

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 October 1979

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

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 158 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy and Messrs. Oswald, Randall, and Whitten.

Petitions received.

PETITION: LAND TAX

A petition signed by 148 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to revalue all properties assessed this year and abolish land tax on residential properties immediately was presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure that the Government adopts and announces a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation that provides for the legal sale, cultivation or distribution of marijuana was presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: NET SCHEME

A petition signed by 102 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation which would enable the Government to adopt the proposed North-East Railway Transit Route through Botanic Park and along Victoria Drive was presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: WAYVILLE TRAMLINE

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia praying that the House would take action to have rubbish removed from the tramline at Wayville was presented by Mr. Langley.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by 312 residents of South Australia

praying that the House would take action to reduce the speed limit to 60 km/h on Yorketown Road between school signs and install pedestrian-actuated lights was presented by Mr. Hemmings.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: L.P.G.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As there is understable public concern over the use of liquefied petroleum gas in road vehicles, following recent incidents, I wish to specify the precautions taken in this State to ensure that the safest possible procedures are followed. South Australian regulations are already the most stringent in this country, and my safety staff constantly monitor developments to ensure that any possible risk is covered by regulation.

In an incident on Tuesday, a fire broke out in a truck powered by l.p. gas, operated by the East Torrens Municipal Destructor Trust. Investigations by my department have shown that a fire began in the engine compartment. Heat generated burned through a flexible pipe connecting the fuel tank and the fuel shut-off valve. The incident is not related in any way to the taxi fire in Newcastle, which involved a build-up of gas through a lack of ventilation which would be illegal under South Australian regulations.

Regulations were gazetted on 30 August 1979 to provide some measure of control over the installation of equipment for conversion to l.p.g. as a fuel in motor vehicles to ensure safety. The regulations were made under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979, mainly because the Liquefied Gas Act, 1960-1973, did not provide for licensing of persons who use or work the l.p.g. The regulations, which are administered by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, require persons who install l.p.g. equipment for use as a fuel in internal combustion engines to be licensed, or to work under the personal supervision of a person who is licensed.

The Chief Inspector of my department, appointed under the Liquefied Gas Act, 1961-1973, issues autogas licences only to people who are competent in the work of installing liquefied petroleum gas equipment, where such gas is to be used as a fuel for internal combustion engines. The regulations came into effect as from 1 September 1979.

In addition to the regulations, the Road Traffic Board of South Australia issued a code of practice in the *Gazette* dated 11 October 1979 for the use of liquefied petroleum gas in motor vehicles. This is under the responsibility of the Minister of Transport, who, I understand, will be making a Ministerial statement later today. Both the regulations and the code of practice require compliance with Australian standards issued by the Standards Association of Australia in respect to the use of liquefied petroleum gas in internal combustion engines.

The equipment required for conversion of motor vehicles to use l.p.g. consists basically of a fuel tank and its fittings, such as a valve for filling the tank, one for supplying l.p.g. to the engine, a safety relief valve and a fuel gauge, a vaporiser to convert the liquefied fuel to gas, and the inter-connecting piping between the tank, which is usually in the luggage compartment, and the vaporiser.

The fuel tank, which is required to operate at pressures considerably above atmospheric pressure, together with its fittings, is required to comply with standards developed for pressure vessels and is also required to be approved by the Chief Inspector in my department.

Information available from officers in the Department of Industrial Relations and Technology in New South Wales indicates that the accident involving a taxi in Newcastle was probably caused by a leak of l.p.g. which developed due to a defect in the manner of attaching the fuel gauge to the cylinder. It is thought that variations in the size and shape of a gasket and a machined groove into which the gasket fits may have caused a leakage in some fuel tank assemblies.

Owners of motor vehicles which have been converted for use with l.p.g. as a fuel and in which tanks made by Rheem Australia Ltd. are fitted should contact either the person who carried out the conversion or Rheem Australia Ltd. Inspectors of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment have advised installers of conversion equipment to cease installations using Rheem tanks until further advice. Rheem Australia Ltd. is also issuing similar advice to purchasers of their tanks.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PIGS

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: A suspected exotic disease of pigs was reported to the Tasmanian Department of Agriculture on a property near Bridgenorth, north of Launceston, on 16 October. The disease was found to be characterised by vesicles, that is, blisters, mainly around the snout of the affected pigs. The Minister of Agriculture in Tasmania agreed with the recommendation for the destruction of all pigs and cattle on the affected property as a precautionary measure.

The Consultative Committee of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which consists of the Senior Veterinary Officers of all the States and the Commonwealth, met in Launceston on Tuesday 23 October to consider the disease incident and to recommend future action. The committee agreed that a vesicular disease was present in the pigs on the affected property. Its cause is as yet unknown; the disease that appeared on the property was of a mild nature. From close examination of affected pigs on the property before and after slaughter, and in view of the fact that cattle on the property in close contact with the pigs did not show any clinical symptoms, the consultative committee agreed that the probability of this disease being foot-and-mouth disease is remote.

Specimens from affected pigs have been collected and sent to the world reference laboratory in the United Kingdom for examination. Results are not expected to be available to Australian authorities for at least several days. The committee endorsed the precautionary control measures already taken by the Tasmanian Government. Surrounding properties within four kilometres of the one affected property are being closely monitored for any possible spread of the disease. Pending results of the overseas tests, there will be no movement of pigs, cattle, sheep or goats from properties out of this control area. Limited restrictions on movements of animals between Tasmania and other Australian States have been recommended, and it is expected that there will be, for the time being, restrictions on the movement of pigs and pig products from Tasmania.

The Consultative Committee is recommending to Agricultural Council the adoption and implementation of the Commonwealth-States cost-sharing agreement for control and eradication of this disease. Adoption of this recommendation will commit South Australia to paying 4.4 per cent of the total costs incurred (both compensation

and operations). No reliable estimate is presently available, although valuation of livestock slaughtered so far is about \$50 000. The Consultative Committee, in conjunction with the Tasmanian Department of Agriculture, will continue to monitor the situation closely.

Under the provisions of the South Australian Stock Diseases Act, the introduction of stock likely to be affected with an exotic disease is prohibited, except with the written permission of an inspector. The suspicion of an exotic disease in Tasmania automatically invokes this provision. The importation of stock of any sort, including meat, from Tasmania is therefore prohibited while suspicion of any exotic disease remains. Officers of my department are making inquiries into recent imports of pigs, pig products and other stock from Tasmania to South Australia. Records indicate that only cattle have been imported during the last three months. However, it is possible that some stock, including meat, might have been imported via Victoria. Inquiries into this possibility are continuing in the interests of South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: L.P.G.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: My statement is complementary to that made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs regarding conversion of vehicles to l.p.g. The South Australian regulatory requirements for liquefied petroleum gas powered vehicles are contained in regulations under the Road Traffic Act and the code of practice for l.p.g. powered vehicles.

The regulations came into effect on 1 September 1979, as my colleague said, and are in conformity with the standards agreed to by the Australian Transport Advisory Council. They require the installation of an internal combustion engine using l.p.g., to comply with the appropriate requirements of Australian Standards 1596 "SAA l.p. gas code" and 1425 "SAA code for the use of l.p. gas in internal combustion engines".

The code of practice for l.p.g. was approved by the Road Traffic Board on 29 September 1979 and appeared in the *Government Gazette* on 11 October 1979. The code was called up as part of the requirements of the regulations: it specifies requirements for gas fitting work and installation in motor vehicles additional to those in Australian Standard 1425. The requirements in South Australia are more stringent than in other States. The code also lists all of the l.p.g. pressure regulator and vaporizer units that have been approved for use in motor vehicles following detailed examination by Road Traffic Board officers.

Vehicles converted prior to September 1979, when no regulatory requirements existed, should be inspected and upgraded if necessary, since those vehicles may not have been converted to the Australian standard or the code of practice referred to.

This is best highlighted in the recent incident, also referred to by my colleague, where a vehicle operated by the East Torrens Destructor Trust was badly damaged by fire at Norwood. The fire started as a result of a weakness in the fuel line, which was made of rubber (which is not approved for use with l.p.g. under the new regulations); this illustrates the need for vehicles converted prior to September 1979 to be thoroughly checked and upgraded if necessary.

To give some idea of the potential size of the problem, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has been notified that, as

at July 1979, some 230 vehicles had been converted to l.p.g. in South Australia. I must point out that, in this regard, the onus is on the vehicle owner to advise the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Since the new regulations came into force, the Road Traffic Board has inspected 30 vehicles, 26 of which have been fitted with Rheem tanks. In addition to the statement made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the direct contact Rheem personnel intend to make with customers, I can assure honourable members that Road Traffic Board officers will also immediately check with these 26 Rheem customers to ensure that the installation of l.p.g. components is in accordance with the "Installation and Maintenance of Liquefied Petroleum Gas Equipment for Internal Combustion Engines Regulations, 1979".

As already stated publicly, the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board intends to inspect all taxis. Any taxis with gas leakage will be immediately withdrawn from service. Similarly, l.p.g. powered taxis in Whyalla and Port Lincoln will be inspected by the appropriate local approved inspectors.

I must stress that it is vital that anyone who had a vehicle converted before the new regulations came into effect should have that vehicle checked by a competent agency, as a matter of urgency.

Finally, with the energy crisis that we face in the future, it is important that the public do not lose faith in the use of liquefied petroleum gas as an alternative fuel. If conversions are carried out in accordance with the regulations and code of practice referred to, the public can feel confident in the safety of such conversions.

QUESTION TIME

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier indicate to the House whether the Government is planning to end or to scale down significantly the administration of South Australian price controls? A report in today's *News* states that there is to be an open go on prices, and the Premier is quoted as expanding on his answer yesterday to my colleague the member for Playford by saying that the Government is very much in favour of the open market philosophy, with prices being set, where possible, by the pressures of the market place and competition.

The consumer price index for Adelaide for the September quarter was released today; it is low again, being 8.2 per cent over the past 12 months as compared with a national figure of 9.2 per cent. Over a 12-month period, Adelaide's prices have been lower than have national prices. Price control regulates regional monopolies, such as the brewery industry and the cement industry, where there is no significant market competition and where the Federal Trade Practices Act cannot apply. Price control was introduced and maintained by a former Liberal Premier, Sir Thomas Playford.

In November 1978, the present Government, then the Opposition, supported a continuation of control up to 1981. The Minister of Industrial Affairs was quoted on 11 July 1979, when a member of the Opposition, as saying that, while wages were controlled through wage indexation, effective price control was important in protecting consumers. No reference was made by the Liberal Party during the recent elections to the weakening or removal of price control. However, since the election, the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs has become simply the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Yesterday, in a written reply to a question in another place, the Minister

of Consumer Affairs confirmed that the Government had increased beer prices above recommendations made to the former Government by the Acting Prices Commissioner. In view of all these facts, will the Premier indicate whether he is planning to end or to scale down price control in South Australia?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for raising the subject generally, particularly the subject of the consumer price index. It certainly is interesting that the rate of inflation throughout Australia in the past 12 months has been 9.2 per cent, and 8.2 per cent for South Australia. Since the honourable member has raised the subject, I must issue a warning. We must use caution in interpreting those figures, because the extent to which price rises are being contained in this State as a result of sluggish economic activity and consequent market adjustment to local economic conditions is not known. The pleasing part is that the figures do include the increased petrol prices. From that point of view they are excellent. In regard to the specific question, the c.p.i., while it is an indicator, can hardly be in any way an indicator of how successful price control has been in South Australia. If one were to take the Leader's extrapolation from his theory, one would say that the c.p.i., when it was higher than the Australian average, obviously indicated that price control was not working. Conversely, when it is lower than the rest of Australia, it is working. That is the inference one draws from the Leader's explanation. I am quite certain he did not mean that, and therefore he does not mean what he said in that respect.

As far as price control is concerned, the headline in today's *News* is somewhat misleading. I think if one looked at the headline and then looked at the reported comments, together with the answer to the question in this House yesterday, one would understand that the whole matter was under review. The Liberal Party does stand committed as far as possible to the open market place and the pressures of free competition. That is as far as it goes; the whole question is under review. When that review has been completed, an announcement will be made about what the Government's intentions are as to price control.

MINDA HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government has given consideration to the request by Minda Home for an additional grant of \$115 000 under the SURS scheme to allow the completion of work to upgrade residential accommodation in the Telethon dormitory complex?

In March 1978, a grant of \$29 071 was made available to Minda Home under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme to fund a study team to provide forward design concepts for physical amenities and associated work. Part of that task included a critical rationalisation of existing services and facilities. A report was produced by the study team in 1978, and the recommendations therein were accepted in principle by the Minda board. Not surprisingly, the major thrust of recommendations centred upon the need for substantial upgrading of dormitory and residential accommodation.

Minda Home subsequently made application for a substantial grant of \$476 935 to carry out these works. In addition, the home offered to provide a further \$185 000. Subsequent negotiations reduced the grant ultimately given under the scheme in January 1979 to \$250 000, with a matching commitment from the home. Owing to significant additional works being found necessary in one of the building complexes, combined with a number of

unforeseeable site difficulties, there resulted a significant cost overrun. As a result, funds for the completion of works for the Telethon complex were found to be insufficient. Minda Home is unable to provide any further financial commitment, having already been placed in a rather precarious financial position by the previously mentioned substantial cost overrun.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: Am I speaking too quickly for the honourable member?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will contain himself with the question and the brief explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I agree, Sir. Unless the grant is approved, there is little likelihood of the work being undertaken by Minda Home in the immediate foreseeable future.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the honourable member for the question. The new Government has already announced in the Budget papers that SURS will not continue. However, we gave an undertaking that existing projects for which approval had been granted by the previous Government would be completed.

The Budget contains an allocation of \$1 500 000 which was committed before 15 September and which we will certainly honour. Approvals for the \$1 500 000 were sent out just before the election. I had the rather dirty task of having to send out the many rejections that were decided by the previous Government to the organisations that had not been so informed by the previous Government. It is interesting to note that the approvals went out before the election date, but the rejections did not.

Mr. Corcoran: And the rejections could have been considered at some later time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I tell the member for Hartley that I had to inform the people of rejections by his Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many unnecessary interjections.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Members should refer to the Auditor-General's Report. Our Government indicated that it was interested in creating full-time and permanent employment in this State. The Auditor-General's Report states that only 12 per cent of the people employed under SURS receive permanent employment or employment continuing after SURS ended. That compares abysmally with even the SYETP scheme, which members opposite have criticised many times. Under the SYETP scheme about 65 per cent of the people receive permanent employment, but under SURS only 12 per cent of the people did. I think that is sufficient reason for the Government to change the policy.

I am pleased to tell the honourable member that the Government has approved \$115 000 in addition to the \$1 500 000 to ensure that the building programme by Minda Home Incorporated, the existing programme involving Telethon homes, can be completed. The money has come from the allocation put aside over the years for increases in prices in contracts. The money was surplus to the \$1 500 000.

Just over 12 months ago in this House I asked Mr. Dunstan, who was then Premier and Treasurer, why a specific line was carried forward in the Budget and in the Auditor-General's Report for almost \$10 000 000, which was uncommitted under SURS. The Premier assured me at the time that funds had been spent but had not yet been paid to people to whom they had been committed. I find that that was not the practice of the former Government. The practice was to keep bringing forward unspent and

uncommitted funds from SURS and keep announcing them for the following year.

That was why we did genuinely shoot up to about \$45 000 000 under SURS but then the total sum spent over the entire period of SURS suddenly started to stagnate, simply because every year the Government re-announced that this year there would be a further \$10 000 000 to spend on SURS. Of the \$10 000 000 committed last year, \$5 000 000 was passed over to this year so the Government could again announce that this \$5 000 000, which had been announced last year, could be announced again this year.

Mr. Corcoran interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hartley to contain himself.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: This was the very piece of trickery that I accused Mr. Dunstan about at the time, but he denied the practice. Now that we are in Government and can get to the facts, I have found that the practice was carried on by the former Government.

I reassure the member for Glenelg that the building programme at Minda Home will go ahead and be completed as requested and, in accordance with the recent application, Minda Home certainly will be able to complete the Telethon buildings.

L.R.T. SYSTEM

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Transport say whether work on the light rapid transit scheme proposed by the previous Government will be resumed if, as a result of the Department of Transport studies, the Government decides not to proceed with the O'Bahn scheme? If not, what other alternatives is the Government considering to service the transport needs of the people of Adelaide's north-eastern suburbs? It has been reported to me that, although a Department of Transport team is currently investigating the viability of the O'Bahn scheme for the north-eastern suburbs, the preliminary advice that the Minister has recorded may have left him slightly less enthusiastic than he was. In answer to a question on notice, the Minister said that the Department of Transport technical evaluation of the O'Bahn option would be completed by about the end of November. I am sure that the Government is investigating other options, and I ask what they are.

The Hon. M M. WILSON: The Deputy Leader is quite right. The Department of Transport is at the moment investigating the O'Bahn scheme. Two officers from the department will be travelling to Stuttgart in the next three or four weeks to conduct an intensive investigation at Mercedes-Benz. They will also be visiting the MAN diesel factory, because I understand that the original O'Bahn technology came from the MAN factory. While the officers are away they will also visit the Volvo factory in Sweden to look at their guided bus technology as well. In answer to the question whether the north-east l.r.t. will be resumed, that will depend on the investigation into the O'Bahn system, so I cannot give the honourable member an assurance about that one way or the other.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE TELEPHONES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Public Works consider having S.T.D. bars installed on telephones in Parliament House that are accessible to the public? On occasions I have noticed members of the public using telephone booths adjacent to the Strangers Gallery of this Chamber. On visiting other Parliaments in Australia, I

found that S.T.D. bars had been placed on telephones that were accessible to the public. In view of the high cost of the telephone account in Parliament House, I consider that this matter should be investigated.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I understand that this question is directed to me as Minister of Public Works, because in that capacity I am responsible for the telephones and other facilities in Parliament House. I certainly will look into the matter raised by the honourable member. I cannot supply him with details of the amounts of the telephone accounts at the moment.

Mr. Corcoran: It will go down considerably now that you blokes are in Government.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It probably will go down.

Mr. Corcoran: You used it extensively.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You checked every call, did you?

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, I did.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: How silly can you get?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I do not know whether the member for Hartley is now admitting that he had each telephone in this place bugged, but I will certainly check the cost for telephones and examine the feasibility of installing bars on those telephones where there is public access as well as access by members of Parliament.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House why there was no reference to public transport in his recent outline of the Government's energy strategy? Will he also indicate what measures, if any, the Government will be taking to encourage the use of public transport in order to conserve those liquid fuels which are Australia's scarcest energy resource? The Minister's energy statement, given to the House on 18 October last, referred to some energy conservation measures, but there is a strong suggestion that the Government will not be giving any priority to reducing energy consumption through better and cheaper public transport.

The Liberal Party transport policy, issued during the recent election campaign, makes no mention of an increased priority for public transport over the private motor vehicle. The previous Government encouraged the use of public transport by holding down fares in real terms for several years.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In the first instance, I would have thought that matters regarding public transport would come under the province of the Minister of Transport. If the honourable member had taken more care in assessing the statement I made to the House, and had examined it in more detail, he would have found reference to the fact that one of the new initiatives of this Government will be the establishment of a committee to set priorities in the use of liquid fuels. Inherent in the terms of reference of that committee will be a duty to satisfy priorities in relation to transport.

GUNS

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Chief Secretary say what are the controls on schoolchildren owning guns, particularly air rifles? An article which appeared in yesterday's *News*, entitled "Many gun owners are children", stated:

Many Australian gun owners are schoolchildren and most guns are kept in the bedroom and not locked up. These comments reveal two of the disturbing findings of a

survey of gun ownership released by the Bureau of Statistics in Canberra.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The article in yesterday's *News* applies to the Australian scene. I have been unable to obtain a readout of the situation throughout Australia, but, regarding the use of firearms by children in this State as applied to existing legislation, minors from 15 to 18 years require a licence for long arms at a cost of 50c; persons 18 years and over do not require a licence for long arms; and pistol-licences are available only to persons 21 years of age or over. Children of any age that are the issue of an orchardist, a horticulturist, a farmer, a grazier, or an agriculturist may use any type of firearm unsupervised.

That is the present legal situation in South Australia. I have intimated, regarding the current firearms legislation adopted by the previous Government, that the Government will, in accordance with an undertaking given prior to the elections, have discussions with all interested parties about the regulations before those regulations are promulgated.

Mr. McRae: And with the Opposition as well?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I said "all interested parties". I am sure that that term is so wide that it would include the member for Playford, as nice a fellow as he is. I will seek to obtain further information from the Bureau of Statistics. All members know that people in this State, and throughout Australia, are concerned about the use of firearms in a way that causes problems for society.

NET

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is considering a freeway system or the widening of the Main North-East Road for the transport needs of the Adelaide north-eastern areas if the O'Bahn scheme is rejected? If a freeway system is an option, what routes are being considered?

In reply to a question in this House, the Minister acknowledged that the much touted O'Bahn scheme is not presently operating on a commercial basis anywhere in the world. People have expressed concern that the Government may proceed to a freeway system, or at least the widening of the Main North-East Road, both of which options would involve acquisition of properties. Can the Minister allay the fears expressed, or tell us what routes are being considered as alternatives to the O'Bahn system?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

MISCELLANEOUS LEASES

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Lands inform the House of the Government's policy in relation to people who wish to convert miscellaneous leases to perpetual leases, or to people who presently hold perpetual leases who may wish to freehold the land involved? I have been approached over the past few weeks by a number of constituents who wish to know the policy of the Government, particularly in relation to miscellaneous leases. Some of the people involved wish to carry out improvements to their properties, but cannot accept a situation of spending money or to raising funds to carry out improvements on land which is the subject of a miscellaneous lease. Will the Minister briefly inform the House of the Government's policy in this matter?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It is the intention of the Government to enable persons with leasehold land to convert to freehold in appropriate circumstances. The

Government is in the process of determining the basis on which this will be possible, and a proposal will be put to Cabinet shortly. In South Australia, we are confronted with many perpetual leases on which a minimum rental applies; a perpetual lease could return 50c per annum to the Government, while costing the Government \$15 or \$16 per annum in servicing the lease and collecting the fee. It is in the interest of the State, the lessees, and the taxpayers that the situation be resolved, so that, where people are interested in converting, and where the circumstances are appropriate, an opportunity will be provided to convert to freehold title.

MINISTERIAL PORTFOLIOS

Mr. McRAE: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs help clear up the current muddle over portfolios by explaining to the House whether he is the Minister responsible for the economic development of the State? The former Department of Economic Development has been renamed the Department of Trade and Industry. In the Estimates, funds for the Department of Trade and Industry are in the division "Minister of Industrial Affairs". The Premier holds the portfolio of Minister of State Development. However, no funds for economic development activities have been provided in the Estimates in the division "Premier, Minister of State Development and Minister of Ethnic Affairs". As the Minister of Industrial Affairs clearly has the economic development resources, he appears to have the real powers, while it seems that the Premier has no real powers and that the portfolio of Minister of State Development is merely a title or window-dressing.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Let me start by pointing out the weakness that existed in the previous Administration. No attempt was made by that Administration to relate policies and the impact of policies under the old portfolio of Labour and Industry to economic development and to attracting new industrial development. We all know the saga of what occurred and the way in which, over the past nine years, industry in this State has been allowed to run down. We know the extent to which private employment has dropped since about 1975, and that has occurred because the previous Government would not come to grips with economic and industrial development. The new Government has said that someone must have specific responsibility for industrial development. As my responsibility is as Minister of Industrial Affairs, I will have to make the hard decisions in relating what we now call Trade and Industry and the new Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

The new Department of Trade and Industry, formerly called the Department for Economic Development (and I believe it was called this incorrectly), had the prime responsibility for trying to attract new industrial development to South Australia. It failed to do so largely because of the policies of the previous Government. The Premier takes responsibility for overall State development. He has that title and I can inform the honourable member that, within the Premier's Department, a position has been created of Co-ordinator of State Development, and that officer will answer to the Premier. So it is the Premier's responsibility to take the overall view and to ensure an overall balanced development of the State. That development will include areas such as those under the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister of Tourism, and other Ministers, including the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Premier has the overall control and co-ordinating role, whereas I am specifically responsible for

industrial development and industrial trade. This is why the department has taken on a new name, and it will certainly have a new emphasis going with that new name.

DRIVERS LICENCES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport bring down a report on his department's attitude with regard to the ease with which people can illegally obtain drivers licences in this State, and in relation to the practice of some persons using another person's licence to avoid being apprehended for breaking the law? Recently I was the author of an article advocating identity cards, and as a result of that article I had three phone calls. One was from a mother who was quite concerned that her son had put \$50 on the table, and a driver's licence. When she asked him what the money was for (he was unemployed), he said, "Well, it is a payment from a friend to sit for the driver's licence." There was no necessity to identify himself, other than to give a name; no photograph was involved. So he was paid to get a drivers licence for a friend, and he told his mother that he knew of other people who were doing the same thing.

In two other cases people said that members of their family had been stopped who had not had a drivers licence. These persons were concerned that the offender had given a friend's name and then presented the friend's drivers licence at the police station within the required time, even though the person who was actually stopped on the road did not have a drivers licence. Of course, this is a simple practice, and an easy method of avoiding apprehension. In particular, the question of obtaining drivers licences as I have described must be of concern to all members. I ask the Minister whether he will bring down a report on how these practices can be eliminated.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have not had this matter brought to my attention since becoming Minister. I do understand that my predecessor (Mr. Virgo) and the previous Government had had a look at the matter. I will accede to the honourable member's request, have the file reopened, and bring down a report.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Mr. LANGLEY: Does the Premier intend to introduce the Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interests) Bill during this Parliament? During the last Parliament this Bill passed the House of Assembly and was laid aside in the Legislative Council. In view of a remark by the member for Hanson about the member for Mitcham's outside interests, it appears that one Government member at least is in favour of its introduction. The Bill would provide that the public have the facts of all interests of members and family interests outside of Parliament. This is especially important when legislation which could help them financially is introduced.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter is under consideration.

GOLDEN GROVE MINING

Dr. BILLARD: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy seen a report in yesterday's press that indicated that a mining company was considering mining at Golden Grove for heavy minerals? Will any newly planned mining in the area be subject to an environmental impact statement?

Would it have noise or dust impact on the nearby dormitory area of Fairview Park, and would it involve extensions of areas already mined? The report stated:

Broken Hill miner, Minerals, Mining and Metallurgy Limited is investigating a diversification into rutile mining at Golden Grove near Tea Tree Gully. An agreement in principle has been reached with Concrete Industries (Monier) Limited to explore and extract heavy minerals from the area. The Golden Grove site is currently producing construction sand, white plastic clay and brick shale.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Although I did not see the actual newspaper report, the matter has been drawn to my attention and I have some information on it. The present indications are that the rutile is obtainable as a by-product of the present sand mining. If the impact of rutile mining is any wider than this, there will be an environmental impact statement. I am also informed that it is unlikely that there will be any significant additional noise and dust impact or that there will be extensions to the area already mined.

The situation will be clearer after the exploratory drilling programme to be undertaken by Northbridge Proprietary Limited on behalf of Minerals, Mining and Metallurgy Limited, and its partner Concrete Industries (Monier) Limited, has been completed. I can reassure the honourable member on the points that he has raised.

ORGANISED CRIME

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Premier say whether the new Government intends to continue the practice of having the Attorney-General meet regularly with senior police officers to co-ordinate Government activity against the infiltration to this State of organised criminal elements? During the office of the Labor Government it was the practice under an arrangement between Premier Dunstan and the Police Commissioner to hold regular meetings between the Attorney-General and senior police officers for the purpose of co-ordinating all of the Government's resources in the fight against organised crime. The police had previously indicated that this co-ordination was invaluable in limiting opportunities of organised interstate criminal elements to operate in South Australia, and led to numerous co-ordinated actions in the areas of liquor licensing, gambling, prostitution, sex shops, and the like.

In recent days police officers have indicated to me that these meetings are no longer being held and, in view of the fact that a member of the present Ministry has previously defended at least two people who had been discussed at such conferences, will the Premier allay community fears that this Government will not continue the previous Government's vigorous campaign against organised crime? Will the Premier assure the House that the Attorney-General and police co-ordinating meetings will continue?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This Government is totally and absolutely committed, as its policy has clearly shown, to preserve the orderly and safe way of life that we would like to see in Adelaide. We will take all necessary steps to ensure that the community is protected.

Mr. Duncan: We want action and not words.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find that remarkable, coming from the member for Elizabeth when compared with his track record when he was Attorney-General. Apart from that, I am totally in favour of consultation at all levels. At the present time consultations between the Chief Secretary, the Attorney-General, Commissioner of Police and me have taken place on more than one occasion, and I am interested in setting up a formal regular

consultative process where all of these matters of concern can be discussed.

I was particularly attracted to the idea when I visited New York two or three years ago and had talks with the Commissioner of Police, who said that, since they had adopted that consultative process between senior police officers, (the law enforcement branch), and the Attorney-General's Department, they had built up a great deal more understanding, duplication of effort had been stopped and much benefit had been obtained from the process. I would hope that that process will continue here.

