support of a higher priority for this intersection. It is a dangerous intersection, because a hotel is situated adjacent to it, as a result of which there is a greater movement of people in the area, with patrons

entering and leaving the hotel. Also, it is on a bus route used by buses of the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority. These buses travel along Valley and Lower North-East Roads.

This intersection is situated on the crest of a hill, where visibility for a reasonable distance is poor. This intersection has had minor improvements effected to it but, because of the increase in the volume of traffic caused by the increasing population, further safety improvements are now required, subject to the installation of traffic lights. I point out that, because local people know that this is a dangerous intersection, they avoid it, if possible, and use another road such as Awoonga Road. Of course, this is not always convenient or possible. I ask the Minister to consider the points that I have raised.

There are other matters I should like to touch on but on this occasion I have confined my remarks to traffic matters only.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Earlier this afternoon, I was discussing my interest in the affairs of a gentleman by the name of Mr. Edwards, and the representations I have made on his behalf to a number of unions. I indicated, as I concluded those earlier remarks, that I had received a letter last evening, which I now quote in full. It is as follows:

Mr. Edwards filled in an application form to join the A.M.W.U. on June 22, 1976. This form was handed to me sometime later by a shop steward with the instruction that he thought Mr. Edwards was still a member of the other union, so on this statement I did not process this application but waited for further instruction. Also the shop steward who took this form did not sign the form. I presumed this was because Mr. Edwards was still a member of the other union.

I did not see Mr. Edwards at this time, or ever have done, as he worked the 11 p.m. to 7.00 a.m., and I start at 7.30 a.m. On August 22, Mr. Edwards phoned me at home asking if I had received an application form; I told him yes; after further conversation he stated that he was still in the other union but had not paid his dues for sometime. I told him that he was still a member of the other union even though he was in arrears, and before he could join the A.M.W.U. he would have to receive a clearance from his union. I was under the impression that a person could not belong to two unions at the same time. I was wrong, as I found out from Mr. B. Pointer of the A.M.W.U. on discussing this problem with him.

I make the point that Mr. B. Pointer is the Acting President of the A.M.W.U. and is one of the other persons from whom I have had correspondence leading up to the receipt of this final letter, which concludes in this way:

In conclusion, it appears that Mr. Edwards' application was not processed because his form was not signed by his shop steward who received it, and lack of union knowledge on my part, and the fact he was a member of another union.

That is a candid comment, which I accept. That gentleman is showing clearly that Mr. Edwards has been denied the cover of union membership which he sought on June 22, 1976. Mr. Edwards does not dispute that he is in arrears with the original union, but he has given me a degree of information as to why he is in arrears.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Perhaps he just has not paid.

Dr. EASTICK: Just has not paid or is it (and this is the question I want to put to honourable members opposite) that he is in arrears because the advice that he gave others, that he was refraining from continuing in that union because of his genuine concern about the way in which its financial affairs were being managed, caused him to have no further faith in that union?

Apart from this, let us not dwell on that point; we can return to it later. Here is a person who has been illegally suspended or had his employment terminated by a company because he failed to join a union. I mentioned earlier that that is an action that the company cannot take, under the laws of this land. Here is a person who has been denied the assistance of a union when he was once the State President of it, and now is being denied the opportunity of assistance to regain his employment by a union that acknowledges, through its shop steward member, it failed to process his forms as submitted to it. At this time, this gentleman has not been supported by his brother union colleagues to be reinstated into a position he has held successfully for a considerable time. His union brothers have not been willing to stand up and assist him in an illegal termination of his appointment. I have every belief that we can assist his position by the obtaining of the information the Minister offered to me, but which he now denies me.

Opposition members can have a genuine interest in the affairs of their constituents, whether or not they vote for them. I refer to the case of a gentleman who comes from a country town north of Adelaide and who is currently being called before the Sundry Debtors Court because it is claimed that he has not paid his dues, this time to the Transport Workers Union. The gentleman is a member of another union, the Butchers Union, although he was originally employed in a position that called for him to be a member of the Transport Workers Union. The local shop steward or travelling organiser took a message from the gentleman that he wished to resign from a given date, and never passed the information on, as can be determined. For this, I have the word of Mr. Nyland, whose letter I will read in full, as follows:

I refer to your note of 30th ultimo in reference to the above-named member of our union. I regret having to advise the information sought in the first paragraph thereof is confidential and available only to the member concerned. Your last paragraph is not relevant as Mr. Krienschmidt is not known to our union.

Mr. Krienschmidt was the name of the travelling organiser.

Mr. Whitten: That's a long while ago.

Dr. EASTICK: I mean the late Mr. Klienschmidt. Would one not believe that the union secretary would have at least said that the last paragraph was not relevant, as Mr. Krienschmidt was not known to the union, but Mr. Klienschmidt was? Would one not believe that when one was genuinely seeking to protect the interest of a person he would have said, "He was once employed, but now deceased"?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's a different name you are quoting. I knew the man.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, a different name by one letter. This is an unfortunate situation. If Government members know the person's name, it is conceivable that Mr. Nyland would have known him also. I passed the letter from Mr. Nyland on to the member and advised him to write personally to Mr. Nyland, seeking the information he required, because he was due to go to court on Wednesday of this week. The letter, duly sent to Mr. Nyland 10 days ago, has not been answered. The gentleman appeared before the court on Wednesday, and, again acting on my advice, took to the court the letter I had received from Mr. Nyland and, fortunately, received the consideration of the court, in that the justices put the matter aside until late in October so that Mr. Nyland might pass on the information.

I point out that here is a genuine attempt by the Opposition to represent properly the affairs of its constituents, no

matter what their affiliations are. I wanted to point out the grave error of capacity on the part of some union secretaries justly and satisfactorily to provide the kind of basic information their past or present members should be able to expect, particularly when they are being dragged into the courts. I hope that the members of the Government will ensure that the information I have sought on the other matters will be made available to me. Obviously,

the Minister is unable to fulfil his commitments, so I ask other members to assist.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that the honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.