PORT PIRIE BRIDGE

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs investigate the reason for and cost of building a bridge at Port Pirie which has often been described as the "bridge to nowhere" and state its expected suitable use? In reply to a question by the former member for Rocky River on 29 November 1977, the then Premier indicated that it had been provided to open up a small industrial area. However, consistent with the previous Government's track record, no new development has taken place.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the member for Rocky River for carrying on a tradition so ably taken up initially by the former member for Rocky River. That tradition is to continue to try to discover the reasons why this bridge was ever built. I understand that the bridge was built in the early to mid 1970's. The bridge is a substantial concrete structure at the end of a small bitumen road; on the other side of the bridge there is vast unused saltbush country. There is a small track, and a chain across the bridge, which cost about \$250 000 to build. Despite the efforts of the previous member for Rocky River, he could never quite get to the bottom of why this bridge was built.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: When Mr. Dunstan was Premier he informed the House that it was built with RED scheme funds. That was an unemployment funding scheme similar to the SURS scheme. I understand that the RED funds were allocated by the Whitlam Government on a political basis in very much the same way as were the SURS funds allocated by the previous Government.

Mr. Payne: Garbage!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member might say "garbage", but I find that a priorities committee decided where the SURS funds would be spent. The Minister was the Chairman of that committee and his Ministerial assistant was also a member. The criteria that appeared to be used was, first, whether the project was in a vital marginal seat for the Labor Party and, secondly, how many votes might be achieved for the Labor Party by spending those funds. I know there are exceptions, but it is quite obvious, when the way the funds have been spent is analysed (and I have done that), that they were spent in areas that favoured the Labor Party Government. I will certainly carry out an investigation for the member for Rocky River as to why that bridge was built. I hope we can now at last get to the bottom of it.

DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Health state what extension the Government plans to existing domiciliary care arrangements; when will these extensions be proceeded with; and how will they be funded? In the Government's health policy a promise was made to further

extend domiciliary care. The extension of domiciliary care was given a high priority by the previous Labor Government. The Minister will be aware that the Commonwealth and the State share funding for domiciliary care on a 50-50 basis. Commonwealth funds in this area have now been frozen and any extensions to services would require 100 per cent State funding unless moneys can be transferred from other areas. If this will be done, how and when?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: It is quite correct that the Government health policy places considerable stress on community health services, of which domiciliary care is an important part.

To what extent they can be funded, at least in the current financial year, is not clear at this stage, because the development budget will not be known until returns from those hospitals that are requesting a reassessment of their Budget allocations have been assessed. It is not possible to give a precise answer at this time. As to when this will be done, I am quite sure the honourable member would surely not expect us to fulfil all our policy undertakings in the first eight months; that is, by the end of this first financial year. That will be implemented over a three-year period.

How that will be done will be a matter for discussion with the advisory committees set up for that purpose. As to the priorities provided by the previous Government, one has only to consider the situation in the Para districts, in the Districts of Salisbury, Elizabeth, and Playford to realise that these areas were sadly neglected by the previous Government. They are crying out for domiciliary care facilities.

It is interesting to me to see that areas that have been represented by Labor members for so many years have been so starved of domiciliary care services. I will certainly be examining that situation, because I think the people in that area need far more attention than they have been given in the past, but it can only be given within the constraints of the Budget allocation, and, as the honourable member knows, for the forthcoming year those constraints are very firm indeed.

WOOLWORTHS SUPERMARKET

Mr. SCHMIDT: Is the Minister of Planning aware of delays in the proposed extension of Woolworths supermarket at Christies Beach? Jennings Industries made an application in October last year to extend Woolworths in the Christies Beach area. The Department of Urban and Rural Affairs, the Noarlunga City Council, Woolworths and Jennings wish and desire the extension of Woolworths to go ahead.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am aware of the problems that I think Jennings Industries is experiencing. I met a representative from that company yesterday, with officers from my department. I am also aware of the time that that company has been waiting for a decision to be made by the Government regarding extension of that project. I am able to inform the honourable member that I have written to the Noarlunga council so that we may be able to get together and negotiate that matter, which relates to a rezoning problem. I am keen that the problem be solved as soon as possible. With that in mind, I hope to meet the Noarlunga council as soon as possible.

PASSENGER TERMINAL

Mr. PETERSON: Has the Minister of Marine any plans

to make use of the now unused passenger terminal at No. 2 berth, Outer Harbor? Because of alterations to world shipping patterns, South Australia now has a passenger terminal which I think was used once in the year before last. It is quite an impressive building, but is unused. South Australia does not have this problem alone. I will quote from the Harbors Board paper, the *Shipping Journal*, which states:

The Fremantle Port Authority has a new use for its passenger terminal . . . Some 45 000 square feet of first floor area will be refurbished as a functions centre to accommodate 4 000 people at a cocktail party or around 2 000 for a sit-down cabaret affair. Convention groups will be able to take a harbor and river cruise before or after a function.

The Taperoo High School currently uses the downstairs area at Outer Harbor for some recreational purposes. The upstairs area, which I suppose one would call the mezzanine floor, is quite impressive, but is not used often. It is hired out infrequently to local groups for cabarets and dances. Is there any plan to make use of that facility?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have not had any firm discussions with the Director of Marine and Harbors about this matter. I know of the terminal and I know what it has suffered because of changes in transport uses that have taken place as a result of the introduction of new aircraft, particularly jumbo jets, which have caused a fall-off in sea passenger visits to this State. It is my understanding (and this has been highlighted by the honourable member) that limited use is being made of the facility. In view of the honourable member's question, and in the interests of his district, I will initiate discussions with the Director of Marine and Harbors along the lines that the honourable member has indicated.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Environment say what provisions he has made for public hearings and public participation in conjunction with the environmental impact study his department is to undertake into the effect of uranium mining at Roxby Downs?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for Price for his question. I think the honourable member should know that the normal procedure in environmental legislation or for environmental protection generally stipulates that the public are invited to participate. I can assure the House, and the honourable member, that this will take place. The public will be given an opportunity to put forward views regarding the mining of the uranium, as will be the case with any other environmental impact procedures carried out by this Government.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: My question is directed to the Minister of Water Resources. During the election campaign, comments were made about the need to investigate the anomalies surrounding the use of water and the associated costs to the user under the present rating system. Will the Minister advise the House of any information about the feasibility of this happening in the near future? Following the price rise in the cost in cents per kilolitre per year, coupled with revaluation of many properties, many South Australians and local government authorities are looking for some method of alleviating the

high cost of water. I, therefore, ask the Minister to comment.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Government has already embarked on the process of determining where anomalies exist in water rating policy or procedure. I refer the honourable member to a brochure that has just been completed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, entitled *Adelaide's Future Water Supply*.

Mr. Payne: It is a good effort.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes. It is a summary of the metropolitan Adelaide water resources study. The previous Minister would be well aware of that study. The brochure deals with a number of aspects of the future water needs of the metropolitan area of Adelaide and clearly indicates that it is anticipated that within the next 30 years the consumption of water in the metropolitan area of Adelaide will increase by approximately 50 per cent. The brochure also calls on the public to advance views and thoughts about various matters raised in it. One point relates to pricing policy and the present pricing and rating system. I urge ratepayers to consider the brochure that has already been distributed.

This is an on-going policy that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has had in relation to public involvement. While the former Minister is trying to jump in, I am more than happy to acknowledge the success of the public relations exercise regarding the Murray River salinity control programme documents. Discussion papers were distributed over a period of years in relation to that important study of the Murray River that was undertaken. I have acknowledged for years the wisdom of that move and the value of public involvement. This is an on-going policy to involve the public in an endeavour to eliminate anomalies that exist at this time.

MONARTO LAND

Mr. WEBSTER: Will the Minister of Environment advise the House as to the future use of a section of land at Monarto, which is currently being used by the Norwood Project Centre? That centre has, for a short period, had the use of a small area of land and a building at Monarto, which, I understand, was not easy to obtain in view of the enormous development and activity being carried on in that area. Nevertheless, the project centre is concerned about the future use of that land, as there is no security of tenure. Will the Minister comment about the future use of this land?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am very much aware that many people are concerned about what will happen to community activities and interests currently conducted on Monarto land. I cannot answer the honourable member's question in detail regarding that specific section of land, but I can tell him that at present the Government is examining alternative uses for the land. I will consider this request in determining what will happen to the land.

It should be made clear that the Government went to the last election with a policy that it would suspend all planning and development activities relating to the city of Monarto. As members opposite would realise, development virtually stopped before this Government was ever in power. It was said that the Government would wind down the activities of the Monarto Commission and investigate alternative uses for the land. In line with this policy, the Government has directed that a report, giving a range of options for future possible use of Monarto land, be provided as a matter of urgency. A committee set up to investigate these matters comprised the Director-General of Lands (Mr. Taeuber) and the Director-General of

Urban and Regional Affairs (Mr. John Mant).

I can also tell the House that the Under-Treasurer is negotiating with the Commonwealth Government about the financial arrangements for Monarto. I am very much aware that a lot of people are concerned about what will happen to this land. I can only say that, once negotiations with the Federal Government are finished, the Government will know what it can do about the land. As I have already said, it would appear that it would be necessary for some of the land to be sold. A committee is examining alternative uses for the land, and, as soon as those alternative uses are available, further information will be given to the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SURS SCHEME

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish to make a personal explanation about the gross exaggerations made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs today in answer to a question concerning the SURS scheme. Those members who have been in the House for a long time are used to gross exaggerations by this member; today's exaggerations come as no surprise to us. The Minister will dwell on anything to prove his point; he is never concerned about whether he tells the truth or otherwise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must make a personal explanation, and not undertake a debate or criticise the honourable Minister.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Minister was certainly criticising me and my Party. He forgot to explain the procedures involved, and I will do so now. The Minister said that there was only one committee, but in fact there were two. One committee was made up of officers who ran the SURS scheme and who made recommendations to the committee of which I was Chairman and which both those officers attended before matters went to Cabinet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader must make a personal explanation and must not debate the issue about committees controlled by him. The honourable member has sought, and received, leave to make a personal explanation, and I ask him to confine his comments to that explanation.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with you, because the position is that the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member disagreeing with the Chair?

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish to explain my position.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member disagreeing with the Chair?

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not want to do that in the early part of the proceedings; however, I wish to give a proper explanation about what the Minister said. In order to do that, I need to refer to the committee he mentioned. I think that that proposition is reasonable.

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept the view taken by the honourable Deputy Leader. It is his request that he make a personal explanation about statements made against him. Leave has been granted for the honourable member to indicate the variation from fact, as he sees it, but not to enter into a debate such as he is developing. Unless the honourable Deputy Leader returns to a personal explanation, I must withdraw leave.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was personally defamed by the Minister when he referred to me as the Chairman of a committee that had manipulated the scheme. I want to deal with the scheme; surely that is fair. The position is

that two committees examined the recommendations. The first committee made recommendations to the second committee, and invariably (this can be checked with public servants) there was no alteration whatsoever to the recommendations made by that committee. If that is manipulating, I am a bad judge of what is manipulation. I will cite areas which had projects and which were not in Labor districts, contrary to the allegations of the Minister.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will please resume his seat. A list of projects may not be related. The honourable member has asked for leave to make a personal explanation and has indicated the nature of the two committees; he cannot, in this personal explanation, proceed along the lines he is pursuing.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is rather unusual for a member to be defamed in this House and not given the opportunity to explain the defamation. Surely I was trying to do that. I was trying to state the districts, other than Labor districts, in which funding operated—places such as Port Lincoln, Hamley Bridge, Ceduna, Kadina, Victor Harbor, Stirling, Renmark, and Murray Bridge. Funding operated in those areas. I totally reject allegations made by the Minister today, and I will deal with him later.

At 3.19 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 23 October. Page 315.)

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$226 000.

The CHAIRMAN: In the documents before the Committee the lines are not individually numbered as they have been in previous years. I ask honourable members to be explicit in relation to the item to which they refer.

Mr. BANNON: A considerable sum was shown for both voted and actual payments in 1978-79 in relation to terminal leave payments but nothing is proposed for the present year. What is the information on which this is based?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Basically, it is because no expenditure on that item is envisaged, because there will be no terminal leave payments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a question about Select Committees.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can seek information; he cannot ask a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, there is no difference between the two, and I propose to ask a question. The question relates to Select Committees, travelling expenses, and so on. The payment last year was \$3 336, quite a small sum, but the amount proposed this year is \$10 000, a considerable increase. Is there some specific reason for the increase, or is it just *ex abundante cautela*?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The whole question of Select Committees in the last Parliament was an unfortunate one, since the early election caused the work of a number of Select Committees to be incomplete. The expenditure in excess of the sum voted was due to the sitting fees of members being carried over from previous years in relation to two such committees, both of lengthy duration. There was a good deal of advertising in respect of the Motor Body Repairs Industry Bill committee, and the

resources committee. The proposed figure relates to sitting fees of members of those committees, neither of which has reported, being carried over from the previous year. The sitting fees for each committee will be more than \$3 000, which accounts for the large increase in the proposed expenditure for the coming year. Most of it is already committed, and only a relatively small surplus remains to cater for possible Select Committees in the coming Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not quite certain, from what the Premier has said, whether the Select Committees are to be reconstituted to complete their tasks, or whether they will be forgotten about now that there has been a change of Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The situation has caused the Government some concern, and consideration has been given to ways in which the information can be made available to the House. A committee which is of concern was one with which the member for Mitcham was involved. If we can get any of these findings into the House, we will see what can be done to do it in the most expeditious way.

Mr. McRAE: My comment is quite the opposite to that of the member for Mitcham. I am not querulous about the proposed \$10 000; in fact, I am surprised that the sum is so low. I ask the Premier to cast his mind back to comments he made in Opposition, quite correctly in my view, to the effect that, under his Administration, there would be a much greater emphasis on Select Committees, and that they would become a much more popular mode of investigation of all kinds of Government business. Are we to understand that the Premier is still of that view and that the sum of \$10 000 is not quite what is needed, or has there been some change of philosophy?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the honourable member would recognise that, if \$6 000 is already committed out of the proposed \$10 000, we are left with a larger sum than that expended last year. I think his fears on that subject can be allayed.

Mr. McRAE: Is the Premier's philosophy still the same as when he was in Opposition?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. We are very much of the view that the Upper House especially has an important role to play, and that this has not been fully exploited until now. I believe that the Select Committees which were instituted were an implementation of the new expanded role of the other place. Nevertheless, I still believe that there are sufficient funds to cover that for this financial year.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am interested to hear the comments on the new and expanded role for the Legislative Council. Under the item relating to the Clerk Assistant and clerical and general staff, the increase of \$6 000 proposed this year is much less than would have been the amount of inflation over the past 12 months. Does this mean a real reduction in the number of people employed by the Legislative Council; if so, how does that fit in with the new and expanded role that the Legislative Council is expected to play? Does this mean that the officers of the Upper House, who already work quite hard, will be working harder, with fewer hands to do the work?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The manner in which the Upper House organises its business is its own concern. The difference to which the honourable member referred was because one position was not filled for the full year. The expenditure in excess of that voted last year was due to national wage cases, but one position of Parliamentary officer was not filled for the full year, and that accounts for the apparent discrepancy.

Mr. BANNON: An amount of \$8 572 is proposed for

pay-roll tax. Are the proposed schemes of the Government in relation to pay-roll tax remissions for employment and so on to be extended to Government departments, and in particular to the Legislative Council?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The proposals for incentives are directed specifically to the private sector.

Mr. PAYNE: A sum of \$31 063 is proposed for the Clerk of the Legislative Council. I need to refer briefly to the House of Assembly, where a similar amount is proposed, although in the previous year actual payments in the two Houses varied by some hundreds of dollars. Why is there that difference?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The information is that the proposed salary for the Clerk of the Legislative Council is the salary as at 30 June 1979. With respect to the Clerk of the House of Assembly, that is still the amount payable at current rates.

Mr. PAYNE: But why are the actual payments to the respective Clerks different for 1978-79, when they are both apparently on the same salary?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is an interesting point, and I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNCAN: I refer to the item "Select Committees—Travelling expenses and fees of members, witnesses and reporters and sundries". In fact, for some years the reporting staff of the House has appeared under the Attorney-General's vote "Government Reporting Division: Director, Reporting and clerical staff", and this year the proposed sum is \$1 833 000. Why is it that some amount is apparently expended on reporters in relation to Select Committees? As I understand the situation, no charges are made between the Parliament, the Legislature, and the Law Department for those services, and it seems to be an anomaly.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I understand it, the matter relates to travelling expenses.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". The amount voted for the previous year was, in fact, exceeded in actual payments quite considerably. This year an increased amount on last year's vote is proposed, but it is \$5 500 less than last year's actual payments. In view of the experience of the previous year, can the Premier specifically say why that somewhat optimistic allocation has been made?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The expenditure in excess of the amount voted last year was almost entirely due to a 100 per cent increase in postage usage during the year. There was an attendance of the President and the Clerk at the Presiding Officers' Conference in Western Australia, Darwin and Port Moresby. Those visits were not anticipated at the time the Budget came in. The proposed sum is the sum which is thought will be adequate. It is indeed higher than that voted last year. It is thought to be adequate. There is no provision for any such attendance at this time, but undoubtedly something will come up, and we hope that will be more than ample to cover the expense involved.

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier detail the exact cost of that particular travel and conference attendance that he mentioned?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will get a report for the Leader.

Mr. DUNCAN: No money has been allocated this year for "Purchase of office machines and equipment". It seems extraordinary that that is the case. The Government must have a great deal of faith in the machinery and equipment in the Legislative Council if it assumes that there will not be any allocation on that item this year. Why has the Government not been more realistic in submitting some token allocation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It basically amounts to the fact that any item under this heading under \$1 000 will be debited to administration expenses and kept under that line. This is a much more efficient way of housekeeping than fiddling with small sums of money, and I understood that was the position taken by the previous Administration.

Mr. LEWIS: I seek information about a matter of principle, and it relates to the item of pay-roll tax. I do not know where the practice came from or why it has continued that the Government charges itself pay-roll tax. Is this believed to create wealth and how does it occur? It seems like a sort of bureaucratic financial incestuousness.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will get a report on that whole matter for the honourable member. I realise that it is not easy for new members in the Chamber to actually understand the complexities involved. I understand that arrangements have been made that officers of the Treasury Department will be available to talk to new members and, indeed, others, and that arrangement has been made within the last 24 hours or so. If members opposite, too, would like to take advantage of that offer we will be delighted to make available officers to talk to back-benchers.

Mr. Millhouse: It's the first I've heard of it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would have thought the member for Mitcham had been here long enough not to avail himself of it.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Premier said that it is not easy for members to understand the complexities of Government financing. That assumes that the Premier knows the complexities of Government funding. I wonder why he is not able to give the member for Mallee the benefit of his great experience and knowledge on this subject without having to go away and get a report. After all, he is the Treasurer of the State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Am I to understand from the Premier's last answer that the services of these Treasury officers are to be denied to me because of my experience, because I am humble and modest enough to believe that I may need them? I would perhaps venture the explanation why the Premier apparently did not have to the pay-roll tax question. This is a carryover from the time when it was a Federal tax and we had to pay it because it was levied on us by the Commonwealth, and it has been kept there really as a cosmetic thing. Until a few years ago pay-roll tax was a Federal tax and State Government departments had to pay it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me hasten to assure the member for Mitcham that the services of the Treasury officers will be freely available to him. The honourable member is quite correct, of course, in his explanation of pay-roll tax; it is a method of accounting adopted since then.

Mr. DUNCAN: Does the provision for administration expenses involve any expense allowance to any officers of the Parliament?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of that. I will find out for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNCAN: In seeking that information, would the Premier also find out, if there is such a payment, how much those payments were in the past 12 months and what is the likely amount of that payment in this current financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I expect that the honourable member is tilting at windmills; I do not think there is any such expense account. However, I will make inquiries for him.

Vote passed.

House of Assembly, \$454 000.

Mr. BANNON: Referring to "Public Accounts Committee—Members' fees", I notice that there was a considerable increase of actual payments on the amount voted in 1978-79 and a further increase in 1979-80. Does that indicate a change in the level of fees, the activities of the committee or membership?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The increased expenditure was due to the increases in the rates payable from 7 December 1978. There was a further 8.9 per cent increase paid from 1 January 1979. The proposed expenditure as calculated is the amount for a full year calculated at the current rates.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Public Accounts Committee may find it necessary in the course of its investigations to travel away from the capital city and its office in Parliament House. In view of that, has an allocation been set aside for expenses that may be required by the Public Accounts Committee in its deliberations and, if so, what sum has been set aside.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The structure of the Public Accounts Committee and the assistance available to it are being considered at present. I think the matters of policy have been ventilated thoroughly in this Chamber in the past 24 hours or so. We intend to follow this through. In the meantime and until these changes are formalised, there is no allocation on the lines for the committee.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take it from the answer given by the Premier that the policy of the Liberal Party before the election that there would be six members of the Public Accounts Committee does not account for the additional \$3 000 that is on the line. I also understand that an increase in research and secretarial staff has been promised to the Public Accounts Committee. That does not appear in these lines. Am I to understand from that that no changes will be made to the structure of the Public Accounts Committee during this financial period and, if that is not the case, from where will this money come if changes are made?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member should know by now that if staff is seconded, as it probably will be under the proposals that we have for the Public Accounts Committee, it will be seconded from the Auditor-General's Department, the Treasury, or some other Government department. Therefore, there will not be any need to provide funds in the line for additional staff.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The most important and most immediate question I have concerns the lines "Clerk of the House of Assembly (Clerk of Parliaments)" and "Clerk Assistant, and Sergeant at Arms". I think Mr. Aubrey Dodd retired on 29 June as Clerk of the House of Assembly, and he was also Clerk of Parliaments, because he was the senior of the two. Since then both Clerks sitting on your left and on your right have been acting in that capacity for a long time. They are both competent officers. I had expected weekly that their appointments respectively as Clerk and Clerk Assistant would have been confirmed by the previous Government, and nothing happened.

Whether the Premier of that day was preoccupied by wondering whether to have an election, or whatever, I do not know, but it did not happen. Five weeks have now gone by and still no appointment has been made. It is not really fair on the officers concerned, who are carrying the full load of the work. I hope that both of them will be confirmed in their respective offices. I am sure there is no one at present better qualified. They have given good service, although they have not been here as long as I have been. It is about time some permanent appointments were made. I therefore ask whether such appointments are to

be made soon.

I also point out (and I do not know which Government to blame for this but probably it is the previous one) that by some clerical slip the Clerk of the House of Assembly is no longer Clerk of the Parliaments. As I understand it Mr. Hull, the Clerk of the Legislative Council (obviously he must be the senior because he is the only one appointed at the moment) is the Clerk of the Parliaments. That bit of a slip in the lines does not matter but the important thing is to get an assurance about the permanent appointments in this place.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thoroughly support the member for Mitcham in his remarks about the officers. The matter has come to our attention now and an announcement will be made soon.

Mr. LANGLEY: My query refers to "Terminal leave payments". On 30 July this year I received a memo from the former Premier concerning accrued leave for people in this House. Information was also sent to the President of the Legislative Council. The Premier made a decision about the postponement of recreational leave which is similar to that applying under the Public Service Act. Since that time, I have been assured by our Clerks that this has happened. Most likely few people now have leave. I wonder whether the Government will continue in that vein.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not absolutely certain in what vein I am to continue. There is no suggestion that this practice is likely to continue, nor, I believe, is there any need for it to continue. The terminal leave payment that was made was not expected when the estimates were compiled in the first instance and we have no provision for terminal leave payments from now on.

Mr. PAYNE: I, too, support the remarks made by the member for Mitcham, and by the Premier when he responded, in relation to the quality of the staff we have in the House and the service that we as members receive from them. The people in this State can be proud of those officers and all other people who work in the House for the way in which they give support to members so that they can carry out their duties.

It is for that reason I refer to the line "Salaries, wages and related payments—Clerk Assistant and Sergeant at Arms". I note that the amount paid to those worthy officers of the Parliament last year was \$262 046 and this year the amount voted is \$256 562. I would have expected to see some amount in the vote column which would have allowed for expected inflation which, as pointed out in the Budget, is about 9 per cent. It would seem to me that presumably someone has been demoted or a lesser payment will be made than was made last year. Does this indicate a recent review of staff which will result in reduced services to members? I seek information as much as possible in relation to that item.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot give the precise information. As far as I know, the rates calculated to the present time are the amounts payable for the current year at the current rates of pay for the staff as it is.

Mr. PAYNE: I do not know whether that is good enough. I have raised a fairly simple query about a certain amount that was paid in salaries for the officers of this House last year. We are being asked to vote an amount to pay less to those officers at a time when we all know that one normally expects some increase on a given line. If there is a reason for this, I am perfectly willing to accept it. I would like to hear whether the Premier has had time to look at the information with which he has been provided.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no further information to hand at present, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. BANNON: I move to the contingencies line under the heading "Select Committees—Travelling expenses and fees of members, witnesses and reporters and sundries". Last year there was an actual payment of \$12 684. This year an amount of \$8 000 is proposed, a sharp contrast to matters mentioned in a previous discussion. In view of the Premier's statements about the role of Select Committees, their importance, and the increase in activities, it seems rather surprising that that line has been reduced.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have nothing to add to what I have said previously in respect of Select Committees in the other place. Much more has been voted previously because of the number of meetings held. I can now refer to the part played by the member for Mitcham and his colleagues in one particular Select Committee that went on for much longer than expected and involved much advertising. The proposed amount represents the cost of completing one committee that has not yet reported, plus an additional amount to cover Select Committees in the coming year. I believe that Select Committees still have an important role to play.

We cannot foresee exactly what is to be the fate of that particular Select Committee, but I would hope that steps can be taken to make sure that the immense amount of work put into that committee and the evidence that was obtained can be made available to the House for consideration in the most expeditious way possible. That matter is being investigated at present. It involves much consideration of the legislative process involved in Standing Orders. The other matter, referring to the sum involved for the Clerk and Assistant Clerk, was due to payments over and above the levels usually payable because of higher duty payments for persons acting in positions, caused by the absence of the Clerk of the House on terminal leave. That payment will not occur again this year.

Mr. BANNON: The Premier indicated that some of the moneys allocated for Select Committees have already been spent on a report, payments for which were incurred in this financial year. Is that correct?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, the amount budgeted.

Mr. BANNON: To what extent is there provision for new committees and inquiries in that amount?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As far as I am able to judge, \$7 000 will be approximately the amount available this year. In other words, there is a carry-over for the small amount of expenditure still involved. It is not expenditure that is important now: it is the Standing Orders and the legislative process that may be necessary to get that evidence into the House, where it can be considered.

Mr. McRAE: Regarding the line "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", am I to understand that it is the policy of the present Government that members of the House of Assembly will, in future, have a private room? If that is the case, is that policy to be extended to members of the Opposition? Further, is any provision being made for what appears to be the fairly obvious situation of some outside premises nearby being rented? Before leaving the happy position on the Government benches, I often noted the squalid conditions in which members of the Opposition were forced to reside. Having now joined the squalor, I know that they are certainly not good working conditions. The circumstances of the working conditions of the Leader are none too splendid; in fact, there is a small sort of hayloft window and a picture to give a perspective of daylight on the wall where one would expect to see daylight.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know where to start. I am overwhelmed that the member for Playford has at last recognised those conditions.

Mr. McRae: I recognised them all along.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In that case, I wish the honourable member had communicated that to his colleagues. I can remember vividly first coming into this place, as many of us did in 1970 in a large intake (and I think the intake after the recent election was the first to match that of 1970) and sitting in the basement in quite comfortable rooms that were taken over by Ministerial officers, leaving us in the attic. We were four and three in a room at that stage, and it was a good thing. I repeat what I said before; I think a little period in Opposition is good for being in Government, because it makes one so much more understanding. As to the proposition put forward by the member for Playford, that each member of Parliament should have his own room, I point out that honourable members do have the good fortune to have their own electorate offices, and they have secretarial assistance. I support the electorate office system, and to find a separate room here for every member of Parliament is quite impossible.

As to the suggestion that we should find rooms outside Parliament House, there was a period when, because of the cramped conditions in the attic, it was thought that the staff of the Leader might have to look for outside rooms, but the situation was resolved for us by the election. I am not in favour of moving people outside of Parliament House, and I do not think that it does any harm for people to double up in offices. I understand there have been some moves relating to the Public Works Standing Committee shifting into accommodation, presently unused, in the railway station building. I do not have information about that matter, which will have to be dealt with by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McRae: How did the last election solve the problem of the cramped quarters of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition? How would they not be the same now, provided the same staff is there?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I should have said "the last election but one". Unfortunately, Opposition numbers were reduced slightly and there was more room for expansion in the attic.

Mr. McRae: Does that mean that the Premier, having acknowledged that conditions for his own staff were unsatisfactory prior to the election, is prepared to impose what he considered an injustice on his successor in that office?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We found that, when our numbers were close to those of the current Opposition, we were quite comfortable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would like, first, to remind the member for Playford that electorate offices were established for members rather than looking for more accommodation here in this building or elsewhere because it was thought that that would be cheaper. That was a decision made by the Government he supported (I suppose he supported it; he always seemed to in this House). It is rather too late to go back on that now, if any of us wanted to. This should not be a place for offices; all we need here is somewhere to rest our heads, or whatever we like to rest, when we are not in here. They are just rooms, not offices.

Our offices are in our districts. It would be absolute extravagance to do anything else, as I am sure the member for Playford really knows. I am pleased that the Premier has finally acknowledged it.

Leaving that subject, I come back to the question of Select Committees, particularly the Select Committee on prostitution, which was the one that the Premier adverted to, although he did not name it. It may be known (and it probably is known to all those in the Chamber) that the

committee was within a week, literally, of presenting the report; it was all but completed when the foolish, arrogant decision was made to have the election that led to such disastrous results for the Labor Party. It was a disaster for the committee as well.

Members have been asked what is contained in the report and what evidence has been taken. Quite honestly, I do not know whether the obligation of secrecy, once a Select Committee has expired (as did this committee with the ending of this Parliament), still remains. I assume it does; it is better to be cautious than otherwise. I am not certain that this is the case. My view would be (and I have not thought about the technicalities) that the obvious thing to do would be to reconstitute the committee, appoint another three members in the hope that the committee would adopt the work that has been done, and bring in the report, or substantially the same report, of the other committee.

The committee as it stood cannot be constituted, because three of the seven members have gone. Some were expected to go and others were not. I was expected to go, and I did not. I am one of the four remaining members. No doubt, the Liberals would want two more and want to give the Labor Party one more member, to keep the new balance. That would be the most sensible thing to do. It would be a crying shame if all the work of the committee did not culminate in a report. The Premier talked about making a report available. That is not the point. A report should come into this House so that it can be debated. Otherwise, there would be nothing to be debated and the whole of the work would have gone.

Apart from the waste that that would entail, I believe that this subject is important and is a very important social topic on which a decision should be made in Parliament.

It took me a couple of years to get a committee appointed, and it was appointed (dare I say this while the member for Hanson is in the Chamber—I am glad to see that he has come in), while I was not in the House, but when I entered I found I had been appointed to the committee. I was pleased to serve on the committee. We need to have a committee appointed again as soon as possible. I asked the Premier about this, and he was vague; I wonder how much thought has been given to the subject. I ask what is intended, what problems are involved, and what lines of possible action are open.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is not quite as simple a matter as outlined by the honourable member; I am sure he is aware of that. Difficulties are involved in reconstituting the committee with new members; these new members would not have the benefit of having heard the evidence and would be required to put their names to that report. It is not fair to ask people to put their names to a report without their being fully aware of what is in the evidence and without their having considered all aspects. However, that may have to be the way out of the problem. If there is a way of bringing that report into the House (and I also understand the report was within a week of being prepared—in fact, a draft report had been prepared) and if there is a short cut available, I believe that the short cut should be taken in the interests of the community.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are not bound to any particular number of members on the Select Committee and I noticed in the last Parliament that when I was invited to go on a Select Committee, two more members would be appointed. Usually, there were five members on a Select Committee but, because the Liberals were jealous of my being on a committee, it was necessary to appoint four Labor members, two Liberals, and me, so that the Liberals would not lose a member on a Select Committee. They were probably after the perk. Normally, only five

members are appointed to a Select Committee.

Mr. BANNON: Probably the value of your experience was wanted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. That was before the Select Committee was appointed, and no doubt the qualification I needed to get on it was my thoroughness in inspections. There is no reason (and I make these comments to make my point) why seven or five members should be appointed to a Select Committee or why the four remaining members should not be appointed as a Select Committee. The problem of people having to put their names to a report, not having been on the committee and not having heard the evidence, can be overcome by appointing the four remaining members as a Select Committee. Let us bring in the report, and it will be before us. I do not know if there is any problem about that. I can see that the Premier is obtaining information from the Clerk. As far as I know, there is no lower limit to the number of members on a Select Committee. My suggestion would be one way out of the problem.

Mr. PAYNE: Comments made by the honourable member were interesting, but I return to the line I raised. I do so in recognition of what was said by the Leader. Regarding the line “Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms, clerical and general staff”, I am sure that members on this side do not want to pass judgment or vote for an amount that would result in a lesser amount being paid to those involved. The Premier has been quite frank but does not have actual details available. I would be pleased if he would assure us that no officer concerned will suffer as a result of any vote taken.

Regarding the allotment of rooms, it occurred to me that, if the Premier is examining that matter, it may be possible for the member for Mitcham to be located closer to the bathroom so that the member for Hanson would not be shocked or horrified at the passage of a body between the bathroom and an office.

I was pleased to see that there was no impediment to my being able to place on the Notice Paper a report of a Select Committee which, by a fluke, had progressed further than had the prostitution Select Committee at the time the election was called. Because of the obligation that the Parliament had to the Pitjantjatjara people, the Select Committee report was kept alive by being placed on the Notice Paper. I would be happy to accept an assurance from the Premier along the lines I have mentioned regarding the line about which I spoke and the sum of \$256 562.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member could not have been listening when I was talking about this line. The payments were made because officers carried out higher duties, for which payments were made, while other staff members were on holidays last year. There were no contingencies, and this will not happen again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is strange that the member for Mitchell should have said what he did about a room for me closer to the bathroom. Only this week I have had a letter from *Cleo* magazine saying that my body is not good enough for the centrefold. Apparently, it was offered on my behalf. The letter was most flattering, and came out of the blue. I was turned down by a committee of ladies aged between 65 and 70 years. On a scale of 1 to 10, I got only two points.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member should link his remarks to the item under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On the question of the Select Committee, Standing Order 372 provides that, unless the House otherwise directs, there shall be five members, so

there would be power to appoint the four of us who are left. I am glad that the member for Hanson is now in the Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation across the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the fees for members of the Public Accounts Committee. Last night, I reminded Government members of their policy on this matter. I pointed out that nothing had been said here about putting that policy into effect, and perhaps I could remind the Premier of the details. He said that the matter was being considered, but no consideration seems to have been necessary. The decision was made before the election on what the Liberal Party would do about the Public Accounts Committee. It is to the advantage of the Labor Party that they should do it. I suspect that members on this side have not read this policy, because they get a bonus out of it.

We will not go into the purple patches about waste and extravagance, but the Premier hinted this afternoon that the committee would be reconstituted, strengthened, and given additional clerical and research support. I should like to know what that may be. I understand there is a gentleman who has an office somewhere in this House, who has been an officer of the committee for some time, and who is still here on his own. I wonder what additional clerical and research support the Liberals think necessary for the committee. I would have thought that a bit of ability on the part of the members, and perhaps some application, were what would be required. This is the crux of the matter so far as the member for Hanson is concerned. If the Government honours its promise, he will no longer hold the position of Chairman.

Mr. Becker: You'll be happy then, won't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a matter of indifference to me, but I think the Liberals must stand up to their promises, which were made in unequivocal terms.

The Liberal Party said it would appoint six members, three from each side of the House. I am not a candidate for appointment, and the member for Flinders is on that side of the House, leaving only the Labor Party and the member for Semaphore as candidates for the extra appointment. Obviously, the plan of the Liberal Party is to have this as a bi-partisan committee with equal numbers of Government and Opposition members, and an independent Chairman. I presume, from the way in which the sentence is worded, that the Chairman will not be a member of Parliament. There is no other way in which we can get an independent Chairman.

The Government did not spell out what it had in mind in using the term "independent Chairman". Obviously, it cannot be the member for Hanson, or any other member of the Government Party. I want to know what is involved, and also what clerical, research, and investigative facilities of the Auditor-General's Department will be available to the committee.

It is difficult to see the member for Hanson working very well with the Auditor-General after what has been said by him in the past few days. It is difficult to see the member for Hanson working well with anyone. I do not know whether the Premier saw the report in the *Weekend Australian*, which said that Mr. Becker was in the position of the boy who was not invited to the party and was given a box of matches to play with while the others went.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the honourable member will relate his comments to the matter in hand.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I am asking the Premier precisely what the Government is going to do to honour to the letter the promises it made in its policy, under the

Treasury policy, which the Treasurer himself put out in August last. I give notice that, if I am not satisfied, and if we do not get an unequivocal assurance that this committee is to be reconstituted with an independent Chairman, independent, and therefore outside Parliament, I intend to move in a certain direction in Committee. This Government has said that it will keep its promises, and this is the first time we have had a chance to test it out.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition said, in a flush of charity, that he did not propose to move any motion of no confidence in the Government until it had had time to prove itself, but this is the first opportunity it has had to prove itself or otherwise. If we do not get an unequivocal assurance that this policy is to be implemented, the time has come, in my view, to move a motion of no confidence, and that I propose to do in the proper way unless I get the assurance.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not quite sure where to start; the honourable member has covered so much ground.

Mr. Millhouse: It's only a couple of paragraphs you wrote yourself.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall go further and talk about what he has not covered. The staffing procedures for the Public Accounts Committee are very much a matter for the committee itself. People will be seconded from the Auditor-General's Department and from the Treasury, as necessary. There will be no increase in total work force.

Mr. Bannon: There are no more reserves?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, they will be working directly for the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Bannon: Taking them away from somewhere else?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, because there will be no increase in overall ceilings. The matter has been discussed with the Auditor-General. It is very much one for the Public Accounts Committee itself. In the past, it has not had the support it should have had. For the member for Mitcham to talk about its needing just a little application (and I cannot remember all the unflattering things he said about the members of the committee) shows a complete disregard for the difficulties the committee has had in the past and which it would continue to have in the future without the staff.

We have not as yet made any change, because of the time situation. There have been no Budget and Estimates Committees set up for the examination of this Budget, and even the member for Mitcham would understand that it would not be possible to do that in the time available. Bearing in mind the legislative needs and the changes that would be necessary in Standing Orders, that matter will be attended to. Until that is done and until we have worked out the total effect of how expenditure is to be controlled by this Parliament, the situation will remain as it is. What will happen in future and when, I am not able to say at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The crux of this is the chairmanship of the committee, and that is the point on which I shall concentrate. The Premier has talked around the question of staff. It does not seem to me that what is promised in the policy speech will work out. One cannot get away from the unequivocal undertaking in the policy of the Government.

Obviously, it means an amendment to the Public Accounts Committee Act. I am not going to let the Premier get away with this. Before we finish the debate he will say either that, he is not going to honour the promise or that he is going to honour it. We are entitled to expect that the Act will be amended to provide for equal representation from both sides of this House, three

members from each side of the Chamber. There is no problem about that at all. The real point is the question of an independent Chairman that must mean (and I want the Premier to answer specifically that it does) somebody who is not a member of Parliament being in charge of this committee as the Chairman. When it stated in its policy what sort of a person is to be the Chairman of the committee, the Government must have had this in mind. Is it to be the Auditor-General, or a retired Auditor-General, or perhaps a Supreme Court judge? Who on earth is to be this independent Chairman? I want to know what sort of a person it will be, and as a first step I want an assurance that the Chairman of the reconstituted Public Accounts Committee will not be a member of Parliament.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no way that the honourable member can pin down one section of the financial package that we have put forward in the policy and say that that must be implemented first. I repeat that we have made our assurances about the Public Accounts Committee, about the Public Works Standing Committee and about the increased role for that, about the Budget and Estimates committees, and about the examination of the Budget in detail. All I can say is that there has not been time to consider how these reforms can be achieved, and whether and how they will match in with each other. I am not going to make any commitment today which would put me in a position in which I am not able to do what I consider to be best in the entire financial management and supervision by this Parliament.

Mr. BANNON: The Premier seems to have avoided the question. Certainly, he is not going to make a specific undertaking. I would like to have some information in this area and to refresh his memory as to who this independent person may be. In Parliament in 1978 these proposals were first made and specific reference was made there on two occasions to the Auditor-General's being an appropriate Chairman of the committee. That office was mentioned in this connection on two occasions. My concern about this has been reinforced by remarks made by the Premier in terms of how he intends to strengthen the committee. Under this line our information seems to be that there is no specific allocation for further staff or resources to service that committee. I am not quite sure where the cost of the car and driver appears in the lines that have been supplied to the Chairman.

Mr. Millhouse: That's under the Minister of Transport.

Mr. BANNON: We will reach that later. He does rather disturbingly say that the Auditor-General apparently has surplus staff which can be transferred across. If it is not the case that there is surplus staff available from the Auditor-General, it does seem equally disturbing that in some way the Auditor-General's Department and its function is to be amalgamated with the Public Accounts Committee, that it is to be in effect a servicing body to a Parliamentary committee and that two quite separate and distinct statutory functions will in some way be merged. One can have even more grave concern in view of the remarks made by the current Chairman about the future Chairman, namely, by the member for Hanson, in relation to the Auditor-General and the honourable member's view of the report.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition seems determined not to understand. I have made the point that staff can be seconded from the Auditor-General's Department or from the Treasury. I think he should be able to understand that when the Public Accounts Committee is examining such aspects as for instance, hospitals, as it has examined in some considerable detail recently, there will be people available to be seconded, perhaps from the Hospitals Department

itself, or perhaps from one of the divisions of the Treasury with a particular concern about hospital management. In other words, the people who will be seconded to help the Public Accounts Committee will not be there permanently; they will be there for specific projects.

I would like to think the Public Accounts Committee could report far more frequently than it has in the past, when it has had difficulties in getting out its reports. With support staff for part inquiries, I hope it can report to this House more rapidly, and indeed on an interim basis if necessary. It is not a question of putting on extra staff to do this; there is no doubt at the present time there is a large Public Service in South Australia. People will be available to do this work, and they will do this work very well.

Mr. BANNON: Is the implication of what the Premier is saying that at least until the next financial year or until appropriation is adopted these changes will not take place. In that case, what role will the committee be playing over the next 12 months?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It will be entirely as it is and has been, until the entire financial package is brought in. That is not likely to be before this time next year, hopefully a little earlier than this. It will take a good deal of research to work out the method of operation of Budget and Estimate committees. In principle, I believe it is an extremely efficient method. I think it will significantly help in Parliamentary oversight of Government expenditure. I think most responsible Governments would welcome that kind of examination of the Budget and I am sure the Public Service will also welcome it. It will not be easy to bring it in quickly. I have no intention of rushing it in only to find out that it needs alteration. When we do bring it in as a total financial package it will be workable and, if there are any changes necessary, that they will be very minor ones.

Mr. KENEALLY: When does the policy of secondment from other Public Service departments to the Public Accounts Committee take effect and who will determine whether or not the Public Accounts Committee obtain research officers for assistance in investigations that the committee may make.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This is largely a matter for the Public Service Board to approve the secondment of officers. I imagine that the Public Accounts Committee itself will put in a request for officers that it needs, and it will be up to the Public Service Board to approve these secondments and make sure such secondment is possible.

Mr. KENEALLY: So, it is possible that a good deal of the efforts and energies of the Public Accounts Committee could be directed towards justifying to the Public Service Board that it requires the services of a couple of research officers.

That is quite contrary to the clear understanding given by the Government when it went to the people with its policy speech. It was quite clearly stated therein that the role of the Public Accounts Committee would be expanded and that additional staff would be made available to it. I believe that the Premier has moved away from the commitment given at that time. I ask him to honour the commitments he made. If the Public Accounts Committee is to be the type of committee he envisages, it ought to have the assistance that he promised. The assistance that he has explained to the House today is not much use at all if, on each occasion the Public Accounts Committee wishes to make an investigation, it first has to justify to another authority its need for the staff. Does the Premier foresee any problems in that? As a member of the committee I certainly do, and it is quite contrary to the undertaking we have already been given within the last

week or so as members of this committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can see no difficulty other than that which the honourable member is trying to manufacture. Obviously there will need to be clerical staff, and that will come from within the existing Public Service strength. I can see no difficulty at all in having research officers seconded for specific projects as necessary.

Mr. DUNCAN: I have been sitting here for the past 10 or 15 minutes listening to the debate as the information has slowly but surely been eked out of the Premier. I am amazed to have heard what he has said in the past few minutes. On a couple of points I am very angry. First, I think that his suggestion that public servants should be seconded from the particular department under investigation is an extraordinary attack on the independence of Parliament.

We as Parliamentarians have a role to play in the way that the Government of the State operates, and the Parliament is independent of the administration. That well-established principle has existed since Dicey. These people will be seconded from the department that is being investigated. They will then have to go back into that department, having been part and parcel of the presentation of a report which in most instances will be critical of the work done by that department. Imagine the hopelessly compromised position in which these poor people will be. They would be poor fools in my view if they took on such a secondment.

Surely, the premier is not seriously suggesting that we are going to second people out of the subject department to do work for the Public Accounts Committee. It seems to me that his suggestion that, as an example, if the Health Commission were being investigated, Health Commission officers could be seconded to assist with the investigation, is a scandalous indictment on his thinking and understanding of the rights and privileges of this Parliament and our right to be independent of the Executive in the way that we go about our business as Parliamentarians.

He has talked about the assurance he has given. He has talked about undertakings. What we have heard this afternoon is a clear indication that this Government is shaping up to renege on the policy it put before the public on 15 September. The people of South Australia have a right to expect an independent Chairman, three members for each side of the House, and have adequate staff for the task of the Committee.

The Premier said earlier that his decisions on these matters would be decided by the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee.

No doubt he is talking about the present committee on which the Government has a majority and no doubt, judging by the way the committee has been operating since I have been on it, the decisions will not be made by the committee; they will be made in the Cabinet room or in the office of the Premier. No doubt the decisions of the committee will be made three-two in the Government's favour and we will find the committee recommendations being mere rubber stamps of the views of the Premier and Cabinet. That is not good enough.

I have mentioned the matter of the office of the Premier. I would like to seek information from the Premier whether there are any proposals to shift the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee out of the Parliament House building into some other accommodation. From the experience we have had of the committee in the past few weeks or so it seems to me that, if the committee is to be shifted, it ought to be shifted near the office of the Premier so that we can lose as little time as possible. The history of this committee whilst I have been

a member of it has been one of the Chairman running back and forth to the telephone to get instructions from the Premier. Worse still, the committee has had to adjourn its meetings earlier than desirable so that the Chairman can trot off to the Premier's office for meetings with the Premier. On another occasion he was a few minutes late because he had to come from that office. Fancy being on the mat to that extent.

I pity the Chairman of the committee, and it is a sad thing to see a Parliamentary committee being degraded in the way in which this one is being degraded. I hope the member for Mitcham goes ahead with his proposal because there is no doubt that this Government is intending to renege on its promise made, and it ought to be condemned for that.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Elizabeth really does exaggerate a lot. First, there is no question, as he suggested, that we would adopt the scandalous process of seconding people from subject departments. I repeat that we will second people from the Auditor-General's Department, the Treasury, or departments such as the Hospitals Department, if some aspect of health is involved, not from the department under discussion; it will be someone with expertise in that subject. There is nothing scandalous in that. It is just plain common sense. The staffing situation will largely be a matter for discussion with the Public Accounts Committee, but an assurance has been given that staff will be available over and above the present Secretary.

The question of renegeing on promises is something which the present Opposition has been quick to leap on, and it has accused us in various ways of renegeing on promises on land tax, on pay-roll tax incentives and many other features. There is no question that we will honour those promises. We will honour our promise to bring better financial management and Parliamentary supervision into this House, and we will do that in proper time and in a proper way. As for the suggestion that the member for Hanson is rushing backwards and forwards to the telephone to get instructions from the Premier's office, I have never heard such claptrap in all my life.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier has had about half an hour now to give me the assurance that I sought and those were that its policy would be implemented to the letter, and he has deliberately avoided giving that assurance. All he had to do was to say, "Yes, they will be", and he will not do it. Therefore, I move:

That the line "Public Accounts Committee—Members' fees" be reduced by \$100.

For the benefit of members on the Government side who are new to this place, I point out that this is a vote of no confidence in the Government. I am moving it because the Premier refuses to say now that he will honour the promises that he made explicitly before the election. I suggest that honourable members opposite search their consciences before they vote on this matter.

Even now, if the Premier will give explicit undertakings that each and every one of these points will be put into effect within the next few months (not this time in 12 months), I will consider seeking leave of the Committee to withdraw my motion. I do not think that I am going to get that assurance, after the Leader's performance in the past few minutes. Let us set the scenario for this matter.

An honourable member: The Premier's performance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am living in the past. Honourable members probably wish I was in the past and not here at present, but I am here despite the best attempts of one of the new members who peddled a letter around my district as President of the Liberal Party. I must not go into those things; the Address in Reply debate will be the time for

that.

There is no difficulty in saying now that the Government will honour this promise—it is not mixed up with a whole package of other things. What I am asking the Premier to say will be put into effect is the following:

The Public Accounts Committee will be reconstituted and strengthened and given additional clerical and research support. It will comprise six members, three from each side of the House, with an independent Chairman.

That is all I am asking the Premier to say will happen. By "independent Chairman" he must have meant, and we must take the Premier to have meant, a Chairman who is not a member of Parliament. There is no other way one can get independence in the chairmanship of a committee except by having somebody from outside Parliament in the position.

What have we got instead of the undertaking to honour that? First, there was the dropping of the member for Hanson from Cabinet when it was expected that he would be a Cabinet member. Indeed, he was written up in some newspapers as being an indispensable tool. Ted Knez in the *Australian*, had the member for Hanson's photograph appear in the paper on the Monday morning after the election, along with the statement that the honourable member was going to be one of the key men in Cabinet to get things straight again financially.

However, the honourable member was not put in the Cabinet, and he made no secret about his disappointment. He had some woman write to the paper saying how disappointed she was, so that the Premier would know about it. No doubt that caused a great deal of ill feeling in the Liberal Party. The next thing we are told by the Premier, through the press, is that the member for Hanson is to be Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and how important that job is. The next thing we hear is that he will get a motor car because the committee is going to be upgraded and that in some way, by giving the Chairman a motor car, that will be an upgrading of the committee.

It is so obvious to anybody who has any honesty and common sense that that was a sop to a member who was bitterly disappointed because he had been left out of the Cabinet that I cannot see how the Government can escape admitting that. Let me assure the Premier that that decision, and a few others (but this is the one that we will concentrate on now) have already tarnished the Government's image. We have this Government that was going to get down on extravagance and the first thing it does is give one of its disappointed members a Government car and a driver.

When we look at the Liberal Party's policy before the election, we find that what it has done with the member for Hanson, if that policy is to be honoured, cannot possibly stand because the member for Hanson cannot continue as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, since the Government undertook to have an independent Chairman. That is the position. Despite our best efforts this afternoon, we cannot get the Premier to say that there is to be an independent Chairman.

The easiest thing in the world for the Premier to do was to say, as soon as I got up, "Yes, of course we are going to honour that promise. We are going to have, when the committee is reconstituted, a Chairman who is not a member of Parliament. We said it and we are going to honour it." He has avoided saying that every time he has got to his feet on this subject. The only conclusion one can come to is that the Liberal Party will not honour this promise, because it feels under an obligation to the member for Hanson, or is afraid of him, or believes the matter will cause trouble in some other way. No other interpretation than that can be put on this matter.

That is, I believe, a very bad thing. Here we have a Government which comes to office saying that it will honour its promises, and keep them to the letter. The first time it is put to the test it reneges and avoids the issue, and the Premier of the day (who himself issued this policy in his own name) avoids saying that the Government is going to do that. If that does not deserve a vote of no confidence, I do not know what does. The member for Hanson has brought this on himself, as he well knows.

Let me come to question of staff (and the member for Elizabeth was dead right in what he said about this).

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If one thing is required in Government and in Parliament in South Australia it is accountability. What has happened in this State (and it is not only the previous Government that is to blame; it has been on a slide for a long time, but, by gum, the previous Labor Government must take its share of responsibility) is that Parliament has, little by little, seen its ability to control Government and Government expenditure whittled away. There is only one way in which we can get that back and that is by having an effective body which is accountable to Parliament, such as a Public Accounts Committee, with some teeth and ability to do something.

The other day I was talking to my brother-in-law, who is a university man concerned with the Flinders Medical Centre, and he made the point that it is accountability that is missing at present and that Parliament just has not got an effective instrument to make the Government accountable to it. These proposals made by the Liberals, frankly, I believe have a good chance of success if they are put into effect. They should not, now they have got into office, go on with the same old scheme, which they complained about when in Opposition; but that is all we have heard from the Government this afternoon that it is going to do.

It is essential, if this Public Accounts Committee is to be any good at all, that it must be modelled on similar bodies in the United States and perhaps in Canberra. It must have full-time permanent staff who are able, because of their accounting qualifications and experience, to go into any department and see what is what. There is no possible way in which people can be seconded from Government departments, or anywhere else, just to do one job. This must be a continuing thing so that experience and confidence between members of the committee and the staff are built up. That is undoubtedly what is envisaged in this policy. What else would anybody reading this sentence believe it means, when it states:

The Public Accounts Committee will be reconstituted and strengthened and given additional clerical and research support.

There is no question of people being seconded and being there for a specific job—they are to be given an expert staff. That is what should happen if Parliament is to be master of the Government again in financial matters. The fact that it proposes to put an equal number of Government and Opposition members on the committee is good. There is no doubt that this should be a bi-partisan committee.

We saw it immediately; the longer a Government is in office, the more it happens. It identifies itself with the Public Service and it is there to defend the Public Service, and not to act, as it should, as a decision-making body in the interests of the community. That is what we saw last time. We also saw it in Playford's time and in Menzies' time. It is a fact of human nature when people are in office in positions of power for too long. This plan will do something to avoid that, because we will have an equal balance. It is a good plan, and I support it. Except for the

political obligation that the Government now seems to have to the member for Hanson, I can see no reason why it should not be agreed to now and put into effect immediately. Obviously, it could not be done before this Budget, nor could the Budget committee that was talked about a few minutes ago be put into effect before the Budget.

The Government was saddled with the necessity of putting a Budget through quickly because of the election. I do not blame it for that, but to say that it will wait 12 months before doing this is absurd. To say that it refuses to implement this policy is downright dishonest. That is why I have moved the motion.

Mr. BANNON: We have canvassed this issue not only in this debate but at other times in the House. After listening carefully to the debate, discussions, and the Premier's reply earlier, I am bound to support the remarks made by the member for Mitcham and to support his motion. It is certainly true that the role of the Public Accounts Committee has been under scrutiny for some time. When in Government, the Labor Party did not make great changes to the committee. It is important to remember that a Labor Government established the Public Accounts Committee to provide scrutiny. The committee's first Chairman, the Hon. D. W. Simmons, who has since retired from this Parliament, laid down some of the groundrules and prepared the committee for the effective role it should play. It is right that we should look at the developing role of the committee.

Regarding the line under discussion and the remarks of the Premier, I do not think we have had the sorts of assurances and the positive statements that we really should expect in the light of the Premier's policy and in the light of the promises he made not only to this Parliament but to the people generally in order to get elected. He may say that the Government has had insufficient time to prepare the required changes. The fact is that all of the things the Premier has been talking about today, and promised in his election speech, were stated by him at least 12 months ago in this House. It was all there, laid out clearly.

At other times in the past, as the member for Mitchell reminds me, the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, talked about changes and reforms. It is not as if this is a major administrative or legislative task for which the Government is not prepared; the Government has been talking about these changes constantly and has had ample time to put specific proposals before us. If the Premier could not say today that changes would be introduced in the next few weeks, he could have indicated whether changes would be implemented some time early next year (if the session is resumed then); perhaps then he would have been listened to, and the member for Mitcham made that point clearly. He said that, if he could get an assurance from the Premier, he would withdraw his motion. We have not had that assurance and we are not likely to get it. The Premier has said that this cannot be done; he said that the Government is not in a position to do it. These promises, simple and clear, were made a long time ago and were repeated to the people; they should be before us, embodied in some way, either in the Budget or in a specific timetable that the Premier can give.

The reason they are not embodied is not because of administrative problems; what is involved is simple. It is not because minor legislative changes needed cannot be made. Already, Bills to amend gift duty, stamp duty and other legislation are on the Notice Paper. These Bills give effect, in part, to other promises, despite the fact that the Budget will collect more tax from the people of South Australia than ever before. Nevertheless, the Government

has given notice that it will introduce legislation in the next few weeks to put into effect some of its policies. However, the Government has done nothing about one of its clear and simple promises. It has the opportunity to do something about it, but it has chosen the means of expediency.

Because the Government was faced with a difficult domestic, political problem, the Premier has chosen to do nothing about the Public Accounts Committee. It was easier to find a perk job for a disappointed aspirant to the Cabinet. The Government decided to throw over the whole question of having an independent Chairman. Independence could mean a number of things. The member for Mitcham has defined an independent person as someone outside this Parliament, who has an independent role. That is the way it has been put. There are other ways of getting some sort of independence from the Government itself, from the Treasury line, which could have been done without any legislative change. Indeed, when the members to be nominated for the committee were announced (when I read the first unofficial pull of *Hansard*), I thought the Government would do this. Listed in the names of those to be nominated for the committee, recorded as having been nominated (which turned out to be a mistake, because a list had been supplied earlier to *Hansard* and a change made on the floor of the House), was the name of the member for Flinders. Whilst he accepts the Government Whip, he is a member of another political Party and could be seen to have some independence. His presence on that committee suggested that there was an opportunity to move at least a step in the direction of independence.

What happened, of course, was that on the very day of the opening of Parliament the member for Flinders had the audacity to move that a person other than the Liberal Party's choice be nominated for the position of Speaker of this House. An even more heinous crime in the eyes of the Premier was that that move was successful. Indeed, another candidate was chosen—the member nominated by the member for Flinders. Within a minute of that decision being taken, a hasty consultation saw the name of the member for Flinders scrubbed off the list as a member of the Public Accounts Committee to be nominated by the Government.

An opportunity to have an independent Chairman was, at that instant, done away with because of the revenge taken against the member for Flinders for having nominated the member for Light as Speaker. That is the truth of the matter. The member for Flinders was as surprised as anyone else when he discovered that he had not been nominated and that there had been a mistake made in the *Hansard* pull. That was the first piece of political expediency.

The second occurred with the need to put the member for Hanson on the committee. Again, there was an opportunity for an Opposition nomination to the Public Accounts Committee to be Chairman. That, again, would be a step in the direction of having an independent Chairman and could have been accomplished without legislative change. That also was not done. The reason became clear; not merely a perk of enrolments was desired for the member for Hanson: it was something new, an added resource for the Public Accounts Committee. The honourable member was provided with a car and driver. That decision has not been explained fully to the House. The reason behind it has not been justified and it is something about which a number of questions will be asked in the future. The Premier can honestly say that the Public Accounts Committee has been given an extra resource and what an extraordinary extra resource! What

a piece of expediency!

Quite clearly, the political domestic problem that the Premier has to solve was solved in that way. The promise went right out of the window. The decision was a total pay-off. Then, the situation was compounded. One finds that the new Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has certain fixed, retractable, strong views about the Auditor-General's Report and what its form should be. He went even further and made certain suggestions about the Auditor-General. Admittedly, the honourable member was gracious enough to withdraw those insinuations, but a considerable time elapsed before he did so. It was significant to note that the Premier, on being asked at the time to do something about the situation by demonstrating some leadership, felt himself unable to do so. This was a further indication that the political disappointment of the member for Hanson had to be sated. It is a pity that we have reached this situation regarding this committee, because the committee has been developing; it has an important role to play and it needs resources. Resources and independence have been promised, yet there is absolutely nothing in this Budget or in statements made by the Premier since to suggest the promise will be fulfilled.

This is a clear example and, if it continues, it will ensure that this Government goes out of office in less than the 3½ years the people have given it. If this sort of political expediency goes on, the Premier will find that the demands of his back-benchers for perks, emoluments, and special status cannot be accommodated, resulting in disaffection and disputes among his members, and the Government will dissolve of its own accord. That is the path he is following with his handling of the committee. I believe that the member for Mitcham must be supported in the motion he has moved.

Mr. DUNCAN: I support the motion, and, in so doing, shall canvass some of the issues that have arisen around the recent history of this committee. The member for Mitcham has said this afternoon, "For goodness sake, Mr. Premier, just repeat, following the election, what you said before the election." In simple terms, the Premier has refused to repeat the policy undertaking that he gave, but this is only a culmination of the sorry series of events that has occurred in this matter.

I want to say one or two things about the position of the member for Hanson, because I feel somewhat sorry for him. I think basically he is in the position set out by the member for Mitcham and the Leader of the Opposition, but it is more likely that the Leader, in approaching him to tell him that he was not going to be in the Ministry, offered him the car. It was not that he demanded it; it was offered to him. In those circumstances, why should he be held up this afternoon as the scoundrel on the Government benches? I do not believe that that is a fair thing. I think the member for Hanson should be defended. He is probably under the Whip and cannot defend himself, and that is a sad situation.

I feel sorry for him, because I think he has been put in this position by the actions of the Premier, and now the Premier is allowing the member for Hanson to go out on a limb. One could speculate on his political future, which does not look too bright while the Premier continues to lead the State. I do not believe that the member for Hanson has been the master of the difficulties in which he finds himself this afternoon. I think the Premier should be in the hot seat, because he has been responsible for this piece of political expediency and should be roundly condemned by the committee.

No members opposite can claim that, while the committee operated under the previous Government, its independence was interfered with. The score is on the

board for our Government. It was a committee upon which the Labor Party had three nominees, a majority, which brought in the report on the Hospitals Department, the Health Department and the Health Commission. Our Government had a majority on a committee that brought in a report damning a number of the aspects of administration for which we were basically responsible.

No-one can say that we impinged upon the independence of the committee. I believe that that independence, as apparently did the present Leader of the Government before the election, should, if anything, be strengthened in the interests of Parliamentary democracy. Only by improving the status of that committee, particularly by giving it teeth in terms of research staff who can really do the nitty gritty work that needs to be done on such a committee, will we enable it to function effectively as a watchdog of the public interest in financial affairs. The present Government is trying to put the watchdog on a leash. It wants to ensure that the committee is not able to function as effectively as possible.

I am reminded of the absence of the former member for Mallee, as the member for Mitcham would describe him. He was a long-time exponent of the necessity to establish this committee, and our Government agreed to its establishment. It is sad that he is not here to enter the debate, because his great depth of knowledge on this subject would have been of value to the House. If he were here, however, I do not think the matter would have reached this stage, because he would have been a tempering influence on the more aggressive actions of political expediency taken by the Premier, and we would not be in this situation.

We are in a ludicrous and incredible situation, if we accept the view of the member for Mitcham that the policy on this committee proposed by the Liberals before the last election is being jettisoned simply because the Premier, as a sop to the member for Hanson, offered him a motor car and a driver. If that is the case, it is a sad thing for South Australia, but I think it goes deeper than that. I do not want to detract from that argument, because I think it has substance, but I think we are seeing real politics developing here. The Premier is untried in office, and can be very green. No doubt he has not yet had experience in dealing with the Public Service and the Public Service establishment.

We are seeing here this afternoon an indication that some of his so-called senior advisers have probably got at him and pointed out that, if he wants a nice cosy existence in Government, this committee is not the sort of thing he wants to strengthen. I believe that that sort of pressure probably has been applied to him, and that his morality in the matter has escaped; he has fallen for the expediency of trying to clip the wings of the committee and not proceeding with the policy he undertook at the recent election.

In this afternoon's debate, the member for Mitcham, being possibly the only person who can claim really to be an independent in the Parliament, now that the Country Party member has become beholden to the Liberal Party Whip—

Mr. Mathwin: What about the member for Semaphore?

Mr. DUNCAN: He has yet to show his colours. I will leave him aside for a moment. I do not want to deal with his position, but the member for Mitcham has raised the matter—

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: At last the back-benchers are trying to defend the indefensible position of the Premier. At last he is getting a little support. In putting forward this motion, the member for Mitcham has shown his concern for the

future of public financial administration in this State, and for the important principle that the Parliament should be a responsible Parliament and should ensure that it has financial control over the affairs of Government. It is an important matter, and each and every member should take account of what we are voting for and why. We are voting basically on a question of the independence of Parliament and the right of Parliament to make necessary financial investigations into the books of account of the Government of South Australia.

That is a very important power that this Parliament has and it is a power that ought to be exercised. Our Government showed the way by agreeing to the setting up of the committee. The Liberal Premier, as Leader of the Opposition before the election, said to the people of South Australia, "We agree that the work the committee is doing is important and should be strengthened." He put forward a set of concrete proposals that he appears now to be renegeing from. I think that is a most disgraceful situation and one for which this House should roundly condemn him.

Mr. KENEALLY: I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Mitcham and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. This is not a matter for levity as the various expressions on the face of the Premier would indicate: it is a matter of great importance to South Australians. It was obvious to everybody in South Australia that the present Government went to the people with a programme, in the absolute knowledge that it was going to lose the election. Because the Liberal Party won, it is now faced with the responsibility of implementing those policies and undertakings, those guarantees and promises they made to the electors of South Australia, but everybody knows that they are going to find it very difficult to do so.

No-one thought that, within a little over a week of this House sitting and at the first opportunity that the Premier had to honour the guarantee that he had given, his Government would have been found wanting. He said earlier today that the promises in relation to succession duties and gift duties have been honoured but obviously this one is not going to be honoured. He seems to be working on the principle that two out of three is not bad, and that that is the sort of average that the people of South Australia are prepared to accept.

That is not good enough, and this Parliament, ineffective as it may be in many areas, still remains the only avenue that the people of this State can use to question the performance of the Government. The responsibility of each and every one of us here, whether on the Opposition benches or the Government benches, is to ensure that the promises made to the electorate before the election are honoured. What sort of opinion will people gain of politicians if we, the members of the Opposition or members on the Government back-bench who support the Government, but are not members of it, are prepared to accept backsliding within one week?

That is exactly what is happening. It is not a matter of levity and not one that members can take lightly; it is the first indication of what this Government is prepared to do to the people of South Australia. They are prepared to go to them with a bill of sale, con them, and immediately renege on all the promises that they have made. It is no good to simply say that the Government has honoured two out of three promises which will assist the wealthy amongst us and that the others that are of no benefit to wealthy supporters will be pushed aside. This is exactly what has happened.

I want to refer to another statement that the Premier has made this afternoon. He said that the Public Accounts

Committee would have available to it seconded officers from the Public Service, which would allow the committee to make the investigations it wished. I suggest to the Premier that, if he were to look at the practical example of what has happened to the current Secretary of that committee, he would know how futile that exercise would be. There is no officer in the Public Service who would accept secondment to a Parliamentary committee to investigate the Public Service, bring down an adverse report on the Public Service, and then to go back into the Public Service, where he may see his future.

That will not and cannot happen; for any Public Accounts Committee to be effective, the research personnel it has must be members of the Parliamentary staff and must be there for the permanent use of the Public Accounts Committee. It will not be possible to move people from the Public Service and out to the Public Service again. I would ask the Premier to check the members of his Party who have also been members of the Public Accounts Committee. They will know that Mr. Brian Woods, a very efficient, effective and competent Secretary of the committee, has ruined any future he had in the Public Service, because the Public Service in South Australia sees him as an investigator of its role, and possibly as a threat. The Public Service is not anxious to have that gentleman back in the Public Service, no matter what level of competence he has. People who have worked with him know that that level of competence is very high, but he cannot go back.

How ridiculous it is for the Premier to say that we can second Public Service officers to that committee who will find themselves in exactly the same situation as Mr. Woods is in! The certainty of the situation is that those officers would not be available for secondment or, if they were, they would be less than enthusiastic in carrying out the tasks given them. This is a very important motion. It is the test of the Government's honesty and integrity. The Government considers that this matter is not one that the public generally would feel very concerned about but I can assure the Premier that any promise or undertaking ought to be honoured and, if not, there ought to be a legitimate explanation given to the only forum where it can be debated, and that is this Parliament. To date the evasiveness of the Premier has been nothing short of disgusting and, as I know that he is going to answer the non-confidence motion in him, I expect him to take this motion very seriously.

He has the numbers and I expect that he will win this debate; he may win the war but he will lose the argument unless he is prepared to accept this motion as a very genuine and very serious one that is of great importance not only to this House but to the people of South Australia generally. I support the motion strongly. The Premier can overcome all the reservations we have by simply being prepared to say right now that he will move to have six members of the Public Accounts Committee (three Opposition and three Government) and an independent Chairman.

I would be quite happy to suggest to him that the member for Mitcham could well be an independent Chairman; if anybody here has indicated a clear independence from both Parties in this House, it is the honourable member. Neither Party has a great deal to thank him for, but, strange as it may seem, he has a high community standing that would indicate that the people outside this House believe in his independence. If the Premier is serious about his guarantee, he may well investigate the possibility of appointing the member for Mitcham to the committee. I can give him the guarantee

and assurance of members on this side of the House that that member be supported for the Chairmanship of the committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Basically, what we are being condemned for by members opposite (and this is the fundamental question we are facing), despite all the dressing up and politicking that is going on from the members opposite, is for the fundamental fact that we have not honoured all of our promises within the five weeks that we have been in Government. I have never heard such rubbish in all my life. First of all there is no question but that, after all the politicking that has gone on, the Opposition is out to get the member for Hanson. That is quite clear and absolute rubbish. Further, its bitterness—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections across the floor. I ask honourable members not to interject. Otherwise, I will be forced to take unpleasant action.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Opposition's bitterness about losing the election has not been constrained at any time since this Parliament has commenced. That bitterness is now showing itself in an attack that I believe to be absolute and utter viciousness. I think that this is totally unwarranted. First, the Leader of the Opposition makes great play of the fact that it was the Labor Party that introduced the Public Accounts Committee when it was in Government.

So it did but only after the then member for Mallee (Mr. William Nankivell) had made effort after effort to get that Public Accounts Committee established, and he can take the full credit for our having that Public Accounts Committee. Let us make that clear. The bitterness at losing the election (and it has been most apparent from the back bench; I have never before had my hand refused by a member of this Chamber when I have seen members socially) is coming out quite clearly, because Opposition members recognise that it was the hospitals report of the Public Accounts Committee that was one of the fundamental things that destroyed the Labor Government. They have tried to skate over that at all times.

They talk about the problems that will exist with secondment. What a load of rubbish! Secondment is possible; it is a procedure which is used within the Public Service, and it can be used whenever there is a reason for it. It will be used, and the Public Service Board is quite happy about that situation. So strongly does the Opposition feel about the staffing situation of the Public Accounts Committee that when it was in Government it removed a steno-secretary from the services of the Public Accounts Committee and refused to replace that person. That is how fair dinkum it was about the staffing situation. In my view that was one of the moves taken to try to hold up the delivery of the reports on time. This is basically an attack on the Government at the first opportunity, theoretically because we have not honoured all our promises in five weeks.

The member for Mitcham deserves some consideration because I do not think he has the viciousness of members opposite. The member for Mitcham has complained that we are not at this stage prepared to commit ourselves to the letter to each and every one of the promises made in that document. I could quite easily stand up here and say, "Yes, we will." It would be much easier to do that, and possibly less than honest because I am not yet convinced that, to the letter, that is exactly what we can introduce. That is the only constraint that stops me from taking that action.

We are committed to Parliamentary supervision of

Government expenditure; we put that forward in those documents, prepared before the election and without the benefit of the expert advice that we could otherwise get when in Government—advice that was in fact refused to us by the policies of the Australian Labor Party when in Government. We have not been able to cross the t's and dot the i's. We are committed to bringing in a package including Estimates and Budget committees, increased powers for the Public Works Standing Committee, and for the Public Accounts Committee, for all of these matters, and they will come in when they have been properly researched and introduced in a way which will give the best possible supervisory powers to this Parliament to keep a watch on Government spending, a watch which has been absent for many years, certainly over the last nine years.

My job is to provide the House with a workable package, and that I undertake to do. That is quite positively an undertaking and a commitment. It will include the scheme as I have outlined for the Public Accounts Committee, the Public Works Standing Committee and Budget and Estimates Committee but the exact details I will not commit myself to at the present time. It would be wrong of me to do so. I repeat that this is pure politicking by members opposite, nothing more or less. So much for the assurance of the Leader of the Opposition that this is done purely in a rather disinterested way; I am just not impressed. It is an example of viciousness and bitterness which basically seems to be coming right through from the back bench to the front bench of the Opposition at present. I hope we can get rid of it and exorcise it as soon as possible.

Mr. PAYNE: I support the motion. I have been listening to what has transpired and particularly to the feeble defence put forward by the Premier as to his reasons for not honouring a promise made no more than five or six weeks ago. It is as simple as that a clear promise was made to take action. I am not going to be as charitable as was the member for Stuart. I do not think the score on the part of the Government at this stage is two out of three; I think it is two out of four, because it was possible to honour the undertaking in respect of land tax in a way which I have outlined and which the Premier can read in *Hansard*, without resorting to this garbage about difficult administrative arrangements and so on. All that is needed is for the Premier to honour that undertaking. The context in which those promises were given is clearly shown; some had dates attached to them and the one that had a specific date was adhered to. Why were two others put in as they were?

The Premier cannot get away from the situation that either they were put in without proper homework being done, chucked in on a gamble and not intended to be carried out because, as stated earlier, it did not really expect to win the election, and therefore it was not necessary to do the homework—

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: The statement was made in 1976 and the reference I gave in *Hansard* has not been challenged so far when the then Leader said what was going to be done by the Opposition, as it was then, when it came into Government, and he outlined the policy on land tax remission he would bring in. If three years is not long enough to do the homework on it so that you can stick to a promise, I do not know how long he is going to need. He is now Treasurer of this State. God help the people if that is the standard of his preparation and accounting. I gave him a clear option. I hope for the people of this State that he

will forgo that \$5 000 000 he wants to hang on to and give it to the people of the State in accordance with the promise made.

We now need to look at whether an undertaking was given in this case and whether it will be adhered to. What was the reason for the Premier's not giving that assurance a few minutes ago and during the passage of the lines before this Committee? The first reason he put up was in relation to providing the extra staff. He said that secondments could be made from departments. He made a slip straight away because he talked about departmental officers being seconded to the Public Accounts Committee to assist in any of its deliberations. Very quickly he realised that he was in a spot of bother, but not before the member for Elizabeth had nailed him and pointed out how ridiculous it was to ask people to sit in judgment on themselves. He then pointed out that it may be secondments from other departments.

I would like to know whether he had discussed this matter with many departments, because in response to the member for Mitcham, I think, he said earlier that he had already had discussions with the Auditor-General about the secondment of staff from the Auditor-General's Department. It came out bit by bit. There was another sally from our side, I think from the member for Stuart, and we got a little bit more information. He said that officers might also be seconded from Treasury. I wonder whether discussions have been carried on with the Treasury Department, because one of the experiences I had while I was a member of the Government (and I think I would be supported by other members who were Ministers) was that that would be one of the hardest-working departments in the State (probably in the whole damn Commonwealth). It is flat out all the time with ever-increasing demands on its time. How can people be seconded from there?

I am quite sure that the Premier is not fair dinkum at this stage. He is just trying to gloss over the queries that are being received. He does not want to tell the true story, which is that he does not intend to do it, and he does not want that probed too closely at the moment. He throws in these little bits hoping that we will pick them up and play with them for a while. We saw this sort of thing happen when we were sitting on the other side of the House. When we gave some information members would go off at a tangent (there was no need to do that, but they did).

The Premier is trying the same tactic. He has to come back to the actual facts—will he do this or not? Let us examine the requirement of the member for Mitcham. Is it unreasonable? Did he say to the House, "I want the Premier to do this next week, tomorrow morning or in three weeks time"? No, he was very courteous in the matter, although he is not always courteous. He said that he would accept from the Premier something reasonable, that if he got an indication that this would be done over a period of a few months he would take that as being quite in order and that that would more than meet his requirements in this matter.

What did he get? Persiflage, and not very good persiflage at that. What has been said by the Premier in accusing us of viciousness is entirely false. We are not vicious on this side. We went to an election, and we know we got done. We are sitting here; we made a blue, we did something wrong, obviously, before that we gave this State nine years of terrific, good government. We did something wrong; we know that, but we are not vicious about it and we are not bitter about it. We are determined to return to those benches at the first available opportunity. We are doing our job as a responsible Opposition (when we were in Government we acted

responsibly and now we are in Opposition it is our requirement to act responsibly) when we ask, together with the member for Mitcham, that the Premier say unequivocally that he intends to adhere within a reasonable time to a promise made.

I am resisting the temptation to explore other avenues. It would not be unfair to ask why the member for Hanson is so powerful. It can be seen that, despite the garbage peddled over the years about members of the Labor Party only having the one kind of voice and being directed to do things, I differ from my colleague, the member for Stuart, who has a different view of the member for Hanson from mine, at least in this matter. I wonder how the honourable member is so powerful that he can get the Premier to make this cardinal blunder on coming into Government, of offering a hand-out, having got into Government, on the basis of being honest, upright and money-saving, to then get stuck, within a few weeks, and to be forced to make this underhand gesture to a member. What power has this member that he is able to extract from the Premier such a promise, such a risky action, such a wrong thing?

As the member for Mitcham said, it is not a good thing. The member for Mitcham uses fairly calm phrases at times to indicate distaste for matters, but I detected a real distaste in his voice about this matter. I share that distaste, and that is why I am on my feet asking the Premier (and I suppose it is not too late for him, even at this stage) to reconsider the consequences of the action he has taken, and to consider the further consequences if he does not respond to the motion now before the Committee in the only proper way. That is, for him to say, "I will adhere to the promises I made, after all, in a month, three months, or six months." I think the member for Mitcham was prepared to accept up to six months.

Mr. Millhouse: If he'll say they will carry it out, that's all I want.

Mr. PAYNE: We could not have anything clearer than that, and that is certainly the stance of the Opposition. Nothing unreasonable is being asked of the Premier. It is not one of those promises where months and months of work have to be done, or where there are great administrative tasks involved before he can take that decision. While I am speaking I am suddenly reminded of a tremendously damaging remark that the Premier made when towards the end of his remarks (when the persiflage was getting a bit short-winded), he said, "I am not convinced that we can exactly implement this." What in the hell did he put it in the election policy for in the first place if he was not sure he could do it? That is reminiscent of Mr. Fraser and the way he runs elections. I have never known the Premier to say that he is operating under exactly the same banner as Mr. Fraser, but it is the same sort of tactic as has been resorted to over the years by Mr. Fraser.

I remember well that in 1975 there was a wonderful page in the *Advertiser* showing what the Federal Liberals would do about various matters. Because I am something of a cynic I kept that page in my electorate office and watched events proceed. By the middle of last year there was only one square that I did not have a big red cross over, so nine of the 10 promises he made such a short time ago had not been kept. If the Premier is dinkum about the platform he came into office on, that is, to introduce careful, upright management to this State (and that is what he stated, amongst other things), one of the things he ought to do to support the image put forward at the election is keep his word. It comes down, finally, to that. The simple thing is whether he will keep his word on this matter and give that undertaking to the House. I support the motion.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I think this Committee owes a debt of

gratitude to the member for Mitcham for raising this matter in Committee, not only because of the intrinsic merits of this motion, which I support, but also because it has forced from the Premier an extraordinary speech, divided into two parts. A good deal of it was bluster, equivocation and trivia, but there was one part of it which was very important indeed, and most significant. The Premier is not prepared to say that this promise will be implemented. He is not simply equivocating about when there may be implementation, although he attempted some sort of lame justification as to why it is not always possible to predict when implementation will take place. I will deal with that in a few moments. He is not prepared to say that it will be implemented. Now, where is the predictability of this Government?

Members of the Liberal Party have, from time to time, been critical of members of my Party because when we come into this Parliament we sign a pledge that indicates that we will vote according to a majority of Caucus members. What the Government must realise is that the Labor Party, a long time ago, adopted this procedure because it provided some sort of predictability as to a Labor Government's carrying out what it had promised to do. If what a Party is putting into Parliament is a flock of *de facto* independents, how can there be any predictability that it will deliver on the promises made to the people?

In a sense, the Premier has taken that even a step further. We are never quite sure what is the status of Liberal Party members in relation to any of these promises, if, as they sometimes claim, they are virtually *de facto* independents and all that really pulls them together is that it is necessary to have a Liberal Party, otherwise the Labor Party would be in Government all the time. They are taking that a step further and saying that they have to re-examine promises once they get back into office because of the inherent difficulties of implementing some things. Let us look at some of the difficulties that may arise.

First, it can perhaps be conceded that, where legislation is necessary, it is important that the Government of the day go into the legal ramifications of what will occur. One would have thought that perhaps, in Opposition, the Government would have already explored these things in some detail, but, nonetheless, it may be conceded that further matters have to be followed up, and everything has to be fitted into the time table of a Parliamentary session.

Secondly, there are those matters that have fairly drastic financial implications and have to be fitted into the framework of a Budget. Of course, the member for Mitcham's suggestion has very little financial implication at all. Even if we try to draw out all possible financial ramifications, they amount to less than the cost of that motor car. I just cannot see why there has to be any equivocation in regard to the financial implications of this matter.

The whole issue gets down to a series of administrative decisions, which could have been taken by now. The Government has illustrated in other areas that it is prepared to take rapid administrative decisions without necessarily sitting down to wait for all sorts of advice that might come in. How quick was the Government to move in relation to the Policy Division of the Premier's Department? The Government did not have to sit down to think of all the ramifications of that decision. How quickly did the Government move in relation to the Industrial Democracy Division? It did not have to sit down to consider all the ramifications of that decision, wait for further advice, or examine what has happened in other States. The decision was taken. How quickly did the Government move in relation to the reshuffling of certain

Public Service personnel who thought they had tenure in particular offices, and not simply in the Public Service generally? Those decisions were taken quickly indeed.

The Government has demonstrated that it does have the capacity, whether for good or for ill, to take administrative decisions quickly. This matter falls within that category and the Government has not been prepared to look at the sorts of administrative decision that would have reassured not only this Committee and, by extension the House, but also people outside, that it was dinkum in relation to this commitment.

The member for Mitchell said that it is not too late, even at this stage of the debate, for the Premier to change his mind. He could jump up again or ask one of his colleagues to speak. There are two reasons why this should happen. The Government should be given an opportunity to reconsider its decision. It is not too late for the member for Hanson to say to the Premier, "Perhaps we should go outside into the corridor and talk about this. I realise that the situation is becoming more and more embarrassing for the Government. I am prepared to make an act of self-abnegation that will get you out of this situation. We will be able to deliver on the promise." That move is possible within the time available.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

Dr. HOPGOOD: It is highly unlikely. He is not in the Chamber at the moment, but I hope he is listening to what I am saying. However, he might take this action in the interests of his Party. It is important that this Committee be given some assurance (and this could only happen by way of a few words from the Premier, one of his Ministers or back-benchers) that the Government really means that it will deliver on its promises and will not get out of them by saying that further investigation is required. It is not a matter of when, or of how much it will cost, but of whether the promise will be delivered. We have been given no assurance on this matter. That is obviously why the member for Mitcham introduced this matter into the Committee. He had a shrewd idea that the Liberals were going rubbery on the matter and, of course, the further we go in this debate, the more rubbery they become. The ball is bouncing, and certainly not in their direction. I support the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, L. Arnold, Bannon, Max Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse (teller), O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (24)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. P. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Plunkett. No—Mr. Allison.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Vote passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$178 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My women's adviser, the ex-Senator, has told me that I should take up a matter under this item, because the Parliamentary Librarian makes decisions on the matter. I am told that the Library regularly contains *Playboy*. While it is not regarded as pornographic, I understand that it does reflect on the status of women. I am sure the Minister of Health will be particularly interested in this. I ask the Premier, or perhaps the Minister of Health, because she seems to have arrogated to herself this role, whether the Government approves of *Playboy* being available in the library, whether

in fact we should go further and have stuff which is further away, or whether it should be taken out. The matter is serious to many women.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not been aware that the publication has been available in the Parliamentary Library. I understand that the Librarian is tremendously accommodating, in that he will undertake to get periodicals of interest to members. I do not know who might have requested that this publication be placed in the Parliamentary Library. I would have thought that perhaps it was the member for Mitcham, but, since he has raised the subject, he has disqualified himself. I shall make inquiries. I see no need to go any further, as the honourable member suggests, but I should like to know more about why it is there now.

Mr. BANNON: Over a considerable time, examination has been made by the Library Committee of matters relating to the rate of pay of the Parliamentary Librarian. I am not sure whether the submission is related to the rate of pay for other Parliamentary Librarians, or to library grades in the Public Library Service. I undertook some research of an industrial nature on the matter, and the member for Coles took it up on the Library Committee.

The salary of the Parliamentary Librarian should be looked at closely, because it is not properly linked to a librarian rate that is clearly enough spelled out. There are problems in terms of relativity with research staff. While they do not work specifically under the direction of the Librarian, they are co-ordinated in their function, and he has the general overseeing role for the research aspects. It is the Librarian who must make final decisions in relation to library functions. His is an extremely important role in terms of understanding the needs of members and anticipating their demands, and it seems that he is quite generous in the sort of publications he is prepared to accept, understanding the serious pursuits members have in the way of periodicals. This adds up to a need for something to be done about the Librarian's rate of pay. Recent developments may have clarified the position.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that developments have not clarified the position. I would hope that submissions could come forward which would recognise the superb work done by the Parliamentary Librarian. I am on record as having supported similar recognition when I occupied the seat in which the Leader now sits. We are served extremely well by the Parliamentary Library, the Librarian and staff, and the matter should be looked at carefully. Whilst not making any commitment, I do make a commitment that I would be pleased to look at a submission for adequate recognition of those services. It would be extremely difficult to replace Stirling Casson.

Mr. LEWIS: I have not been long in this place, but I have heard some speeches from members opposite, and I think the tenor of them could be lifted somewhat if another research assistant was provided in the library to turn up information for them and to save them the embarrassment of having their speeches written by someone else. Perhaps they could read the speech before they come into the Chamber, so that at least they could pronounce the words. Perhaps we might consider whether adequate research staff is provided, because the tenor of debate in this Chamber depends on the information and the facts on which the argument is based.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I take issue with the honourable member on only one point: that just because the Labor Party now occupies the Opposition benches there is a need for more research assistance in the Library. I do not think that is necessarily so, in spite of the honourable member's impressions since he has been here.

The question has been raised from time to time, but it has not been brought up while we have been in Government. In the past it has been refused, but it is something I am prepared to look at again, if necessary.

Vote passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Joint House Committee, \$197 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I raise a matter of considerable importance, namely, the allocation of \$172 380 for caretakers, catering and general staff (with fuel, light and board where applicable). This is the line which gives us, amongst other things, our very cheap meals in Parliament House. As I understand the system in the dining room, which is run by the Joint House Committee, the only component of our meals that we pay for is the food. Because the staff is paid for by the Government, it is possible for us to enjoy an excellent three-course meal for \$1.20. It is absolutely and utterly wrong that we should have this perk. I have protested about it before and I do so about it again. Although my faith in the sincerity of the Government to honour any of its promises has been sadly shaken by what happened this afternoon, there was the overall undertaking to cut out extravagance and waste.

Mr. Lewis: Didn't you enjoy your dinner?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I did enjoy it very much. It is amazing how quickly the member for Mallee, who has been here for only a fortnight, has become cynical, selfish, self-seeking and out for everything that he can get. Before dinner, he made the silliest remarks about the Labor Party, and, by that stupid interjection, one realises that he is obviously here to enjoy all the perks he can get. I have known him for a little longer than some members in this House. Some I do not even know by name, because no-one has bothered to introduce me to them. However, I know the honourable member, and I thought more of him than to expect a stupid interjection like that. I remind the honourable member that we are here to serve the public, not just get as much out of the game as we can. If the honourable member goes on like that he will not long remain the member for Mallee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We will come back to the matter under discussion. There is nothing in this line about the member for Mallee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, thank goodness. There is no reason in the wide world why we should have subsidised meals and not pay the full price of a meal. Yet, that is what we are doing now by voting for this line: we are giving ourselves subsidised meals. I feel embarrassed when I hear even my children talking about how much it costs to have lunch at the university or somewhere else. It costs students or schoolchildren far more to have a meal than it does for me to have a meal in this place. Not only that—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose the Minister must have the brains with which he was born, but that was not too many. So, we get the same stupid interjections from him as we do from the member for Mallee. Country members all seem to be the same. We get almost free meals here; often, we pay less than school children must pay for a meal in a canteen. This applies not just to members, because in the past few years, this place has been made into a club for former members. The responsibility for this rests, by and large, with the Labor Party. Not only do we get these cheap meals but also former members come in here. We cannot tell who is a former member and who is not. I am afraid I made a mistake recently regarding the member for Price. I thought he had retired. We have got a free-for-all here, and I hope the Government intends to stop this

because it is quite wrong and utterly indefensible. If people outside knew (as many of them are getting to know) of this perk, they would have an even lower opinion of us than they do otherwise. We are on reasonably good salaries. Whether we have other jobs or not does not matter. The Parliamentary salary is above the average wage earned in the community so that even those who are not fortunate enough to have another income could well—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You can't live on a Parliamentary salary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right; I have got extravagant tastes.

The CHAIRMAN: The member should come back to the matter under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is remarkable how, when I get on to a topic like this, the two sides gang up.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. I have lost complete touch with the point that the honourable member was making. To which line is he referring?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will make the point and I hope I get a direct and definite answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not get one from him this afternoon, but perhaps I will now. I suggest, for the benefit of the Premier, that in future the Parliamentary dining-room staff should be paid for not by the Government but in the cost of our meals. I am saying that we should do that, like everyone else who eats in a public place or cafe has to do. That is a definite proposal that I put to him, and I would like a definite answer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find it rather amazing that the honourable member who assiduously avails himself of the services at least once a day and often twice a day should adopt this attitude. It is a matter for the Joint House Committee, which I am sure will make the necessary recommendations if it sees the need for it. I point out that the honourable member is, as usual, being very extravagant. Perhaps it was because he lost his temper when the member for Mallee interjected.

The situation is that in industry, as honourable members will know, it is appropriate that meals of the same high quality that we enjoy in the dining-room can be obtained in industry canteens for sums which are very often less than the \$1.20 that we pay. If the honourable member doubts this for one minute, I suggest he get out into the public and sees exactly what happens in industry. I am quite prepared to look at any submission which the Joint House Committee might care to make.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What possibility does the Premier think there is that the Joint House Committee will suddenly suggest that the price of meals be increased to cover wages? That is an absurd suggestion and is on all fours with his attitude this afternoon. This is a subvention that Parliament votes on this line at the behest of the Government, and the only body which can withdraw it, because it has the power of the purse, is the Government. It is utterly unreal (and the Premier and every member knows it) that the Joint House Committee is suddenly going along to the Government and saying, "we want to pay four times as much for our meals, and we do not want the servants in the dining-room to be subsidised or paid for by the Government." That is an absurd suggestion, which reeks of hypocrisy. Here we have a Government that came into office saying that it would cut out waste and extravagance. Members laughed at me before but they know that we all do fairly well out of this game, however much we can top it up outside. There is not one member

on the salary that we get here, even if it is the basic salary, that cannot afford to pay the full price for a meal, the same price that we would pay, not in an industrial canteen (I noticed that the Premier did not mention by name any canteens where we could get a meal for that price) but across the road at a restaurant.

To what part of the Gateway Inn does the Premier think one can go to get a meal for \$1.20? Even if one goes down to Cranks, which is a nice little vegetarian place, one is charged \$2 for a meal. That is regarded as a very cheap meal, and, let's face it, if we weren't self-serving on this matter, no member in his right mind would suggest that outside one can get a meal comparable to a meal here for \$1.20. I challenge any member to name any place where one can get for \$1.20 a meal comparable to the one we have, which consists of soup, main course, dessert, and coffee, with as much fruit as you like thrown in, bread and rolls, and sultanas and almonds on the table. There is no place in South Australia where one can get it.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I should like to take up the challenge that has just been issued by the member for Mitcham. Unlike him, I am on one income only and, secondly, I am here to represent the people of Todd. Therefore, I will be at the Parliament all the time, so that I can do the job properly for them. The first point I should like to make is that I left the Chrysler company, where everyone, from the factory floor up to the management staff is able to obtain a three course meal for anything from \$1 to \$1.40. In other words, one gets a meal comparable to that supplied here, and it is supplied for all workers at that company. I know that the company for which I worked was not an exception in this area.

Members are here to represent their constituents. We do not stay here by choice, unlike the member for Mitcham who comes here as a part-time hobby: we are here to represent our constituents. We do not go home early and get a good night's sleep; we stay here and do our duty, and we need to have our meals while we are here. It is therefore quite justifiable that we should be able to get our meals at the price charged in Parliament House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am concerned about caretakers and other things, and I note of course, as would anyone with two eyes, that the member for Mitcham does have a lean and hungry look, although I did not really know why previously. I am one of those people who was brought up as a child to eat everything put on my plate and not to waste anything. I did not enjoy the kind of silver spoon syndrome that the member for Mitcham has had throughout his life. He not only enjoys the benefits of office in this place but also finds the time to devote to a very lucrative legal practice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the line being debated.

Mr. LEWIS: He said that we did not have the brains with which we were born. I would remind him that it was Epaminonda's mother that made that point in the beginning. He must have been a part of that family.

Mr. Payne: Who was that, was it Ozymandias's sister?

Mr. LEWIS: In any case, he must have been told to be careful how he trod on those pies. I know that the member for Mitcham has extravagant tastes and that the dining-room cannot cater for his type of taste. Before I came to this place, I was a full-time student and although, the honourable member may have passed on his extravagant taste to his offspring without constraint whatever or consideration for those less fortunate than himself, I invite him, if he feels that he has been undercharged for his meals, to make whatever donation he considers appropriate to Freedom from Hunger Campaign or The Year of The Child. I am concerned that if he feels as

though he cannot get a meal anywhere else at a reasonable price that he can afford, I am pleased to invite him to my home and would be pleased to accommodate him with whatever I have to offer.

I am concerned about caretakers of this place, and I address this inquiry to the Premier or his representative. I would like to know the number of hours that they are required to work continuously on a shift and the number of hours they might have to work any one week, because I suspect that the roster on which they operate has not been examined or amended for many years and that we may well find that they do a service for this place well in excess of what we expect from the rest of the community on a day-by-day or week-by-week basis.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It's certainly more than we expect from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. LEWIS: Indeed; there is no security there whatever. I do not understand how Parliament's caretakers are paid, but I would like to know. Will the Premier therefore ascertain that information for me or explain it to me?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not able to explain the details for which the honourable member has asked, although I will certainly get a report for him. I am grateful that he has taken the trouble to raise the matter. We in this Parliament receive extremely good service from all members of the staff, and the caretakers are no exception. We are particularly fortunate that they get to know us well and that they are able to help us as much as they do. I am certain that the new members will come to appreciate them as much as the people who have been here for a length of time. I think it is a point worth making and I shall certainly obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: I should like seriously to take up the comments made by the member for Mitcham, because I believe he has shown an immense degree of hypocrisy. I was fortunate, or unfortunate enough to be the Whip for the member for Mitcham and, if he thinks back, he will remember that he was one of the persons who was quite keen to make use of privilege, regardless of what it was. He used to leave early sometimes to the disadvantage of others, if he could do so. Even when the House was not sitting the honourable member took the opportunity to come down from the other end of town, perhaps from court or his office, for no other purpose than to have a meal here at the reduced rate about which he complains.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: On the Beeline bus.

Mr. EVANS: He would know that he makes use of that privilege for his friends and associates at any time that he is allowed to do as is his right, and never bats an eyelid about doing so. Throughout his Parliamentary career the honourable member, when it has come to the point of privilege, whether it be on the travel pass or whatever, has never hesitated to use it. I do not really believe that this makes a lot of difference to the overall Budget.

If the honourable member achieved his goal, fewer people would dine here, not because of the price of the meal but because, if one was to pay the price outside, one would alternate where one dined, as some honourable members do now. Many members dine out at least one or two evenings a week in restaurants or public places if for no other reason than to make contact with the community, speak to proprietors of businesses and restaurants, and make contact as Parliamentarians.

We would then destroy the concept of Parliamentarians dining together, of meeting and socialising with employees, and others. It is not a big burden overall. If the member for Mitcham was genuine in his desire, I should have hoped that, when he was a member of Cabinet, he

would raise this matter in the Party room. However, he never did so in the two years that I was in the same Party room.

The honourable member used every opportunity to ensure that he got every benefit that he could and, if the man was genuine at that time, when the same privilege prevailed, he would have argued for that within the Party structure. However, the member for Mitcham did not do so. Now, because he believes that he stands in the middle as some form of Independent, where he can gain publicity by knocking both sides, and when he knows that he will never be able to put his philosophy into operation, because he will never have the numbers, he can get some credibility with a minority group in the community who might regard him as the guardian angel of the people's money. I hope that the man, who has claimed to be an active President of the Bible Society, shows a little more credibility, and that he has some Christian ethics in his approach to life. He has not shown it by the way he has attacked this problem, as he sees it, in this House tonight.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information from the Premier about the words "terminal leave payment". I raise this matter seriously because of a constituent whose husband was dying of cancer. He had previously worked and, when he had to leave, was presented with a document, with the word "terminal" on it, showing what he had received as his financial entitlement. People who see that word read into it other meanings that are meant in this context. The dictionary definition states:

Forming or undergoing the last stage of a fatal disease.

Other more appropriate words could be used in this context, and I seek the Premier's assurance that he will take up the matter with the Under Treasurer to see that a more appropriate word is used in future.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is a good point that has been raised and one that had not occurred to me before. It is a terminology with which I am much familiar, and I think that the honourable member's suggestion is worth examining.

Mr. PAYNE: Although my question indicates that perhaps I do not have the knowledge I should have after my years here, I refer to the line relating to administrative expenses, minor equipment and sundries, and ask the Treasurer what is involved in this category. The member for Mitcham suggests that we pay for food only, but I am not sure what is covered by "minor equipment." As Parliament House is generally equipped by the Public Buildings Department, does the allocation for minor equipment relate to replacements in the kitchen. To what does it relate?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That basically covers it. I do not have the details, but I will be delighted to obtain them for the honourable member.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I seek information from the Premier under the item "Caretakers, catering and general staff." If the House sits after 10.30 p.m., members who are not supplied with a Government car are provided with taxis, as are staff who work beyond 10.15 p.m. The cost of my taxi journey to Elizabeth costs the Government more than \$12. Can the Premier say how much will be spent on ferrying staff and members from Parliament House in the ensuing year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, I cannot. If it is possible to find it, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot allow this line to go through without saying something in reply to the very unkind things that have been said about me, not for the first time, by members on both sides of the House,

particularly by the member for Fisher.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the honourable member will relate his remarks to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. If you give me the same latitude that you gave other honourable members, when discussing the matter, I will be quite content. I am sure that, as a fair-minded man, you will do that. It sounds as though I am not particularly popular and am regarded by a number of members as being incurably wicked and not deserving of any place in this House. That was in line with the attitude of both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party at the last election, but here I am, and for the time being anyway I will stay here. After the unkind things that had been said about me I am tempted to go home, because I do not seem to be wanted in this House. However, I make the point that not one member who spoke defended the cheap meals in this place. The only answer that was given to my suggestion that we should pay a full price for our meal was personal abuse of me. That shows the hollowness of the refusal of members in this place even to consider that they should give up this perk. It confirms what I said, and I believe it is wrong that we should get meals at \$1.20, not even up to \$1.40. One member (I do not even know his name yet) referred to \$1.40. It is wrong that we should do that, because in this place we can afford to pay the full price for a meal. I am entirely unrepentant in what I have said, and I will go on saying it.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have listened closely to what the member for Mitcham has said. The honourable member has had the opportunity during the course of his Parliamentary career (the honourable member has been in Government and could have altered it), but he did nothing about it, anyway. I have been on the Joint House Committee for several years, and during that time I have never received a letter from the honourable member on this matter. All members on the committee are approachable on the matter that has concerned the honourable member tonight.

However, the honourable member thinks he has something that will really hit the front page of the papers tomorrow. I do not begrudge what the member for Mitcham does because the people elected him, and that is the finish of it. However, he is one of the persons in this House that I have seen going into other areas and buying things a little cheaper than they are outside. I assure the honourable member that there is a proper place to air his feelings about this matter, but it is not in this House. I am sure that members on both sides of the House make phone calls to their homes and their wives, who are very helpful to their husbands. I assure the honourable member that we are in the House looking after our constituents all the time. I don't know what the honourable member does about that. If any honourable member has a complaint, for goodness sake let him go to the right people, the members of the Joint House Committee. Its members come from both sides of the House and will give a member an opportunity to have his say.

Dining-room prices are governed by how much is consumed. If the honourable member is concerned about this matter he should write to the Joint House Committee about it. I assure the honourable member that the Joint House Committee has provided dinners for which he has not had to pay. Other things that have been done around the House about which the honourable member has not complained. I must add that the staff of this House is excellent, and any member, new or old, will be looked after. I am sure that the honourable member has been treated in the same manner.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Referring to the line under

"Contingencies"—"Overseas visits of officers" on which \$6 673 was paid last year, nothing is voted for that line this year. Why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that amount was for Miss Stengert's overseas trip, when she visited catering establishments in various Houses of Parliament. I have no further details.

Vote passed.

Electoral, \$1 210 000.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I wish to raise a matter related to the lines "Principal Returning Officer, Returning Officers for Legislative Council and House of Assembly Districts, Clerical and General Staff" and "Electoral Rolls—Printing, data processing services and other expenses". Last week I gave notice of a question relating to section 110a votes. The question was as follows:

How many persons claimed a section 110a vote at the recent State election and how many of these votes were admitted to the count?

The answer was that 4 138 people were issued with section 110a certificates and ballot-papers. Of these, 1 314 were admitted at the scrutiny.

That is quite a large number of claims and, indeed, a reasonable number of votes were admitted at the scrutiny. I suppose one could ask why any section 110a votes ever need to be cast. This gets back to the matter of human error and that sort of thing, which will always come into these matters. What has distressed me on more than one occasion (and this applies, also, to Commonwealth elections where a similar provision exists) is that usually at some time during an election day I receive a phone call from a person who says that he or she, having gone into a polling booth to claim a vote, has been told that he or she is not on the roll for that electorate. Those persons have been given virtually no assistance at all to claim a section 110a vote.

On one occasion a lady telephoned me and said that she had been down to vote. Having been told that she was not on the roll, the woman claimed that she should have been. The woman told the presiding officer that she understood that there was some machinery (she could not quote from a section of the Act) in a section of the Act whereby she could claim a vote that could be admitted if subsequently it was established that, in fact, her name had been omitted from the roll in error. The woman alleges that the presiding officer told her that he had no knowledge of such a piece of machinery.

The lady went away, telephoned the State Electoral Office, and was given all the necessary information. She returned to the polling booth and induced the presiding officer to telephone the State Electoral Office, and, as a result of that, she was eventually allowed a section 110a vote. This woman asked how many people might be less assiduous than she in chasing up their rights in this matter and simply walk out of the polling booth without bothering to cast a vote. I suppose that this is one of those things that could be placed in the category of, "Why have not previous Governments looked at this matter?" I suggest that there should be some better means whereby, through the returning officer to the presiding officer, the specific machinery is actually spelt out.

So far as I am aware, no member, in the time I have been here, has ever raised this matter. It is the sort of thing that comes to our notice from time to time and we have not taken it up. I can recall another occasion in a Commonwealth election when a person came to my house and said, "They just won't give me a vote." If it had been a State election I would not have done what I did, because on polling days I keep as far as possible away from polling booths, except for the purpose of casting my own vote, in

case I contravene the Electoral Act. However, I actually took that person to the polling booth, went up to the presiding officer, and explained about this machinery. The presiding officer then telephoned Adelaide and got assurances that such a procedure was available.

I imagine that this sort of thing occurs in only a minority of cases. It may occur when a presiding officer is new to the job and doing it for the first time. I make no criticisms of returning officers in this matter. They simply pass on material given to them by the State Electoral Office. That material should, on proper examination, include the necessary instructions about this matter. It seems to me, from information that I have been given from time to time, that presiding officers are not always as well versed in relation to section 110a votes as they should be and perhaps the Electoral Office could take some additional steps to educate presiding officers about this matter.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I believe that the Electoral Department and its officers from the Commissioner down do a tremendously good job. I am sure that the honourable member will agree with me. His suggestion is interesting, and I will certainly pass it on to the Commissioner through the Attorney-General and ask whether something cannot be done to advise people of their rights under section 110a. I agree that my experiences have been similar to those of the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: I seek information regarding the line "Fees for elections and referenda". I take it that this comes into the costs of running a general election. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Returning Officer about the feasibility of establishing points in the suburbs at which people can lodge absentee votes. During the last State election I received a lot of complaints from constituents who were going to be out of the State on polling day. The only assistance I could give them was to tell them to come into the city to record an absentee vote. I understand that during lunch hours the queues were so long that most people were spending up to three-quarters of an hour at the Electoral Office. This put a tremendous amount of pressure on the staff of that office. Of course, tempers became frayed because people were afraid that they would not be able to lodge their vote and get back to work on time.

The suggestion I made at the declaration of my poll was that perhaps Federal Division officers could be used in the suburbs for people who wanted to record an absent vote. Can an arrangement be made between the State and Federal Division officers along those lines, or could some other arrangement be made so that points can be established in the metropolitan area where people can cast an absent vote.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: At all times there has been an admirable degree of co-operation between the State and Federal electoral bodies. I am quite certain that a suggestion such as that could be made. There are always difficulties at election time, particularly when there is a short lead into an election, and those difficulties have been intense. Indeed, in the last few weeks I have been quite surprised at the number of people who were not in South Australia for the recent election and had an enormous amount of difficulty in casting a vote. In fact, most of those people were not able to vote, because they were overseas. I will certainly take note of the member for Hanson's suggestion and I am sure that something can be arranged accordingly.

Mr. SCHMIDT: My question relates to the item dealing with fees for elections and referenda. We all know that an early election was called and, despite the claims of Opposition members that they always work for the

harmony and wellbeing of the working people, all the presiding officers hired during the election were paid a fee based on the 1977 election. It is now 1979 and we are all aware that there have been cost increases between 1977 and 1979. Will the allocation for 1979-80 take into account changes in the rate at which these presiding officers will be paid? Will they be paid at a rate commensurate with our cost of living now, or will they still be paid at the 1977 rate, as was the undertaking of the last Government?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: At first glance, the figures do look alarming. However, the increase in the actual amount expended last year came about because of the Norwood by-election, which increased the sums that were actually expended. The increase in 1979-80 as proposed is the loss of fees for the State-wide periodical general election held on 15 September.

Mr. Trainer: That is not what was asked. The member for Mawson was asking about the hourly rates of pay.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That figure has been vastly expanded because the election will be debited against this year's allocation. There may also be other by-elections, which will have to be taken into account. I have no information at all on the rates of pay, but I will obtain that information from the Electoral Commissioner and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: I cannot find the item that refers to the matter that I wish to speak about. It may be related to the item for fees for elections and referenda, or it may come under the contingency item—"Periodical and general elections, and by-elections and referenda—printing and stationery, hire of booths and other expenses". I understand that there is a current arrangement between the Commonwealth and the State with respect to the education of Aboriginal voters, particularly in outlying areas where there is a greater proportion of non-sophisticated Aborigines who may live in a tribal situation. Certainly, the state intent would be to ensure that no person who wishes to vote would be deprived of voting facilities. By that I do not necessarily mean physical facilities, but an actual education process to assist persons in that situation. As I recall, an announcement was made by the Commonwealth and State Governments, that this programme was to be set in motion some time ago. Can the Premier say whether that programme has been in force for some time? If it has been, has that programme been a success?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will be pleased to bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. HEMMINGS: In reply to a question from the member for Mawson about fees for elections and referenda the Premier said that the actual payments were incurred through the Norwood by-election. However, under the item dealing with periodical and general elections, the actual payment of \$15 992 was well below the sum voted in the 1978-79 Budget. Can the Premier explain why this particular item is so low, when we had a by-election in Norwood? Regarding the item dealing with fees for elections and referenda, he said that was why the actual payments were increased.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is so. There is only a limited number of booths involved in a by-election, but that sum also provides for returning officers and so on. It involves not only the people working in the electorate, but also people working on the by-election, at the tally room, and so on.

Mr. DUNCAN: I notice under the item "Contingencies Purchase of motor vehicles", that the proposed sum for 1979-80 is \$5 000. This seems to be a fairly modest amount. Can the Premier indicate why that figure has been chosen? I presume it is only a guesstimate of the cost,

but \$5 000 seems a fairly modest amount, notwithstanding the savings that the State Government makes in its purchases.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: To some extent the honourable member's question relates to the question asked by the member for Mitchell, about which I have no details. A four-wheeled drive vehicle was obtained in 1978-79 for the education enrolment officer to visit remote areas. A glide-on camper van has now been delivered and paid for from the 1979-80 allocation, which completes the motor vehicle requirements as seen for the immediate future, and that sum relates to the completion of that transaction.

Mr. DUNCAN: In the contingencies item "Electoral rolls—printing, data processing services and other expenses", the proposed vote is \$129 400 which is presumably to cover the rolls that were produced for the recent State election. Can the Premier say when the Electoral Department is proposing to produce a print-out of the street order rolls, which in the past has been done during election campaigns or, as applied when I was Attorney-General, printed about every 18 months.

Will the Premier tell the House whether this item includes a proposal to print such rolls, and, if so, when it is likely that they will be available? Does the new Government intend to continue the previous Government's policy of supplying a copy of the roll for the particular district to each member?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that a copy of the street roll was made available once in the term of each Parliament to individual members, although I am not certain of that.

Mr. Duncan: With a three-year Parliament, it works out 18-monthly.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We have been rather hampered in recent years because there has rarely been a three-year Parliament.

Mr. Payne: Would you like to go back and start again on this one?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not think that would make much difference. The Government may even increase its majority. There was no print of joint electoral rolls in 1978-79, because it was not considered necessary. There will be two printings in the next two years; one is a lead-up to the Federal election, due within about 12 months. The Government will continue the present practice regarding street directories and I will inquire as to how the matter is progressing.

Mr. HAMILTON: Regarding the item "Fees for elections and referenda", I understand that the Government is investigating the reduction of polling hours on election days. Initially, I agreed with this suggestion. I imagine costs would be reduced. However, on reflection, has the Government considered the complications that would arise for people like Seventh Day Adventists, Orthodox Jews and Moslems, who cannot participate before sundown? Daylight saving may also be a significant factor. Has the Government considered this matter?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: At about this time after elections, a proposal is usually made that polling booths close at 6 p.m. instead of 8 p.m. That situation applies in New South Wales at present, but in no other State. Certain advantages would accrue; counting could begin sooner and the rather unpalatable sight of television commentators, before any figures are up, standing in front of cameras mouthing inanities for the first hour, and a half of commentary would be avoided. If the hours were reduced, counting could begin earlier. I accept the point made by the honourable member. Daylight saving causes a real problem for some people, and I respect this.

However, there is a simple way out; people can obtain postal votes, and I understand most do.

Mr. PAYNE: Probably, this is a small matter, but I am sure the Premier would not be happy if I sat here and voted a sum without obtaining all information, especially as he has been elected on the basis of his care with finances, regarding "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", \$45 000 was voted in 1978-79, but \$21 937 was actually spent. The sum voted this year is again \$45 000. Perhaps the difference in the amounts occurred because the election occurred in the financial year 1979-80, and less than half of the sum provided was expended. I would like to be sure of the reason before giving my imprimatur to this line.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This matter is quite clear. The programme for last year included \$20 000, as the previous Attorney-General will probably remember, for a programme to educate and enrol electors in remote areas.

Mr. Payne: Earlier you said you didn't have any information.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know the detail but I know of a programme. This programme was held over and the \$20 000 provided in the Estimates was also held over. The programme will commence in this financial year. The sum of \$20 000 that would have been expended last year will be expended this year and that accounts for the difference, because it is added to the \$25 000.

Mr. PAYNE: Regarding "Fees for elections and referenda", taking the term in the most general sense, my understanding is that the Electoral Department is occasionally involved in the conduct of union elections in this State.

Mr. Duncan: It is only the Commonwealth Electoral Office, and not only for unions but for various bodies.

Mr. PAYNE: I am indebted to the honourable member for that information. I would still like to know whether funds are provided for elections that are not those that members are normally associated with and I would appreciate any information that the Premier can provide.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am also indebted to the member for Elizabeth. I do not think there is any doubt that, if that activity were undertaken, funds would be supplied from this line. I do not have details available, and I will obtain a report.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Regarding "Fees for elections and referenda", the Premier, in answer to a question, said that the increased sum covered the recent State election and possible by-elections. Since the Premier said that, I noticed that the Chief Secretary spoke to the Premier for a considerable time, then to the Minister of Agriculture, and then to the Chairman; could the Premier give any information as to whether there will be a by-election for the seat of Victoria possibly in this coming financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Now that the honourable member has put the hard word on me and made me face up to reality, I must be honest and confess that the serious discussions related to the menu for tomorrow night's Parliamentary Liberal Party dinner.

Mr. EVANS: I have received magnificent service from officers in the Electoral Department over the years. These people look after members of Parliament and their constituents to the best of their ability. Difficulties occur when snap elections are called. Some method of giving more leeway for calling elections should be examined, although governing parties may not like this suggestion. It is a physical impossibility to obtain votes from people overseas, considering the short time available between when nominations close and the election day. Many people travel overseas these days; 50 years ago, before the Act was enacted, few people travelled outside the country,

although some went interstate.

Nowadays, many of our citizens travel all over the world, and we should be considering having a longer time between the closing of nominations and election day. What concerns me is that any person can be removed from the roll by another, unbeknown to the person removed, merely by the signing of a document. Recently, a person changed his name to "Screw the taxpayer to support big Government and its parasites", stood under that name, and had that name printed at the bottom of his card in applying for the right to vote under that name. I believe that the Crown Law Office ruled that that was a valid signature. The Electoral Department could not check whether it was the same person, because there was not a signature to compare. A person can be removed from the roll just before an election and must argue the right to be entitled to vote. It has serious legal implications regarding individual rights of a person. A candidate for election could suddenly find that one of his opponents had lodged a notification with the department that the candidate had been transferred to some other State, when that was not so. I ask the Premier to consider this matter before another election.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This extremely serious matter can only be condemned, and I hope that it is not widespread. I have no reason to think it is: it is one reason why section 110a votes are available. I do not know what are the penalties.

Mr. Duncan: There are penalties.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Certainly, they should be applied rigorously.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think it extraordinary that the Opposition Whip should send members out of the Chamber and then to call the attention of the Chair to the state of the Committee. However, if that is what he wants to do, he is entitled to do it. The suggestion that the lead-in time between the calling of an election and the election should be extended could be referred to the Constitution Convention we intend to hold, together with the question of Parliamentary terms and ways of ensuring a full term.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Fisher has raised three matters. I agree with the latter two to some extent. I agree about snap polls, but I do not agree concerning John Pocius. The history of signatures and the method of identification of a person's mark on a document is old, going back to identifying the particular person's mark. If a person adopts any signature, so be it. It is not for the law to ask questions to determine any extraneous matters. The practice may be somewhat exotic and leads to all sorts of interesting results, as we have seen in Australia in recent years, with beloved Susie Cream Cheese and Stop Immigration Now. To date, I do not think it has been exploited to the extent that it has caused anyone real fuss, and it is not a matter of sufficiently high priority to need great care and attention.

The matter of methods by which people can be removed from the roll is most serious. I have no evidence of the widespread practice of people wrongfully removing others from the roll, but I am sure that it goes on from time to time. Possibly of even greater concern in practical terms is the way in which the department itself (I think the Commonwealth basically undertakes it) goes around the various neighbourhoods from time to time with a squad of people, door-knocks, and asks questions about people residing at a certain address. As a result, it takes it on itself to remove people from the roll.

I know of one particularly interesting example involving

a well-known watering hole in North Adelaide. The departmental officer called at the hotel at about lunch time and approached an employee who happened to be somewhat facetious. He said, "I'm from the Electoral Department and am interested in who lives here." This man being an astute student of how to avoid the long arm of the law, said "I'll be only too happy to tell you. For whom are you looking, and I'll tell you whether he's living here?" An officer read out the names of all the guests and residents, and the smart employee said, "No, he doesn't live here. We don't know anything about him." All those people were removed from the roll. It should not be so easy to remove people from the roll. Will the Premier, following an investigation, have a report brought down to tighten up the procedures to a great extent to ensure that this does not happen in the future? It is better to err on the side of caution by having some on the roll who are not entitled to be on the roll, because they have removed themselves from the district, rather than have residents of the district who are entitled to be on the roll removed from it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Russack): The Committee is drifting away from the line. If there is any further comment, I want honourable members to refer to the item to which they are speaking.

Mr. PAYNE: Subject to your ruling, Mr. Acting Chairman, I propose to raise a matter under the line dealing with electoral rolls, printing, data processing services and other expenses. I refer to applications for postal votes. I am not raising this in any sour grapes way, because we are no longer in Government, as the matter came to my attention only during the last couple of elections and I would have taken it up with my own Government if the opportunity had arisen.

Many people have a strong sense of privacy about their voting arrangements. The application for a postal vote in a State election consists of a card on which certain information is required. The application is then posted without an envelope. I have been told by people assisting with applications for postal votes, including my wife, that many people think an envelope should be provided, presumably self-addressed, within which the application for a postal vote could be forwarded. No doubt some people, intending to be away from home on voting day, want secrecy about their place being empty. This is an issue of some significance in the minds of many people.

On the subject of making one's mark, my feeling is similar to that expressed by the member for Elizabeth. People should be free to exercise their vote, and the matter of a signature should be in accordance with their wishes. Often, people are handicapped, and the aged or invalids may have some permanent physical disability, so that their signature has changed, or the ability to make a legible signature is beyond them. Their faculties are intact, and they are clear about their wish to express a vote.

I discussed this matter with the Returning Officer for Mitchell, Mr. Brenton Gill, for whom I have the highest regard. In the elections in which I have been returned to this House he has been the Returning Officer, and his conduct has been beyond reproach, and of the highest standard of rectitude and fairness. He said, in answer to a query I put to him on behalf of a constituent, that, where a signature resembled a symbol, either a cross or a similar mark, attested to by a *bona fide* witness in terms of the Act, he did not count those votes. However, he retained them so that, should the figures in the election require the intervention of a court of disputed returns, they were there to be adjudicated on. I think the matter is important. We are all in a business in which we understand that people have strong feelings about their votes, irrespective of

Party.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is getting right away from the line.

Mr. PAYNE: I am in no way straying from your ruling, Sir. The line refers to processing services and other expenses. If it is in relation to electoral rolls, I assume that no money has been provided for the printing of postal vote applications.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is in another line.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to be brief.

Mr. PAYNE: I do not wish any levity to be brought into the matter, because I raise it in genuine good faith. It is most important to people who are entitled to receive, in their attempt to vote, the same assistance as is received by other persons who are able to go to booths. Will the Premier give this matter some attention?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN: I wish to raise the matter of the rates paid to Principal Returning Officers, Returning Officers, and their staff on election days. As I understand it, the Electoral Act stipulates that the rates must be set by regulation, or by gazettal of a proclamation. A rate is normally struck for an election, and it stands until the next election. When an election is coming up we have our minds on other things, and very often the rate which applied at the previous election applies at the subsequent election. I know the Speaker is well acquainted with this matter, he having asked me many questions about it when I was Attorney-General.

Will the Premier consider amending the Act, if necessary, to provide for a fixed rate to be struck as being reasonable at the time, and to provide for cost of living adjustments to be added as increments to the rate indefinitely into the future? I think that would overcome the problem that has occurred in the past. At the time of the 1977 election, serious problems arose because inflation in the period prior to that election had been quite serious. The poll clerks and the booth officers were being paid a reasonably poor rate.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am aware of the procedure that has been followed in the past and that followed now, whereby the rate is declared by regulation. There was, I understand, a slight *contre temps* in relation to payment in the 1977 election when most officers were paid twice.

Mr. Duncan: They were paid the rates and then they were given an *ex gratia* payment.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was done on an *ad hoc* basis, whereas I understand the matter has now been made official and regular.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I wish to pursue a matter put forward by the members for Fisher and Mitchell in relation to "Fees for elections and referenda". It concerns what postage rate the Electoral Department uses for overseas mail for people who have registered for a postal vote and then gone overseas. In a recent State election I lost two votes, not that it made any difference because I was returned quite handsomely. However, the situation is serious. Two people, when the election was announced, came to my office saying that they were due to go overseas to Yorkshire in England. I told them where to go to apply for a postal vote.

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A quorum is present.

Mr. HEMMINGS: These two people wanted to cast their votes in my favour on Saturday 15 September. I gave them the information where they should go to apply for a postal vote. They did so, and I informed them prior to their leaving for the United Kingdom that I would send

them a telegram giving the names of the candidates when the nominations closed, along with a "how-to-vote" card for the Labor Party in the Legislative Council. When they returned from the United Kingdom they were quite distressed to find that they had received my telegram, which I had sent from my home address at considerable expense. I did not use my office telephone to send that telegram to England. We found that the electoral office or the returning officer had either not sent the postal vote (I cannot really accept that, because the returning officer in my district is usually very competent) or that the postal vote had been sent to the United Kingdom by surface mail. I hope it was not sent by surface mail—it may get here in time for the 1981 election. Will the Premier find out what postage rate is used by the Electoral Department in sending postal votes to overseas electors?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: By air mail.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek further information from the Premier in relation to industrial and other associations that are having their ballots conducted by the Electoral Department. This is a power which the Electoral Department has had for some time but which has been little used until the past few years. The Premier said earlier that he would obtain a report on this matter. I would seek some details, including a list of the associations now availing themselves of this facility. I would be interested to know what is the Government's policy for charging in regard to these associations that have their ballots conducted by the Electoral Department.

As members will know, the situation with the Commonwealth is that the Commonwealth Industrial Court conducts ballots with the assistance of the Commonwealth Electoral Office and, as I understand it, there are no direct charges to the organisation apart from the cost of postage and the like. As I recall the situation in the past, the organisations that have availed themselves of this facility have primarily been co-operative societies and associations rather than industrial organisations. In recent years some industrial organisations have exercised this facility, and it is an important one that the community should make available to all groups. A comprehensive report on this matter would be of interest to all members of the House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will get the report. No consideration has been given to varying the present policy at this stage.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information from the Premier as to the Government's policy in relation to physically handicapped persons seeking to exercise their right to vote. At the recent election, I was concerned to see the difficulty that a person in a wheelchair was having in obtaining his right to vote at the Elizabeth West polling booth. This person had to be carried into the booth. It was a fairly hot day and there were about four steps up into the booth. Generally the premises were unsatisfactory for access for handicapped persons.

Recommendation 12 of the report on the law and persons with handicaps states:

The State Government is to be applauded for adopting the access standard AS. 1428 in the building regulations, but the extent of its legal application needs classification. Access Advisory Committees should be established under the Building Act with power to direct modifications to existing buildings, in similar fashion to existing fire safety committees. The power of local councils to waive compliance

with the access standard should be removed. Applications to waive compliance with the standard should be determined by Access Advisory Committees.

Of course, the new Government has not had the opportunity to review the report in detail and to decide its policy, but I would have thought that the policy consideration behind a matter of this sort (namely, whether or not handicapped people are able to get reasonable access to a polling booth) is one of the broader imports in considering the details of the report. I seek an assurance from the Premier that steps will be taken to make sure that in future the interest and rights of handicapped people are taken into account when polling booths are being established.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would hope that the needs of handicapped people are considered at all times in all sections of our community, not just in relation to polling day. That certainly is a matter which I am quite certain has been considered by the Commissioner. It is not always easy, as honourable members would know, to find suitable polling places where there are difficulties, every effort will be made to help these people to cast their vote properly.

Mr. TRAINER: Is it absolutely essential for ballot-papers for the Legislative Council and ballot-papers for the House of Assembly to be in separate envelopes? Many elderly folk find it confusing and I understand that, if they put the ballot-papers in the wrong envelopes or if they put both ballot-papers in one envelope, one or both ballot-papers will be ruled informal. Using one envelope would reduce costs and confusion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I understand it, the procedure has been laid down to avoid a muddle that could occur. As the honourable member pointed out, a ballot-paper is classed informal if it is admitted into the wrong poll. I will make inquiries of the Commissioner to see whether any modifications can be made, but I suspect the present procedure is essential.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Over the last six months, along with computer read-outs of new electors, there are stick-on labels to go on envelopes. While this is convenient for members and their staff, so that they can send out letters to new electors, I point out that under the old system it was possible to pick out the husband, the wife, and the complete family. Now, there is a stick-on label for each member of the family. Perhaps there may be four members of a family, and a letter is to be sent from the member of Parliament welcoming the people to the electoral district. We all send these letters out. Is it possible, under the system to which I have referred, where several members of a family are at one address, for the label to include only the one surname and all the initials? That would permit a saving in postage costs.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It strikes me that it would be far more expensive to produce that label on a limited basis and to programme the computer accordingly than to print the four labels for the four people in one family. I do not think that the responsibility for the saving is that of the Electoral Commissioner. It is a responsibility that the honourable member must bear himself.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe that the suggestion of the member for Ascot Park concerning postal votes was dismissed somewhat summarily by the Premier. It seemed to me that the honourable member's suggestion had considerable merit. The Premier's reply, that the honourable member's suggestion would lead to confusion, does not hold much water. I point out that the ballot-paper for the House of Assembly is of a different size from the ballot-paper for the Legislative Council and, therefore, the return of the ballot-papers in one envelope would not pose great problems. The ballot-papers could easily be

sorted in much the same way as they would be if they had been posted in separate envelopes. It would simplify operations and represent a saving in the cost of envelopes to the Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite sure the member for Ascot Park can look after his own questions. I have already undertaken to obtain a report.

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier ascertain whether both of the statutory positions in the Electoral Department are filled at the present time in a permanent capacity by their occupants?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Certainly.

Mr. TRAINER: In regard to administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, would that allocation include the supplying of a letter box at the entrance of the premises of the Electoral Department office in Currie Street? If a constituent wishes to lodge his postal vote in a hurry and is unwilling to send his application through the postal system, there is nowhere to lodge his vote after hours. I have been there at night and have seen votes shoved under the door, but that looks a bit daggy, and votes could be tampered with by someone not connected with the Electoral Department.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his extremely good suggestion which I will pass on to the department.

Mr. DUNCAN: In respect of salaries and wages, no reference is made to hospital visitors. Can the Premier provide information about whether hospital visitors were employed during the last election campaign and, if they were, why is no reference made in the line?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The former Attorney-General is being most assiduous in following the matter up, and I will obtain a detailed report for him.

Mr. DUNCAN: In respect of administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, no indication is made that the Government is intending to undertake a redistribution during the current financial year. Can the Premier clarify that position?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member is correct; no provision is made for a redistribution this year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the hire of booths because, in my own district, in the districts of Elizabeth, Salisbury and Playford, and probably throughout the metropolitan area polling booths are located in local schools. Is any money paid to the Education Department for the use of schools in this context and, if not, what does the term "hire of booths" mean in relation to what is paid out?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Exactly what it says: money passing for the hire of accommodation, whether it be in schools, church halls or elsewhere. I have been tremendously impressed by the assiduous attention and great interest that members opposite have shown in all matters electoral. Perhaps I could ask the Electoral Commissioner to arrange a briefing session to cover any other points on which they might like more information. I would be delighted to arrange that if honourable members desire it.

Mr. PAYNE: In respect of the hire of booths, although I appreciate that the Premier might not have that information with him, what is the position regarding the official designation of booths? I was associated with a booth that was used for some time on a Federal basis and a State basis. Who has the authority in respect of the actual choice of a booth used in State and Commonwealth elections? Is it a State or a Commonwealth decision?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest that the honourable member reads the Act if he really wants to know. I am surprised that he has not done so, with his great interest in this matter. It is a State decision and a State responsibility.

If the honourable member has a situation involving booths similar to the situation in my district, say, where there are two adjacent halls, one could be used for a State polling booth and the other might be used for a Federal polling booth.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I refer to Electoral rolls—printing, data processing services and other expenses. I have noticed the absolute paranoia of the Opposition members with regard to the Electoral Act. Obviously, they paid little heed to it in Government. The member for Ascot Park said many electors were confused about forms and other papers relating to the elections. In the recent election the former Government did little to improve the electoral forms for voting in the Upper House. Electors were confused regarding the procedure of filling out the form, as it was stated that every square must be filled out yet, under the voting system introduced by the former Government, that was not the case. Can the Premier take measures to alleviate the problem and show electors that we are concerned about their wellbeing, rather than trying to confound the issue and solicit votes by innuendo or false information?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There has been a report to me about the confusion concerning voting for the Upper House in the recent election. I was surprised to see the advertising campaign undertaken by the Electoral Department to explain how the voting paper should be filled in.

Mr. Payne: There was an advertisement that caused some problem with the Australian Democrats.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will come to that matter in a moment; I am sure that the member for Mawson is well aware of it. On the one hand, the voter is urged, regarding the Lower House, to place a number in every square, virtually a number by every name. In the Upper House it is a matter of grouping. Many voters were confused, even though the square seemed to be adequate, and wanted to put a number by every name. The situation has got to be overcome by further education. I believe that there is a need for electoral reform in the system of voting for the Upper House, whereby the full preferences are supposed to flow on completely and where votes are not ignored in the counting because of anomalies in the Act as it presently stands. That legislation will ultimately come before this House.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Regarding the hire of booths, I would like to know how much was paid by the Electoral Department to the Education Department for the hire of primary schools and high schools at the last State election.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will certainly get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: I, too, return to the line "Hire of booths", and let me make quite clear that I intend to be fully satisfied before I give my approval to any amounts voted on these lines. It does not bother me if the Premier wishes to resort to insult or innuendo.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member should come back to the item.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, I intend to. I think I understood the Premier to say earlier that the money involved in the hire of booths went to the Education Department. I am not certain that the Premier is correct in that matter, and I would appreciate his checking this out. My understanding is that on occasion moneys are payable to school councils, which are the bodies vested with control of schools in many cases. If this inaccuracy on such an important matter involving quite a deal of money is an example of the information we are going to be supplied with during the rest of this debate, then I only hope that the Premier will improve. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I seek information

as to whether these fees are payable to the Education Department or to the school councils.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Although the honourable member is doing the best he can to antagonise me, I will not pick a fight with him. I repeat that the money payable for the hire of booths goes to churches, schools, or whatever. I think that it was the member for Napier who mentioned the Education Department. I do not know whether the money goes to school councils or to the Education Department, but I have already promised to get a report for the honourable member, and I will.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I turn again to the hire of booths.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not permitted to be repetitious.

Mr. HEMMINGS: No, but the Premier stated I said that the money was paid to the Education Department. I think that if members check *Hansard* tomorrow, they will find that the Premier said that money was paid to the Education Department. I asked what constituted the cost of the hire of the booths and where did that money go. The Premier answered that it went to the Education Department. I asked a supplementary question as to whether the Premier could give me the exact cost of hiring schools for the 1979 State election, and the Premier undertook to obtain a report on the exact costs involved. Subsequently, the member for Mitchell rose and—

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the member should seek his information.

Mr. HEMMINGS: This will be a repeat question, but perhaps I can clarify the question to make it easier for the Premier to answer, as obviously he is getting a bit tired. Could the Premier give me the exact cost of hiring booths for the election and tell me to whom that money was paid?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will get a report for the honourable member, as I said previously.

Vote passed.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$41 000.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to the line "Secretary and staff" under "Salaries and wages and related payments". I note that the actual payments in 1978-79 were \$35 332. The proposed payments for 1979-80 total \$33 330, which is about \$2 000 less than the amount actually spent during the previous year. In seeking information about this line, I refer the Treasurer to remarks he made in the course of the debate on 26 September last year, when he referred to the Public Works Committee, as follows:

This committee should be given additional powers to maintain a watch over projects in the course of construction and to consider proposed variations from the approved plan. This is one of the major problems associated with the Public Works Committee at present. Once approval for a specific project has been given, the committee has no power of continuing supervision, and almost anything can happen. When a project has been completed, it is too late to discover costly and extravagant variations and extensions to the original plan, because the taxpayers' money has already been spent. This also is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, as we have learnt most recently with the Frozen Food Factory, and it cannot be allowed to continue.

The committee should require a certificate on the completion of each project to confirm that the work was carried out according to the specifications approved by the committee. A statement should be prepared as part of the Auditor-General's Report each year setting out the cost of completed works as compared with the authorised expenditure and giving reasons for any marked variation from this level—a variation, for example, of 5 per cent or more.

I think that the important statement is:

This committee should be given additional powers to maintain a watch over projects in the course of construction . . .

If the committee is given additional powers, and if it is to exercise the powers it has already, one would anticipate that it would indeed be given some greater resources in terms of secretarial, clerical or other assistance. One, therefore, would look to see whether or not that particular aspect was covered by the Premier in the preparation of his Budget this year. Regrettably, one finds not a suggestion that the staff is to be increased but, in fact, reduced.

I think of even greater significance, and again this is something to be deplored, is the fact that the Public Works Committee, which has indeed been allocated less money than it actually spent last year, has been transferred abruptly from the premises that it occupied. It had rooms in this building. We all know of the problems involving accommodation for the Opposition, but I must confess that until occupying the Opposition benches I had not ventured on to the floor above, and I sympathise with the problem experienced by the Premier and his colleagues when in Opposition.

However, the restrictions in the House make that difficult and the point has been made that we do have electoral offices. I have no great complaint about my office, and one of its great advantages is that the window can be opened to obtain fresh air.

Mr. Becker: You can jump out, too.

Mr. BANNON: No, the window is too high and too small—I am sorry to disappoint the member for Hanson. Accommodation is important for the effective functioning of any committee. However, the accommodation provided in this House is no longer available to the Public Works Committee, which has been transferred to the Adelaide Railway Station building. I am not sure what accommodation facilities are available in that building, but nonetheless the committee is out of this House and the convenience of being in this building and the symbolic importance attached to that has been lost. Not only do I require information about the reduced amount available but also I want to know the reason for the change in accommodation.

The reason for the transfer has not been to improve the Public Works Committee; it has come about through pressure brought to bear by Government members in another place who want better offices than they have had in the past. Those members are attempting to remove other members from their offices. More importantly, a certain member of another place who failed to receive a Ministerial position, then failed to occupy the President's chambers, and then found himself condemned to sitting on the back bench for the next six years has to be found a decent office. We will have to wait and see what else he is found in the future. As a result, the Public Works Committee has simply been removed, and that sits very oddly with the statements made by the Premier about the importance of this committee and about its requiring increased powers and resources. In a stroke, the efficiency of that committee has been reduced for the political expediency that we have noted was such a crucial factor in the decision on the Public Accounts Committee. This is just another element of that pattern of behaviour by Government which, as was said earlier will lead it increasingly into error.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has shown a lack of thought tonight in making such statements on this vote. The Public Works Committee was suddenly moved for an obvious reason; the number of members in another place has increased by one. The

Labor Party in this State could not even muster sufficient votes to keep the Australian Democrats from winning a seat in their own right, and an Australian Democrat could hardly be expected to share a room with a member of the Labor Party and I am sure both Parties would have objected if the Government had insisted on that. Furthermore, we were still required to maintain a room for a woman, so it became obvious that there were insufficient rooms for members in another place. We had to find extra accommodation urgently, so the Government asked the Public Works Committee whether it would mind moving on a temporary basis to the railway station. That was planned as a temporary move until we had a chance to discuss the matter with the committee and the new Chairman, who has not yet been appointed. A member of the Leader's own political Party is still Chairman, and he asked me whether I would respect his request to carry on as Chairman for another three months following the election.

Mr. Keneally: That's traditional.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, and I upheld the tradition. Obviously, it is up to the Minister to discuss the final arrangements with the new Chairman when he is appointed. At that time I will also discuss the future role of the committee. The Leader of the Opposition asked why some announcement has not already been made about this, but the reason is obvious. The present Chairman, who is a member of the Opposition in terms of political viewpoint, will be there for only a short term.

Mr. Keneally: It's a Parliamentary committee.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, and I respect the job that he is doing, but it is not for the Minister to sit down at this stage with an old committee, which still has vacancies on it, to discuss its future role. I will discuss the committee's role with it when its membership is finalised. A submission prepared by the committee before the election has been put to me, and we will be discussing its contents.

Mr. BANNON: I appreciate the way the Minister has handled the membership of the committee and has respected the tradition of the Chairman's tenure for the three months. The Minister has displayed propriety and an understanding of the way that these things should be done, but we are not considering that issue; we are referring to the committee's accommodation.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It's a very relevant issue.

Mr. BANNON: If the Minister's agreement that the current Chairman should remain in office for three months was meant as some kind of *quid pro quo* for the committee's being sent over to the railway station, then I immediately retract the remarks I made about the approach taken by the Minister which, quite clearly, is improper.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That's not what I said.

Mr. BANNON: That is what the Minister is implying. We are not considering the continuance of the committee. I appreciate that the Minister should wait until the new Chairman is elected before undertaking any in-depth discussions about the role of the committee. Our point is that the committee is traditionally housed in this building and has now been moved elsewhere. Surely the *status quo* should have remained.

The Minister has detailed the needs of the Australian Democrats' member, who can possibly occupy one room. The Minister was not clear about how the situation of the lady member in the Legislative Council affected the issue. The Hon. Miss Levy and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper were there throughout the past five years, and the fact that the present women members are both in the same Party would, I should have thought, make that problem easier to solve. A large office is used for meetings and there is

another office that has not been discussed. Will those offices be made available to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, to whom I referred earlier? Will he be supplied with a secretary who will occupy yet another office; in other words it will be used not by a member at all but by superfluous secretarial assistants given as some kind of sop to a disaffected back-bencher?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Again, the Leader of the Opposition shows amazing ignorance. He knows only too well that it is not the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works to allocate offices in Parliament House. I was asked by the Leader in the Upper House to provide additional space for members in that place, and it was obvious that the only way this could be done was by moving out the Public Works Committee. The matter was discussed, and it was decided that the committee would be moved out immediately, before Parliament sat, to the railway building. It is not my responsibility to allocate office space, as the Leader knows. The Leader shows appalling ignorance in suggesting that the responsibility is mine. He knows equally that in the House of Assembly area I am not responsible for allocating office accommodation.

Mr. Payne: Why did you respond to the Leader? Surely it is the President's responsibility.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The matter was discussed with the President, but the request to me—

Mr. Payne: You said the Leader in the other place.

Mr. Bannon: You don't know what is going on.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I know exactly what is going on. It is up to the Upper House to decide how its office accommodation is allocated, and I have confidence in whatever decisions are made. If the Leader is prepared to have his members jammed into offices, I will convey that to the other place and make sure that this happens.

Mr. BANNON: I would like to get this matter completely clear. The Minister is telling us that a person, to whom he referred as the Leader in the Upper House (I presume he means the Government Leader in the Upper House), requested that these rooms be vacated, and he has complied with this request. Two things are involved: first, that rides roughshod over the rights of the committee that has been occupying these rooms; secondly, the Minister has consulted with the Leader in the Upper House, but it is the President's responsibility to allocate rooms. What role has the President played, and why has the Minister accepted instructions from the Leader in the Upper House to do something about this committee when the Leader has no authority for this, both in respect of the committee and in respect of the allocation of rooms in the Upper House?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader misquotes me. I indicated that the Leader in the Upper House told me that accommodation problems were being experienced and that insufficient space was available. I, as the Minister responsible for accommodation in terms of the entire Parliament House building, looked at the two committees that could possibly be located elsewhere. The Leader of the Upper House indicated the accommodation problems being experienced, and there was nothing improper about that. I therefore requested that the Public Works Committee move to another place. The Leader in the other place did not make the request that the committee be removed; he indicated the problems being experienced. I made the decision and the request.

Mr. McRAE: I wish to pursue this matter and several others. Will the Minister advise me if I am wrong in saying that the summary of all he has said is that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris came to him, the responsible Minister, and put a proposition concerning the disposition of no fewer than

three rooms, which formerly provided accommodation for the Public Works Committee, and that he, the responsible Minister, in response to that request, and that request only, proceeded to reallocate accommodation? If I am wrong in saying that, I would like the responsible Minister to deny it. Secondly, will the Minister, as the Minister responsible, indicate whether the incumbent President at that time, the Hon. Mr. Whyte, made any request at all regarding this whole matter?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On the first point, the honourable member is wrong, and I deny it. On the second point, I understand that it is the prerogative of the President to allocate accommodation in the Upper House. I will certainly not interfere with what the Hon. Mr. Whyte has decided.

Mr. McRAE: May I then ask if I was wrong in saying that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris made a request (and he, at that time, was Leader), whether I am now right in saying that, without any request by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Leader at that time, the Minister of Public Works proceeded to request the Public Works Committee to vacate the premises?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It would appear that the honourable member has become rather mixed up about who was Leader and who was not Leader in the Upper House at the time that any request was made. Mr. DeGaris made no request to me and did not even discuss the matter with me. I have had no communication whatsoever with Mr. DeGaris regarding this matter.

Mr. McRAE: May I then ask whether any request was made to the Minister by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Sumner, or any other member of the Legislative Council, before he, the Minister responsible, made the request or suggestion, or took any other step to see that the Public Works Committee vacated those rooms?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There are some thick members in the House at present. I pointed out clearly, and I repeat again—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the Minister should reflect on members of the committee.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Members opposite reflect on themselves. I said that the accommodation problems that had arisen in another place (in the Legislative Council half of Parliament House) were pointed out to me, and in looking at those accommodation problems I decided that the Public Works Committee should therefore be shifted. I did so.

Mr. McRAE: Who pointed out the problem to the Minister?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The problem was pointed out to me by the senior Government Minister in another place.

Mr. McRAE: What was the name of the senior Government Minister in that other place who pointed that out to the responsible Minister?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Attorney-General.

Mr. McRAE: For the record, what is the name of the Attorney-General to whom the Minister refers?

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister need not answer that question if he does not wish to do so.

Mr. McRAE: With great respect, my question is designed to obtain clarity and to avoid density, which the Minister, who accuses me of being so thick, is creating to avoid his own confusion. Is the Minister referring to his own Attorney-General or to the Hon. Mr. Sumner? Did the Hon. Mr. Griffin make the request or did the Hon. Mr. Sumner make the request? Will the Minister name the person who made the request, if, indeed, any request was made?

Mr. PAYNE: I am absolutely surprised at the Minister's

attitude. In past sessions, when the roles were reversed, it was alleged that the previous Government did not provide information. I do not agree that that information was not supplied, but the position is now reversed. I have been sitting here for over 10 minutes, hearing every excuse under the sun put forward by the Minister to avoid answering a simple query. What has actually happened is that the Public Works Committee, a very important committee in this Parliament and one to which reference was made in the Liberal Party's electoral policy (how it would be strengthened and assisted to play a greater role in the affairs of this State) has, on the request from one of his mates, been turfed out by the Minister into another building.

If there is nothing to hide in the matter, why did the Minister not give the simple explanation when it was sought? Is there more to this matter than so far we have been able to elicit?

I categorically deny that that information came forward regarding who made the request that caused the action until it was continually raised, to such an extent that it sorely tried your patience, Sir. The query had to be repeated so often and to be sorted out so much that the Minister could no longer avoid committing himself and admitting to everyone in the House that he took the action that was not instigated by the member of another place who has traditionally been charged with that administrative matter, namely, the provision of accommodation in that section of the building. That is why he took that course when asked about the matter. He felt uncomfortable regarding it. I hope that we get better responses to other information we will be forced to seek. It does not augur well for the people of the State if this is the conduct we can expect from the Minister responsible for such matters.

Mr. McRAE: Was the person who made the request the Hon. Mr. Griffin?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: When I was Minister of Public Works, there was only one Attorney-General, and that happened to be the Hon. Trevor Griffin.

Mr. McRAE: Why, at the relevant time, did the Minister not consult with the traditionally responsible officer, the President of the Legislative Council?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There had been discussions with a number of people in another place regarding the problems involved. The Attorney-General, as the senior Minister, brought those problems to my attention. I discussed the matter with officers of the Public Buildings Department, and the appropriate action was taken. If the honourable member is so petty and small-minded as to pursue an issue such as this, then heaven help us for the next 3½ years.

Mr. McRAE: Did the Minister consult with the President of the Legislative Council concerning this matter?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: You can keep asking as much as you like.

Mr. McRAE: Is the Minister refusing to answer my question whether he consulted with the President of the Legislative Council concerning this matter?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No.

Mr. McRAE: If the answer is "No", will the Minister now answer my question?

Mr. HEMMINGS: If the Minister did not discuss the problem with the President of the Legislative Council, did he discuss it with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris at any time?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: For the third time (the honourable member is apparently deaf), no.

Mr. PAYNE: I regret that we are forced to pursue this matter.

Mr. Lewis: So do I.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member may speak at anytime if he wishes to. No Opposition member, or indeed any member, should be forced into trying to obtain from a Minister of the Crown a simple answer to a question which, if there is nothing to hide, should be immediately forthcoming. His reluctance speaks for itself. There is more to this matter than the Minister is willing to disclose.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not really concerned about the honourable Minister's reluctance.

Mr. PAYNE: We can judge only from the Minister's manner, because we cannot get the information. Judging by the Minister's demeanour, and the way in which he has failed to come forward with simple answers, if there is nothing to hide, why does he not tell the Committee what actually transpired in this matter? Our view can be based only on what we are told. In response to advice from a fellow member of his Party (not the responsible person normally concerned with these matters), the Minister took it upon himself detrimentally to allocate accommodation for a committee which his Party only a few weeks beforehand, as part of its election campaign, said it revered and held in high esteem. That Party said that it intended to improve the status of the committee, give it greater powers, and help it to function better. In order to facilitate all that, the Minister took this action without any consultation whatsoever (we have had no evidence to the contrary) with the President of the Legislative Council. The committee was turfed out into other accommodation away from the place in which it has operated so successfully. I appeal to the Minister to overcome his misgivings about the murky dealings in which he has been involved and to come clean and tell members what really happened.

Mr. McRAE: As the Minister is not going to respond to the member for Mitchell, I, too, will try again to get some decency from him. Members of the present Opposition recall the Minister, when he was in Opposition, many times making propositions, many of which were good, seeking, openness of government, accountability of government, and responsibility of Ministers and the Executive to the Parliament. He cannot deny that. His own Party has put forward a number of suggestions to have Estimates committees involved in the debate in which we are now engaged. I agree that this would take less time and would be much more functional than what we are now doing.

Mr. Payne: It would have saved us half an hour tonight.

Mr. McRAE: And it would have saved hours, with the nonsense with which we have had to put up. The Premier and he have made tremendous promises to the public concerning the Public Accounts Committee. Now, we have all learnt this afternoon about the absolute corruption that has been going on concerning this matter. It is nothing less than corruption.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should not continue to refer to a previous vote of the Committee.

Mr. McRAE: I bow to your judgment, Sir. This is a matter of petty corruption, but the situation is not helped when the Minister, who, in the past, as a member of the Opposition, demanded from Government Ministers vehemently (and rightly so) open and full disclosure, puts on a petty and stupid performance. He has hidden behind all sorts of formulae, and it has got him nowhere. We know that the last time it was to buy off the member for Hanson. Now, it is buying off the Hon. Mr. DeGaris by providing him with accommodation which formerly provided for the Secretary and Steno-Secretary of the Public Works Standing Committee and which also comprised a large committee room. I understand that

some parts of the accommodation are now occupied by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, as a back-bencher, who, unlike any other back-bencher in this Parliament, happens to have a steno-secretary in that accommodation.

We can only presume that the Minister really meant what he said in Opposition, and that he is now seriously embarrassed by what has been disclosed during the course of this questioning. He has been indulging in some petty little deal with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, his own Premier, and the Attorney-General in the Upper House, to buy off the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and shut him up for the moment. As the price for that, he has shoved off into the railway station the very committee highlighted by his Leader last year in the Budget debate as an important committee to be given an additional function, an on-going scrutiny of public works in this State.

Mr. Payne: Ask him to come clean.

Mr. McRAE: I have been asking him to come clean for a long time, but without much success. That is because he is so embarrassed. He has tried to jump in every direction and has gone so close to misleading Parliament that it is not true. His Leader this afternoon was not in that position, because he was shrewd enough to stay well clear of stating anything like the facts. It will be interesting to read *Hansard* tomorrow and to compare the Minister's original replies to the Leader of the Opposition with those he has given subsequently. I believe that, tonight, he has misled the Parliament and he has misled the people not only tonight but also in the shabby way in which he has dealt with this committee for his own petty corruption inside his political Party.

What is more, he has tried to pass some of the blame in a shabby sort of excuse on to the former member for Salisbury by suggesting in some way that he, as the responsible Minister, having allowed that honourable gentleman to stay in his position for another three months, agreed to this shabby transaction. That is not true, because Mr. Groth would not do it. In any event, it is not true because the constitutional position is such that the Minister cannot stop it. He cannot remove Mr. Groth from that position if Mr. Groth wants to continue, and only yesterday Mr. Groth told me that he intended to continue.

This is a bad reflection, for the second time in one day, on the way in which this Government has been conducting its affairs. It is acting in concert with its Federal colleagues, misleading the Parliament, jumping from one attempted promise to another, and from one attempted promise to another withdrawal of a promise.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am now starting to see what the twisted, warped, gutter minds opposite are trying build up. They are trying to suggest, and to prove in their twisted little minds, that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris came to me, directly or indirectly, and asked whether he could have an especially large room and some special accommodation in the Upper House. As I have indicated, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had no communication with me. In discussing the accommodation arrangements in the Upper House, at no stage was his name mentioned. I give that absolute guarantee. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not see me or raise the issue with me, and he did not send someone on his behalf; his name was never mentioned. I do not know how honourable members opposite can carry on in such a petty manner for more than half an hour.

On election night, I was staggered to find that the A.L.P. vote in three big polling booths in Davenport was down to 11 per cent, yet they claim to be the alternative Government. Having seen their performance tonight, I am staggered that their vote even reached double figures.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: We have been told that the move

of the Public Works Standing Committee to the railway station is a temporary move only, and that a change could well be made when the new Chairman is appointed some time in December. I should like to know how much this temporary move is costing the Parliament and the people of South Australia in terms of rent payments, refitting, fuel, light, utilities, cleaning, and so on. How can the Minister justify that for a temporary move in the light of his previous answers as to why the move has taken place?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is costing absolutely nothing in terms of rental, because the accommodation is owned by the Government. It is costing nothing at this stage in terms of alterations; no request has been made to me to alter any facility. The Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee is downstairs, where he has been waiting for 45 minutes to see me. I do not know what he wants to talk to me about, but no doubt he is furious with his former colleagues for having held him up down there. The answer to the honourable member's question is "absolutely nothing".

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am amazed that the building is so light and airy that it needs no light, and so clean that it needs no cleaning costs. These costs are being paid for the rooms in this place. I should have thought that at least some cost would have been paid. Is it usual that buildings owned by the State Transport Authority can be imposed upon and have Parliamentary office space imposed upon them without any rent being paid to them? Is this usual practice?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I appreciate that the honourable member is a new member and might not know what government is all about. As Minister of Public Works, I am responsible for Government accommodation. The Accommodation Committee, under the Public Service Board, reports directly to the Minister. It is my responsibility to make sure that we use the available accommodation as cheaply and as efficiently as possible and to the best possible use, and that is what I will continue to do.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Is it suggested, therefore, that there is some cost to the general budget of the Minister of Public Works for rent of buildings that may appear elsewhere in the Budget in relation to this space that is being used? Is it correct that the shift is not a nil cost to the Government?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Again, it shows appalling ignorance. If members opposite are going to attack the Government on an issue like this, any effective Opposition would have done some homework. The space was vacant at the time.

Mr. Keneally: So was the space between the ears.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Stuart must not reflect on the Minister.

Mr. McRAE: Will the Minister tell the Committee whether the undertaking given by his Party at the time of the last election that the Public Works Standing Committee would have an additional function, namely, an ongoing scrutiny of public works in addition to its present function of an original scrutiny, will be honoured?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We have clearly stated what we have believed. When I have discussed the matter fully with the new Chairman and the full committee, when they are all appointed, I will announce that some finality has been reached. To do so beforehand would be foolish and quite improper.

Mr. McRAE: Do I understand that the Minister is now denying that the time of the—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I am used to the arrogance of the Minister

from the days when he was in Opposition, but I will try to put the question as simply as possible. Is the Minister denying that it was one of the election planks of his Party that the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works would, not might, have an on-going function to continue to scrutinise public works expenditure after the original vetting which is now done?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was not denying that at all. In fact, I was confirming just that. I said our policy has been clearly stated, and my discussions with the committee will take place in the light of that policy. If the member is so thick that he cannot understand that, he appears more and more like a frustrated lawyer who is unsuccessful elsewhere and is attempting to be successful here. We have clearly stated upon what grounds we see the expanded role of the committee. The committee equally has put a case to the Minister and we will sit down and discuss these two cases. When there is something definite in terms of a final agreement, I will announce it to the House.

Mr. McRAE: May we clearly understand that, in the course of the next few months, the Government of the day will arrange that the election promises it made prior to the recent election will be put into effect in this financial year?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Until I have had the discussions with the committee, including the present Chairman, who has not yet had an opportunity to put a case to support what was put to me in writing, it would be quite improper for me to give any undertaking. We have outlined the the principles that we uphold and will certainly operate within those principles.

Mr. McRAE: Can we have some assurance as to the latest date at which we can expect that the policy announced by the Liberal Party will be put into effect?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, as soon as possible.

Mr. PAYNE: I noted in a response from the Minister to the member for Salisbury (and it had been mentioned in other information) that the move—I would call it the turf-out—into the premises now occupied by the Public Works Committee in the Railways building is of a temporary nature. Will the Minister say what factors will govern the length of time involved in that temporary move and where the next move will be? Will it be another turf-out or will it be a move to the final location? Is he in a position, at this stage, to say, or is all of that still contingent upon these discussions which he is going to have with the Chairman at some future date in respect of the modified operation of the Public Works Committee as outlined in the policy of the Liberal Party at the last election?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In light of the need to establish additional accommodation in the Upper House immediately, I asked the committee to move as quickly as possible. I asked it to move before the House sat, and they moved on the Wednesday before the House sat. From memory, I spoke to the existing Chairman on the Monday or Tuesday night (that may have been the long weekend) before the House sat. I asked them, in light of the need to create urgent accommodation before the House sat, if they would be willing to go down there immediately. The Chairman expressed some concern but neither he nor any member of the committee has objected to me formally since.

I will certainly uphold that undertaking, that I will discuss with the committee what permanent accommodation it will need in future. I can assure the honourable member that I will sit down and discuss with the committee what sort of accommodation is needed in the long term. It will be part of the discussions on the expanded role the committee should have. We need to look at how much space and staff the committee requires.

Once such matters are finalised we will be able to finalise accommodation as well.

Mr. PAYNE: I must say it was a pleasure to elicit that response from the Minister, now that he appears to have recovered from the embarrassment he suffered through attempting to avoid giving fairly simple information earlier. I do not know why he took that attitude, but I suspect that he had an ulterior motive. One point he did not canvass was the length of time involved. Can the Minister state the length of time involved, in terms of six months or nine months? Can the Minister state whether the procedure suggested earlier will apply; that is, is he investigating secondment of people from departments? Is it likely that additional full-time staff will be appointed? I think all members of the House, in view of the great importance given to the question of committees by the Liberal Party, would appreciate any information that the Minister can give us on this topic.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It may turn out that the committee is quite happy there and wants to stay. The honourable member should wait until I have had time to discuss the matter. Until we know what sort of staff will be involved, I cannot tell whether any additional staff will be needed, and I cannot say where they would come from. Any member who would think I could say that at this stage would be stupid, and I am starting to get that very impression.

Mr. PAYNE: I am only too willing to point out that there was an occasion earlier when I was convinced that the Minister was acting in a stupid way. I think he recovered from it somewhat, because he is now controlling his replies to a degree; only now and again is he lapsing into his old arrogance. It will not do him any good, and I suspect that as he grows older he will learn it is not really worth the effort. The Opposition is entitled to this information, and we intend to seek it in accordance with the terms and conditions which operate in this House. I accept the fact that he has now told us on this side of the House that what he told us earlier (that it was a temporary move) was another of the off-the-cuff answers that he is tempted to give us. Now he has informed us that it is not necessarily a temporary move at all, and that they may decide to stay there. I do not understand why these things were not said in the first place, when we sought to find out from him what was involved in the move that he had made. The matter of staff is directly relevant, because we are looking at the matter of funds for secretary and staff. There is no special description there—the word “staff” is in the plural sense. The Minister just said he had no idea as to the provision for extra staff or where they would come from, and he says that we are stupid to think that he ought to know. If that is being stupid, I think I will go on being stupid. I think we are entitled to expect a Minister concerned with an activity to be able to say to this House what staff and cost are involved. The salaries come from the people of the State, and the money is spent on their behalf.

The Opposition is entitled to know how it will operate, how it will be put into the Budget, and how it will be voted on. The Minister did not take the view at all. I feel like giving up trying to obtain information from the Minister, but I will not.

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. McRAE: I hope that in answering my question, the Minister will refrain from the dubious and insulting manner that he has adopted in the past. Has the Minister or his Leader instructed the Parliamentary Counsel to prepare amendments to the Public Works Standing

Committee Act to put into effect the policy promises made by the Liberal Party at the last State election?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member knows that, when legislation is introduced in this House, it will be introduced by the appropriate Minister with the appropriate announcement. The honourable member's Government for the past 6½ years that I have been in the Chamber always adopted exactly the same procedure. I am not sure why he suddenly wants it changed.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have heard the Opposition's rantings and ravings about the Public Works Committee, yet the Opposition knows that it was their colleague in another place who caused all the problems.

Mr. McRae: Who?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Hon. Mr. Sumner. He caused all the trouble and is the person that honourable members opposite are trying to protect tonight. If that is the standard of the Opposition in this place, it is time they obtained the truth. The instigator of all the trouble was a Labor Party member in another place, guided by the Leader, the Hon. Mr. Sumner.

Mr. KENEALLY: I have just heard the most incredible contribution to any Committee debate that I have ever heard. The honourable member for Glenelg arrived out of the blue for the first time in three hours—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing about the honourable member for Glenelg in the lines.

Mr. KENEALLY: That there is nothing about the honourable member in the lines says much for the lines. I have absolutely no idea what the honourable member for Glenelg was referring to in his comments about the Hon. Mr. Sumner, and I am sure that he has not, either, because if he had he would have given us some facts. We asked him for some facts, but he was not prepared to give them, so we can only assume that the honourable member is up to his old trick of plenty of noise and no substance.

If these lines mean anything at all, they quite clearly indicate to the Committee that there is no intention on the part of this Government to honour its election promise that it would extend the role of the Public Works Standing Committee. If there was a possibility that it would be providing additional research staff, secretarial staff or what-have-you, the item "Salaries, secretary and staff" would not be less for 1979-80 than it was for 1978-79. I ask the Minister whether there is any intention in this financial year, before the next Budget, to increase the staff of the Public Works Standing Committee. If there is, why is it not in the lines, or is the Government going to do with the Public Works Committee what the Premier told me it is going to do with the Public Accounts Committee and second staff from other parts of the Public Service?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is a little difficult to decide how many, if any, additional staff will be needed when one has not worked out what the role of the committee will be. It is difficult to work out what we think the role of the committee should be when there has not yet been any formal discussion between the committee and the Minister and when one knows only too well that there is a temporary Chairman of that Committee who is to retire in less than two months. The fact is that members opposite have wasted a full hour of the Committee's time with this matter. In fact, considerable time and money has been wasted by the Opposition's petty questioning tonight and its following what appears to be a gutter piece of its imagination, which has run rife on this and a few other matters. Opposition members have been making claims that have no foundation and trying to make some of the mud stick. That is the sort of politics we now have from the Opposition in this State, and that is an absolutely appalling situation.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections across the Chamber.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: When the role of the committee is worked out we will also work out the number of further staff, if any, that is required.

Mr. BANNON: We have just heard a quite extraordinary statement. I do not know why it is that the Minister, who complains of time wasting, proceeds to make the sorts of statement he makes and has made repeatedly throughout the debate in order simply to prolong the debate. By constantly refusing to answer a question directly and mis-stating what is put to him he encourages a further response or question from the Opposition. The reason we have been over an hour on this matter is that we cannot get a direct, true, straight answer from the Minister. As long as the Minister persists, we will have to keep asking these questions.

The subject of his last speech was that he does not know what the committee is going to do; he does not know its changed role or increased functions. Right at the beginning of the debate on this item, I read to the Premier carefully from *Hansard* a quite detailed statement on the role of the committee that was made by the Premier when he was in Opposition. It would be understood that what he was saying there was the policy of his Party at that time, a policy that he has since indicated has not changed, because it was restated in the recent election. I will not waste the time of the Committee reading that again, but I refer the Minister to *Hansard* on 26 September 1978 at pages 1161 and 1162, where he will find a quite detailed statement on how his Party perceives the role of that committee.

For the Minister to keep saying that that is to be determined simply invites the Opposition to keep rising, not to respond to him but to try to give him some information so he can give a specific answer to the questions put by me, the member for Playford, the member for Mitchell and so on. Until we receive direct answers to those questions we will keep repeating them.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I point out that if I again repeat the statements I have made, I will be in danger of being ruled out of order for being unnecessarily repetitious, as the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues opposite have become tonight during the last hour.

Mr. McRAE: I would like a direct assurance from the Minister that it is his Government's policy (and it will be put into effect through legislation) that the role of the Public Works Standing Committee will be changed to permit an on-going investigation and control of public works in this State—yes, or no.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: For what must now be about the tenth time I say "Yes", it is the Government's intention to look at the role of the committee and to discuss it with that committee. We have laid out the principles involved which we, as a Party, uphold, and which will be used as guidelines in the discussions with the committee. In addition, I will even take into account the written submissions put to me by the committee, as is only right and proper. I have clearly stated on four or five occasions what will occur.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: For members opposite to keep wasting time is a waste of this State's finances and a waste of this Houses's time.

Mr. PAYNE: I have already raised the matter of staff and the Minister said that he had no information on the matter of additional staff. I accept that and do not intend to go on with it. Apparently, that is a sample of the way he

will operate in Government.

Despite the fact that it took us a long time to get a simple "Yes" answer, we did make some progress on this question. Earlier the member for Playford attempted to find out whether the policies espoused during the election would be put into operation this financial year. My understanding was that he could not get a definite answer to the question.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As soon as possible.

Mr. PAYNE: Is "as soon as possible" likely to be in the financial year after this?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It will be as soon as possible.

Mr. MATHWIN: Members opposite would know that the co-architect of the move by the committee was their Leader in another place, the Hon. Mr. Sumner. He agreed that the committee should be moved out of this building. Members opposite should not look so startled, and the member for Playford can give a supercilious leer but he is very well aware of the history behind that move.

The honourable member knows damned well the history of the matter, and he knew this an hour ago before he started bringing this junk in here, trying to put red herrings in the path of the Minister. The honourable member also asked whether the committee would be upgraded. Of course it will; I am going to be a member of that committee. The committee is bound to be upgraded and improved because the Liberal Party will have a majority of members on that committee. No doubt, the Minister was too embarrassed to say this about members on this side of the House, but I am quite willing to advise members opposite that the committee will certainly be upgraded with the appointment of members from this side of the House. Members opposite know the sad story of the committee's move and who were the instigators and the architects in that matter.

Mr. McRAE: I want to get this clear because I am worried about my friend, the Hon. Mr. Sumner, in view of the allegations that have now been made. Will the Minister say whether the Hon. Mr. Sumner entered into any negotiations with him with a view to shifting the accommodation of the committee in question?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I have clearly indicated at least four or five times that the only person with whom I had discussions was the Attorney-General.

Mr. PAYNE: Regarding "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries," as the Minister has said that the committee will be upgraded, will the allocation of \$6 000 be sufficient for the committee's purposes this financial year?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I expect that \$6 000 will be adequate, only \$4 418 being spent last year.

Vote passed.

Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement,
\$5 000—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1 512 000.

Mr. BANNON: Regarding "Parliament Building—Fuel and light, rates, cleaning, etc.," in 1978-79, \$3 386 was spent in excess of the vote, but that figure is fairly reasonable when one considers the items contained in this line. However, for 1979-80, \$137 000 has been proposed, which is a significant leap. Does that increased sum allow for one item or a number of items, or is this a pessimistic projection of inflationary effects in that area?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There were increases in expenditure, including cleaning charges and other charges, and these increases were added during the last part of last financial year. In the course of a full year, those increases will amount to a considerable sum.

Mr. PAYNE: Does the line "Insurance premiums—Members of Parliament" involve an accident type of cover

or accidental death type of cover?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not shown any morbid interest in that policy, but as far as I know it is an accident policy in relation to members involved in the discharge of their duties, and I think that for a modest sum one can extend it to a 24-hour cover.

Mr. LEWIS: Regarding "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries," I am interested to note that it has been possible to reduce that line by about 80 per cent of the total spent during the past financial year. How has that been possible? Are items such as the microphones that enable members to be heard so clearly and audibly in this Chamber included in that line and, if so, what part of it comprises the expense incurred by some irresponsible Jack who purloined the microphones from this Chamber before the commencement of the session? Has that person been apprehended?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know how many microphones disappeared, but a number of them disappeared. That matter is not covered in this line. There is a considerable discrepancy here, but the expenditure is a good deal lower than was anticipated, because of the Government printing indirect billing that was understated considerably. In the 1978-79 Estimates the total for this line, including that billing, was \$920 000, and the short-fall was far greater than was expected. The vote for the 1978-79 figure should have been more in the order of administration expenses \$180 000 and indirect billing by the Government Printer, \$740 000. The proposed expenditure for the current year is to offset increasing air-conditioning costs and the costs of consolidating the Statutes.

Mr. KENEALLY: It seems to me that the sum of \$83 000 voted in 1978-9 for travelling expenses was incredibly accurate, when we see that \$82 915 was actually spent. Should credit for that go to the people estimating possible expenditure, or is some more accurate procedure involved?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is based on an average requirement. The sum of \$87 000, compared to \$83 000, represents fare increases, etc., in the 12-monthly period.

Mr. McRAE: I think that the current provision for insurance of members is ridiculous, and this is indicated by the small amount of premiums. In many other States, New Zealand, and in other places, members are provided for by either workmen's compensation or analogous Acts. Will the Premier consider bringing down a report in due course?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The amount of the sum insured is, I understand, \$40 000. It is an accident cover with other related benefits, as is usual with accident cover. I would prefer to see it stay that way rather than have members of Parliament covered under the Worker's Compensation Act. There was a rather unfortunate suggestion of a claim made within the last 12 months on that basis, and I think it would have been improper. It was withdrawn. Certainly, I shall consider increasing the capital sum involved in terms of today's money, because certainly it is not as valuable as it was when we first came to Parliament. I will consider it and bring down a report.

Mr. McRAE: Looked at in that light, it seems quite generous, but it is not interpreted in that way. It must be shown by the member to be a violent external act or damage. He is covered only in respect of, say, a collision with a motor vehicle.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: What if he breaks his collarbone playing netball?

Mr. McRAE: He would not be covered for that, nor would he be covered under worker's compensation. Let us take the case of a member who has served for five years,

and who receives no superannuation. He has a heart attack or suffers some other disabling injury. Why should not that member be covered? Workers are covered against that contingency. Members of Parliament are covered in New Zealand, in Victoria, and in other places in the Commonwealth. I raise the matter in all seriousness.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I take the point. The member is looking for a sickness and accident policy. There would be no payments from the sickness fund while the member was sick. However, if he ceased to become a member because of the illness and was not entitled to superannuation, he would be entitled to sickness payments.

Mr. PAYNE: The amount of \$87 000 is proposed for travelling expenses. The amount spent in the previous year is so close to the amount voted that I suspect that it has been mutually agreed that a tight rein is kept on the expenditure. Does the Premier consider that the sum of \$87 000 will be sufficient, bearing in mind the number of members who have left the House and who are now in the former member category?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not gone unremarked, but sufficient unto the day, I think; it works both ways. One is a check on the other.

Vote passed.

State Governor's Establishment, \$254 000.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the provision for aides-de-camp, clerical, domestic and general staff. During our period of Government, there was a change in relation to the appointment of aides to the present Governor. Has that resulted in a saving, and is this reflected in the amount proposed to be voted?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is only one aide-de-camp, where previously there were two. Honorary aides are now used. Obviously the national wage increase comes through in these matters, but increased penalty rates were payable during the Royal visit, particularly for the chauffeur. That provision previously has come from Government Garage funds.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am following in the illustrious steps of the members of the former Opposition when I ask questions on motor vehicles, as it used to be a general source of questioning when the Liberal Party was in Opposition. I heard the answer given by the Premier regarding the allocation of \$5 000 for a motor vehicle for the Electoral Department. As pointed out earlier, \$5 000 is not a large sum when one places it towards the purchase of motor vehicles, having regard to the special allowance that State Government's have in this matter. Will the Premier explain what the \$5 000 will buy for the State Governor's establishment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Even with the concession that the State Government has on sales tax, one would not expect a large vehicle for \$5 000. Provision has been made this year towards the replacement of a motor vehicle. In other words, one motor vehicle will be sold and the additional money will be provided for the replacement.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to what is almost a delicate matter, which I raise in a true spirit, namely, the \$2 000 expense allowance for the Lieutenant-Governor. I note that \$2 000 was voted and spent in 1978-79. If one looks at any other line associated with emoluments or salaries, one sees that provision is made for increments or awards. It seems a little niggardly for Parliament to be asked to approve the same amount. I know that the Lieutenant-Governor works very hard and is often involved in long journeys. I suggest that it might be something that the Premier could examine in the future. It is almost like industrial justice prevailing when all others receive incremental arrangements, yet it does not apply to the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will examine the matter. Vote passed.

Premier's Department, \$4 130 000.

Mr. BANNON: I have been searching through the lines for some reference to the role of the Minister of State Development. To which lines can the Premier point which relate to that role of the Minister of State Development?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Ministry or the department has not yet been set up. It is proposed that, when it is set up, there will be a move of officers from the Premier's Department and other suitable departments to make up the staff of the Office of State Development. It is intended that it will be a small office only. Initially, there will be a Director and possibly two or three other people in that department. Much of the work done there will involve making a point of first contact with people who are interested in investing in South Australia or who wish to make contact with other markets.

Mr. Keneally: You don't expect much traffic because you have a small office?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There will be a developing traffic as time goes on, and I imagine that, by the time the next Budget is introduced, we will have a significant provision for the department. It is important that the whole operation is planned most carefully and that we do not duplicate functions. I do not intend to rush into that. I intend in the near future to appoint a Director of State Development but, other than that, we will build our base first before we move up.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to the line "Administrative, Committee Secretariat, publicity and clerical staff", for which over \$1 000 000 is proposed, although that is less than the sum spent in the previous financial year. I presume that, if resources from the Premier's Department are to be made available to form the basis of this new Office of State Development, they may indeed come from officers employed under that line.

Will the Premier indicate how much of the total sum is devoted to administrative expenses, and what savings have resulted from the abolition of the Policy Division of the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: At this stage no substantial savings have been made, because the changes have been in operation for less than four weeks. There will be quite considerable savings made in terms of the number of people. It is hoped to provide a research staff and the staff of the Minister of State Development, which will together amount to less than the number of people who were in the Policy Division. The present staff in the Premier's Department totals 78, 38 being in administration, as opposed to 41 before. In the Policy Division there are 14; those appointments are now being moved. There were 17. The Publicity and Design Division has not yet been varied in any way, although there is some investigation being conducted as to the cost-benefit value of the work in that division.

Mr. BANNON: In response to a question on notice, the Premier detailed, I think, 19 positions of senior officers whose positions have been altered as a result of abolition, either through transfer or whatever. Some of those are Ministerial staff. There is no problem in relation to the Government of the day seeking to place those Ministerial staff members as best it may, bearing in mind of course the level at which they are employed and so on. However, there are large number of quite senior officers who have been placed in various other departments such as Public and Consumer Affairs, Local Government, Engineering and Water Supply, Environment, the Childhood Services Council, the Public Service Board, Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Trade and Industry. It

is a matter of some concern that these persons are senior project officers. I am distinguishing, of course, between Ministerial appointees and those officers who are in fact filling career Public Service positions and who have been promoted accordingly. It is of some considerable concern that the Premier has outlined that under the administrative line there will not be any great savings; there may, in fact, be some reduction in the number of staff employed but then, with the creation of his special Office of State Development, perhaps even that will be taken up. I draw attention to a number of senior officers whose appointments could not be described as political in the sense that they are officers of the highest professional skills who have been appointed for those professional skills and have been promoted up through the Policy Division from other arms of the Public Service under the procedure laid down by the Public Service Board.

These officers have been fairly peremptorily and somewhat ruthlessly removed from their positions, not, it would appear, to effect major savings or alterations in the way in which policy advice is to be gained but simply to clear the way for the Premier to replace these Public Service positions. Again, I stress I am not talking about Ministerial officers, but these Public Service positions, with persons of his own choosing. I have in other debates expressed considerable concern about this but, as we are being asked to vote funds to support the administrative sector of the Premier's Department, could the Premier comment on his intentions in this area? Why is it that he has moved these senior career public servants so quickly and peremptorily to other areas? What is his intention about dealing with the vacancies thereby created?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am well aware of the Leader's efforts to build up this subject in the community in recent days. I believe that the subject has been vastly over-stated. There are not 100 as was reported in the paper. I am not sure whether that is attributable to the Leader (I hope not), because that was vastly exaggerated. I understand that fewer than 40 officers have been transferred in the entire Public Service as a result of the changeover, and I find that entirely allowable within the total of the excellent Public Service that we have.

We will effect considerable savings in staffing at this stage from the Premier's Department Policy Division. The Leader is suggesting that there is some political implication here. The only test that I apply to that is the efficient running of the department in my style. My style is that I do not believe that submissions coming to Cabinet should be automatically vetted by a Policy Division working in the Premier's Department. That is just not my style of doing things.

In those circumstances they are vetted by members of Cabinet themselves, and they will be vetted, where necessary, by a very small research staff for, and on behalf of, Ministers. In other words, I subscribe very much to the Cabinet office or the Department of Cabinet routine, where submissions for Cabinet are examined by a small staff on behalf of Cabinet and reported back to Ministers before coming to Cabinet. It is a different style of Government. I will not go into the details if the honourable member does not know what used to happen when he was in Government. I just do not see it that way. I am going to run the department the way I would like to. None of the officers who have been transferred has suffered in any way. They have been found proper positions commensurate with their status and training and, indeed, I had a report from the Public Service Board to that effect today.

Mr. BANNON: I thank the Premier for his further explanation. However, it not only leaves some questions

unanswered but also raises other questions. The Treasurer talks about a small research unit. Does that mean persons such as he has the basis of already, Mr. Story and Mr. Lachlan? Do these individuals comprise the basis of a unit that will vet and look at his policy, or is this to be a professional Public Service unit, professionally appointed through the Public Service Board?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We have been talking, as the Leader made clear at the outset, not about Ministerial appointments but about Public Service appointments.

Mr. BANNON: Is it the Premier's intention to appoint an inquiry unit, similar to the one that was disbanded immediately upon his coming into office, to handle specific inquiries to the Premier? If he is not going to have such an inquiry unit, is he going to handle that through his political staff, or what other means will he have to handle the enormous volume of inquiries that consist largely of social-work type approaches? I refer to a somewhat distressing situation that arose as a result of his sudden disbanding of the inquiry unit. Clearly, the Premier and his Government perceived this as some kind of political arm of the previous Government; in fact, the individuals in that unit could not be described as political, either in their specific allegiance and activities, or in the sort of advice that they gave.

The primary role of that unit was simply to have somewhere for people who come seeking the Premier's attention or help, without in many cases having specific problems that can be referred to a department but which need counselling, advice, and often simply just an ear to listen to, someone who can claim some connection with the Premier and some *imprimatur* to represent him. In this role Mr. Fred Hansford, who occupied that position at the time of the change of Government and whose contract was peremptorily terminated, had earned enormous respect and had helped many people.

I know from my electorate office that there were occasions when individuals had reached the end of the line and Mr. Hansford was one person one could still refer them to who would try to do something for them, listen to them, and who was able to say that he was acting on behalf of the Premier. I do not know whether his services were availed of by members opposite, but certainly he was available, and I would be surprised if similar cases were not referred to him by the then Opposition members' officers. Another individual I will mention is a Miss Katsidis, who is a member of the Greek community and whose role was to look after a large number of ethnic inquiries that simply could not be sent off to the Ethnic Affairs Unit or somewhere else, because the people were requiring, as they perceived it, the attention of the Premier. Quite clearly, under the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations many thousands of people felt that they needed that sort of attention and could not be satisfied by speaking to electorate officers or representatives of departments, but got considerable satisfaction from the inquiry unit. Its role certainly was not political. Its function was not political, nor was the advice given by it. I can provide testimony, as I am sure many other members can, of that fact. Therefore, it was somewhat distressing to hear of the peremptory way those individuals were dealt with. I would like to hear the Premier's comments about this matter and about how he will handle that sort of situation. Is it to be inflicted on permanent public servants who have administrative and other duties which might make it difficult to handle those complaints, or is it, in fact, to be made a political function of the political staff that he appoints?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader is now talking about Ministerial appointments again.

Mr. Bannon: I am talking about the inquiry unit.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, which were Ministerial appointments. As such, their contracts were terminated, as the Leader says was entirely proper.

Mr. Bannon: They were not political appointments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am just making the point. If the Leader wants to get his facts straight (and I will put him straight), I will tell him exactly what the facts are. The three people referred to in the inquiry unit were Ministerial appointments on contracts and those contracts have been cancelled, which, as the Leader virtually said in so many words when he started this exercise, was to be expected.

I believe it is right to put on record something that occurred to me very soon after I took office as Premier. I, as a matter of inquiry, had investigations made and asked for reports on the activities of all sections of my department. I believe that all other Ministers did the same. When I asked about the activities of the inquiry unit, I received from my officers a report that I understand had been prepared for the previous Premier. There was one factor that I was not going to raise, but, since the Leader has raised this matter, I will put it on record. I will not quote names, but I will read from a report about the activities of the inquiry unit of the Premier's Department, which refers to business problems. It is a summary prepared, as I have said, for the previous Premier. It states:

A most interesting case concerned X. The problem commenced about 1975 and was generated by damage caused by a Highways Department vehicle causing damage to a sign. During 1976-78 the matter remained in dispute. The Supreme Court appointed a liquidator. Some time after this action Mr. X was referred to the inquiry unit by Jack Jennings. Advice was given and Mr. X acted accordingly. Within 72 hours the matter had been heard by a judge. The court appointed liquidators were severely criticised and constraints were removed . . .

The report goes on to state exactly what was involved. Then it states:

The final result: Mr. X, previously a Liberal supporter, has become an ardent ALP supporter and is actively engaged in John Bannon's electorate activities. This particular exercise is a fair indication of the public relations worth of the unit's work.

I will make no other comment on that matter. I simply say that, as these were Ministerial appointments as the Leader said, it was my prerogative to cancel those contracts. At the present time it has not been totally wound down. One officer has been seconded from the Department of Further Education to deal with inquiries and to assess the situation on a relatively temporary basis. In other words, I would like to see exactly what the demand is and what can be done.

I agree that it looks very much as though the inquiry unit does serve a useful purpose. In that regard, particularly in respect of Mr. Economou from the Riverland, it is intended to create an Ethnic Information Officer for the Riverland. I understand that position has been advertised today or will be advertised tomorrow. Mr. Economou was seconded from the Department for Community Welfare to take up a Ministerial appointment in the inquiry unit and he is at liberty to apply for that job if he wishes.

Mr. BANNON: The comments just made by the Premier deserve further response and inquiry. Quite clearly the report quoted by the Premier indicates that, as a result of the attention given by the inquiry unit to the individual's problems, he felt motivated to support the Government that made such a unit available. In my view, that does not in any way suggest that those persons in the inquiry unit acted as some kind of recruiting agent for the Labor Party.

That strongly emphasizes the point I was making to the Premier; in fact, I was proffering him some advice as to the value received by the Premier of the day in having to deal with these individual problems and having some facility to deal with them effectively. If, as a result of that, the Premier is able to attract either personal or general Party political support well and good, and we as politicians often find that that occurs; that is part of our job in the electorate.

I happen to be aware of the individual case mentioned by the Premier. What was said is true. That individual, a small businessman, had been constantly banging his head up against a brick wall. He found that he received immediate and effective attention from Mr. Hansford of the Premier's inquiry unit and therefore felt a debt of gratitude to the Government that made such an individual service available to him. He felt he could best demonstrate his gratitude by actively supporting that Government. That cuts both ways. Given some weeks, Mr. Hansford, or whoever, may well have been able to write a similar report to the current Premier in relation to allegiance to his Government. There is nothing sinister, untoward or improper about that report whatsoever, but it illustrates the extreme effectiveness of that unit.

Perhaps it also illustrates the foolishness of the Premier in abolishing it, because he has indicated that he has already found it necessary to provide some other service in the Riverland. It is a great pity that without a second thought the Premier has simply thrown away the expertise and skills of the individuals concerned, skills developed over a number of years in this field, skills that could provide such assistance to a frustrated small businessman and, for an effective job done, earn his gratitude.

The Premier is determined on his course to completely clear away not just the Ministerial areas (the political advice and sensitive areas) but also to clear away the ancillary services, all the senior public servants and career public servants from the policy division, in order to create a vacuum that can then be filled by political replacements of his own. In respect to the line for the committee secretariat, I ask the Premier what is the role of that secretariat and what specific funds have been made available to it for the current financial year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot give that information in detail, because I only have information regarding administration policy, publicity and design. I will obtain a report and break down the separate amounts.

Mr. McRAE: Regarding "Justice Division—Chief Stipendiary Magistrate and Stipendiary Magistrates", the vote for this year is marginally down overall. What surprises me is that there is still unquestionably a backlog in all courts, certainly in magistrates courts everywhere and in the main magistrates courts of Adelaide, Port Adelaide and Para District. As I recall, the current Attorney, quite correctly, stated that justice delayed is justice denied. That is a true and trite comment. The degree of delay has become alarming. This matter is obviously not on the shoulders of the Government, but is a sad fact throughout Australia.

A contested criminal matter in a magistrates court which is a serious matter but not so serious as to attract a jury trial, sometimes waits six or seven months for a hearing date. In those circumstances, and considering the fact that magistrates are that part of the justice provision service closest to the people, I had hoped that some improvement would have been made in this line. Will the Premier consider, with the Attorney, whether an urgent appointment of additional stipendiary magistrates in at least the main courts I have referred to would be appropriate?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will discuss this matter with the Attorney-General. Two magistrates have been appointed since 30 June, but I understand that delays are still far too great. The matter will be considered.

Mr. KENEALLY: I refer the Premier to his answer to a question about the inquiry unit and particularly the report he read to the House. The Premier said that he did not wish to make the report public, but it was conveniently in his file. Who provided the Premier with that report? I challenge the ethics of a public servant providing, to the Premier, a report stating an individual's political preferences. Individual political preferences have nothing to do with a public servant in the Premier's Department.

The Premier used the issued of political preferences to disband a unit in the Premier's Department. This behaviour by the officer concerned is questionable, as is the Premier's behaviour. He quoted the political preferences of a person in this State who approached the Premier's Department for assistance. These questions must be answered. Who provided the Premier with that report and why was that officer concerned about the political preferences of a person who approached the Premier's Department for assistance?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The report was handed to me by an officer of my department; it was also prepared by an officer of my department. I do not know whether the person who handed the report to me knew what was in it. The honourable member has taken it on himself to impute to me attitudes that I do not have. He said I used political preferences as an excuse for winding up the present staff of the inquiry office. I did not. I make the point that the staff involved were Ministerial staff. The Leader has already indicated they are Ministerial staff, and he knows that this is so.

Did he not get his own Ministerial staff and appoint them when he came down here? Of course he did, and that is a proper course of action to take.

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Premier say what the new Government proposes to do to try to increase the output of magistrates? It was always my view that it was not necessarily the case that there was a greater need for additional magistrates, but rather a need to get some of the existing magistrates to do a fair share of the work. This matter has concerned me for a number of years. We tried to take various steps to solve the problem, but it is not difficult to see (and the member for Norwood would well know what I am talking about) that magistrates in certain courts do significantly less work than do others. It was common to hear, when I was Attorney-General, people say of certain courts that you could fire a cannon in the corridor in the afternoon and be certain of not hitting anyone. This situation is of sufficient magnitude that I place on record today my concern, in the hope that the Premier might be able to do something about it. Something needs to be done. Whilst the paramount concern of the Government and Parliament must be to ensure speedy and efficient justice (and if that means we have to have more magistrates, so be it), nonetheless, in reaching a decision on staffing of the courts, the work load of the current incumbents ought to be taken into account.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: What the honourable member has said is most disturbing. Indeed, I can hardly believe it. Accepting that he is a member of the legal profession, I assume that he is better informed about these matters than perhaps are others. However, I find it difficult to accept that there are magistrates who are not doing the job they are put there to do. I certainly will discuss this matter with my colleague the Attorney-General. I am also concerned that justice is done speedily: I am even more concerned that justice is done, and is seen

to be done. If it means that a magistrate must take longer to reach a decision, I believe that he should take that extra time. Certainly the last thing I would want to see is Parliament or Executive Government interfering in the courts at any level.

Mr. PAYNE: In a reply to my Leader, the Premier said that, when he became Premier, he had had certain investigations made. In the further information which he has supplied, he has relied heavily on the fact that people employed in the Premier's Secretariat were Ministerial appointees. Who carried out the investigation? Was the officer concerned an officer of the Public Service?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The report given to me about the inquiry division was already prepared for the previous Premier.

Dr. BILLARD: I refer to the matter of the alleged political activities of officers. The whole crux of the matter is the question of what business officers of the Premier's Department had assessing the political allegiance of anyone, regardless of whether or not the assessment was accurate. If they have been assessing people's political allegiance, I believe they have been acting in a political way. I believe I know the person involved who, on a previous occasion, assisted me when I was involved with the Liberal Movement. I understand that person to have never been a supporter of the Liberal Party, so perhaps the accuracy of the assessment could be called into question.

Mr. KENEALLY: I cannot help but agree with the first statement made by the member for Newland. He is right. I want an assurance from the Premier that he will tell his staff that it is no business of theirs what the political preferences are of any individual who comes to his department for assistance. I want an assurance that never again will we see an example of the disgraceful performance that he put on tonight when he read to the House a report, while a number of members in this Chamber knew the individual to whom he referred. I think that is an infringement of a person's civil liberties and an invasion of his privacy.

The Premier has looked at the back bench for moral support and, having thought that he has got it, he has turned back full of vim and vigour. I want him to give the Committee that assurance. It is useless for him to say that he respects the privacy of the individual. We have the Leader of the Opposition saying that he knows the gentleman to whom the Premier referred, and one of his back-benchers has said that he knows that gentleman.

Mr. Lewis: Who raised the matter?

Mr. KENEALLY: The Premier.

Mr. Lewis: What inquiry?

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member can ask questions, he can seek information, or he can make a fool of himself, as he sees fit; he sees fit to do the latter. I am asking the Premier for this assurance. It is a serious question, as the member for Newland pointed out, although I think he wanted to make some point, which he failed to do. I will rest on the answer given by the Premier, but I am not prepared to let it lie if the Premier intends to wipe it off in the casual way he wiped off my last request.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot remember what the last request was. I agree wholeheartedly with the member for Newland that the officer concerned had no business to be making political assessments, and I understand that the member for Stuart agrees with that.

Mr. Keneally: You had no business—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let us deal with the first subject first, the one the honourable member wants to dodge. The officer involved had no business to be writing political assessments about anyone who had sought his

advice. That is the point I am making. It was a Ministerial appointment, thank goodness, because in my view that sort of political activity would not be tolerated for a moment in the Public Service. As far as I am concerned, that is the difference.

I give an unqualified assurance that none of the officers whom I appoint will be making political assessments and reports about anyone who seeks their help in my office, and certainly none of my officers would write such reports.

Mr. McRAE: Following the question asked by the member for Stuart, I now ask a question in all justice to a number of public servants who have now become involved in this. It is unfortunate, but this has to be done, because someone tends to come out of it somewhat badly. Is the House to assume that the person who wrote the report that the Premier read to the House was a person other than Mr. Hansford?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have no idea who wrote the report; I merely know that it originated in the Inquiry Division. It was given to me, having been prepared by the Inquiry Division in relation to its activities.

Mr. WEBSTER: As one of the legal people in the House, I should like to comment on the situation that exists in the Magistrates Court. I appreciate the concern of other people regarding this matter. Having been confronted with similar situations, I reiterate what the member for Playford has said; namely, that long delays are occurring in the Magistrates Court. In some instances they are possibly worse than instances to which the honourable member referred. It involves not only the cases to be heard in the Magistrates Court, because even committal hearings are taking up to six months, with adjournments, to be heard.

I have also had the opportunity of doing a fair amount of work in this area over the past six months, and, apart from the matters raised by the member for Elizabeth, I have practised in this area for some years and have never been aware of magistrates who have purposely not worked. I commend the efforts of the magistracy, which is terribly overloaded at the moment.

The area that is possibly responsible for the long delay is our ever-increasing crime rate. Figures are available in this respect, and the line on the graph does not show an even slant across the page. Indeed, it is rising vertically at present. The long delays occurring in the Magistrates Court can possibly be attributed to this factor. I wonder why the figure for the magistracy was not increased beyond this. Whether or not the provision of further magistrates is the answer or whether a more detailed investigation into the reasons for the rapidly-increasing crime rate is required, I am not sure. I suggest that it may be a combination of the two. I refute the statement made by the member for Elizabeth that some magistrates are not working. Having been in the area numerous times, I have nothing but commendation for the magistracy, which is working under extreme pressure and to its utmost ability.

Mr. McRAE: The last matter I wish to raise on the question of Ministerial appointments is that on many occasions my constituents have had every reason to be very thankful to the Inquiry Unit and, in particular, to Mr. Hansford. If it happens that, for whatever reason, he has been dismissed, I trust that the Premier will now place on record that his dismissal had nothing to do with the competence, honesty, tremendous determination and goodwill with which that officer approached his work over a large number of years, during which he helped a great number of people who badly needed it. I know that he did these things.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be delighted to do that, because I have heard the most glowing reports of the

activities of Mr. Hansford, Miss Kousedis, and Mr. Economou, and indeed I have had evidence of the high regard with which Mr. Economou, particularly, is regarded in the Riverland. I am quite happy to place on record the appreciation of their skill and the high regard in which they are held. I do that willingly.

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Premier aware that there was a study done some little time ago into efficiency in the Magistrates Courts and I think one source of information as to the amount of work that was being undertaken was a study of the reporters' and secretaries' notebooks in various courts. I think it would have been completed last year. This information indicated the times that magistrates were in court. This showed a dramatic variation between individual magistrates and, of more concern, between particular courts. That was reinforced by indications that some magistrates in some different courts seemed to be handling a very much greater work load than in other courts. I want to make it clear that I am not saying that any magistrate is bludging. What I am suggesting is that the organisation of the magistracy still needs a great deal of work and that it is an area which the Premier might find fruitful in his search to try and make the courts more efficient and to get speedier justice.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am reassured by the honourable member's remarks. I will be interested to see the report and discuss it with the Attorney-General.

Mr. PAYNE: With regard to the line "Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Publicity and Clerical Staff," I note that the amount proposed to be spent this year is about \$95 000 more than was actually spent last year. It is not one of those lines which is qualified by an asterisk or some other symbol, suggesting that there are amounts now chargeable or showing on other pages. I ask the Premier about the three persons who have been mentioned as having had their contract terminated. I do not know exactly what the figure would be, but I guess that their collective salary would be considerably less than \$95 000. Has the Premier information as to where other economies will be practised on that line?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is the elimination of the media unit, transfer of positions to other departments, and *pro rata* leave payments transferred to the line "Terminal leave payments". Those changes have been offset to some extent by national wages increases over that period.

Dr. BILLARD: I am rather dismayed about the remarks made by the member for Elizabeth concerning the tactics which were used to check up on magistrates. I can remember reading about the impact of technology in connection with checkout machines. These were remote stations of some sort which were linked to computers which were set up to check on checkout girls to see how fast they were doing their work. A big rumpus was stirred up over that, because that was an invasion of privacy. It seems to me that exactly the same sort of tactic is being used on magistrates. It sounds to me as though this is very much an invasion of privacy, and it causes me great concern.

Mr. DUNCAN: I do not want to get into a debate on this matter. Obviously, the Premier is in control of this report now, and the information is there. My memory is hazy on the exact details, but certainly the information that was contained in that report did not refer to specifically named magistrates: it was an attempt not to obtain information against individuals but to show that the system was not working efficiently. I am merely complaining about the system, as I did then, and I hope that something can be done about it. All South Australians would be much better off if we were able to develop in the courts a system that

would enable us to use the resources there much more efficiently.

For example, members of the profession will know that most of the matter to be dealt with tomorrow in the Adelaide Magistrates Court are listed for 10 a.m., although some are listed for later in the day. When people go to court, some of the cases, say, contested matters, that are listed for 10 a.m. are found to have been settled or the police have agreed to a lower charge, and they are not proceeded with. If that happens in two or three cases on that day, perhaps three magistrates sit around for half a day with little or nothing to do.

It is simply a matter of organisation. There are ways of overcoming that sort of thing if one can develop the systems and obtain the co-operation of the magistracy. One worthwhile system that I saw overseas was a clearing court that sat at 8.45 in the morning, each case being distributed. Reserve magistrates, who are retired magistrates or the like, are then telephoned and asked to come in to hear matters at 11 a.m. if they are needed. By that means one can list more cases for the day, and there is less chance of magistrates sitting around the court doing nothing. That is the sort of system changes that we need in that area.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the Premier explain how it has been possible to obtain the economies indicated in the allocations relating to immigration? There is no proposed expenditure for this year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer is extremely simple. The savings result from the closure of the Woodville Hostel, which was finalised in December 1978.

Mr. LEWIS: I seek information about the Agent-General's office in London. How much trade either way, or other business, is transacted through that office *vis-a-vis* offices that the State might have in other places? The sum of \$2 000 is allocated in respect of the Asian Association of Management, yet \$180 000 is being spent on the Agent-General's office in London. Why do we continue with that expenditure if the emphasis of our developing trade lies elsewhere?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am extremely pleased that the honourable member raised that subject. Obviously, members opposite regard it as a bit of a joke, but, when I was in London (and I think that you, too, Mr. Chairman, experienced the same thing) and saw the low morale and low throughput of business in the Agent-General's office, I was ashamed. It had nothing to do with the calibre of the officer there. It had nothing to do with the enthusiasm or hard work of the Agent-General and his staff.

It was purely and simply because the policies of the previous Government had so completely inhibited the possibility of attracting trade and investment to this State that it had nothing it could offer. That is why we have not been getting as much trade back as we should have. It has nothing to do with the Agent-General, I repeat. That staff is a good one and I hope that before long (and when I say "before long" I mean within 12 or 18 months) we can upgrade the staff in London and see some results from it. There are already inquiries coming in from the United Kingdom and Europe from firms wanting to invest in South Australia. Those inquiries are being channeled partly through the Agent-General's office. If that office can be encouraged to do the job that it was set up to do, and the job it did very effectively indeed under a succession of very able officers in the past, it will be well worth having and well worth supporting.

Mr. BANNON: I was interested in the statements and rhetorical flourishes of the Premier relating to that question. I agree with him that it was a good question that was asked by the member for Mallee and one that should

have been asked. The question I ask the Premier is whether, in his view, the expenditure is justified in not only maintaining but, as he anticipates, expanding the functions of the Agent-General in England in terms of the pattern of trade and the ability of this country to make contracts for sale of exports, and for the other various functions that the Agent-General performs effectively in terms of those resources. In all of the rhetoric that the Premier uttered in defence of the Agent-General and his staff, he did not answer the specific question asked by the member for Mallee, which was what was the cost effectiveness and how much trade was being handled.

It is all very well for the Premier to say that there is tremendous gloom and doom there because they just could not get anything to sell because of the bad state of South Australia's economy. The facts are that, whatever the state of the economy, there is some business going on and some comparative way in which one can judge the comparative amount of business. As the Premier is aware, during the election campaign the then Premier (Mr. Corcoran) announced an intention, if re-elected, to scale down the activities of the Agent-General in England, many of whose activities relate not to trade but to a section of South Australians overseas. That is very welcome. Any of us who have travelled overseas have welcomed the facilities, the address, the news from home, and so on, provided by the Agent-General in London.

Some sort of presence of that kind surely does not cost the kind of money listed here. Balanced against that must be the trade opportunities we may well be losing in the East. Look at the activity in the Arab world in recent months, particularly by the former Minister of Agriculture, and look at the trade prospects opening up in Asia generally. The previous Premier's policy was to scale down the old Imperial connection, however, however much it may hurt the Premier and his supporters, and to have a reception centre of that sort which serves a useful function. His intention was to put those resources into trade sales where the markets are, or does, the Premier deny that Asia is the market for products for South Australia and that that is an expanding area? If he does not deny that, what is he going to do in terms of our trade presence in those areas? Is he going to open some supplementary office in Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore or places like that, or is he going to do nothing?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I point out to the Leader that this line relates to the Agent-General in the United Kingdom. By the same token, the points he has raised are vital ones to South Australia. Yes, indeed, we are looking closely at this matter and one of the first jobs of the Director of State Development when appointed will be to look at the representation we have in other States. I do not agree in any way, shape or form that the Agent-General's position or the establishment in London should be wound down. I repeat that, if the trade justifies it, it will be expanded.

I will certainly assess that situation in about 12 months time, when the effects of our policies have really begun to bite and show some return to South Australia through investment and trade. I should have thought that the Leader knew that we had an agent in Tokyo. We are very well served there by Elders-G.M., which acts as agent for the South Australian Government. I am also aware of the previous Government's plan to set up an Agent-General's establishment in Hong Kong, and that matter may well be furthered.

I certainly see an extension of trade into the Asian-Pacific area. The Government has received inquiries from Japan from people who now want to invest in South Australia again and to manufacture in this State and trade

with us. Those people have avoided South Australia like the plague over the past few years, but they have taken the initiative to open up contact with the South Australian Government again, and I am very pleased about that. The Philippines is another area where discussions are currently going on about trade, and where we may seek some form of representation. I assure the Leader that the Government is looking outwards, not inwards.

Mr. PAYNE: I have just listened with some interest to the discourse from the Premier about what he feels may be the future role on the development of the Agent-General in England. I note that under the item "Secretary, Administrative, Accounting, Clerical and General Staff" there is no mention of what I presume would be a vital element in any increased activity by the Agent-General in England, namely, publicity. In the item "Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Publicity and Clerical Staff" for the Premier's Department the word "publicity" does appear.

Is the amount shown in the vote for the Agent-General in England of \$180 000 for the current financial year required to cover publicity requirements in the United Kingdom, or is some component of that contained in the item for the Premier's Department, the Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Publicity and Clerical Staff? I would be surprised if an amount of \$180 000, as is proposed, covered all the activities mentioned under that vote and also provide the amount that would be needed for publicity to be mounted on a scale that would have a real effect.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I understand, the sum as outlined is under a separate vote for contingencies under the Agent-General in England. That sum is \$8 000, with \$6 040, expended last year. That is probably a reasonable sum for the sort of publicity that has been indulged in. I will certainly have inquiries made to find out whether that is a sufficient sum. Equally, to a large extent South Australia House depends on displays provided by manufacturers and trade organisations, which is a saving.

Mr. KENEALLY: When members opposite were in Opposition we heard much criticism about the lack of staff in the Parliamentary Counsel's Branch. All members know that they are a very hard-working group of people and at certain times of the year the task that is given them is nothing short of horrendous. In view of the criticism from members opposite about the lack of opportunities they had to have Parliamentary Counsel draft private members' Bills, etc., for them, one would have thought that, upon attaining the Treasury benches, they would have immediately upgraded or at least increased the number of persons working in the Parliamentary Counsel's Branch. Can the Premier tell me whether he has it in mind to increase the staffing of that branch or whether the *status quo* exists because the Government does not intend to introduce much legislation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Counsel, but I will do so.

Mr. BANNON: Regarding "Payment to consultants for services" on page 15, a sum of \$8 000 has been proposed; this represents a slight increase on actual payments last year, which were almost double the sum voted. The Premier has, in the past, criticised the use and role of consultants. Will he say what services will be provided by consultants and whether any specific projects are planned? Or is that item a contingency item in case consultants are needed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The 1979-80 provision will involve consultants for special projects. In setting up the Department of State Development, it may be necessary for the Government to obtain a consultant's report about

how that department should function and about various areas where development could be attracted and trade established. The sum provided is much the same as that provided in the past. It is hoped that funds will be diverted into a productive outlet to stimulate trade and development.

Mr. BANNON: I assume from the Premier's comments about consultants, and his earlier comments about the establishment of the Department of State Development, that the Government lacks confidence regarding the former Department of Economic Development and the officers who were, and still are, in that department, under its new name and in its new location. It seems that the functions of the department (and the Premier's latest answer shows this) are the functions for which the Department of Economic Development was established, and officers of that department had the specific skills required. It even ranges into the area we were discussing earlier, relating to overseas trade for South Australia. Mr. Bakewell, the former head of the Department of Economic Development (now the Department of Trade and Industry), is a member of an extremely important Commonwealth secretariat, which has been meeting in various locations overseas for the past few years. At the time of his appointment, it was recognised as an extremely high honour on the international scene for someone from South Australia. I am surprised at the Premier's comments about the new department and proposals relating to it. This proposal appears to ignore completely the role of the former Department of Economic Development and its officers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it does not.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Committee is well aware that the work load undertaken by the Ombudsman has been increasing yearly. It is pleasing to note that the Ombudsman will be attending a conference. One would imagine that, with the increase in work load, there would be a need to either increase or improve office machines and equipment. Yet, in 1978-79, \$2 000 was voted, and there were no actual payments; nothing is proposed for 1979-80.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No comment has been made to me about this matter. I imagine that there is no requirement for new office machines for the current financial year.

Mr. Hemmings: Will you make inquiries?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I will.

[Midnight]

Mr. PAYNE: For "Publication of quarterly magazine", \$63 000 was voted last financial year and \$71 000 was spent. The sum proposed for this year is \$18 000. That sum suggests that the magazine might be published for only one more quarter. Is that the case, or does the Premier foresee a changed role for the magazine?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The publication of *Vantage* has been halted. Early next year, it is hoped that a new publication on a somewhat less ambitious scale will be undertaken.

Mr. Payne: Will it be *Disadvantage*?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Is that what the honourable member would want to call a publication promoting South Australia? It will be based on an annual production to promote South Australia and what it has to offer by way of trade and investment, as well as other matters. I think that it will be totally satisfactory and more in keeping with our present economic situation.

Mr. BANNON: What report did the Premier receive or what evidence was collected about *Vantage* that led him to

decide that the magazine was not effective and was not promoting South Australia adequately and thus should be cancelled?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I inquired of various people on the mailing list of *Vantage*. Whilst everyone agreed that it was a high-quality production, very entertaining, and well produced, on a cost-benefit basis it could not be justified.

Mr. DUNCAN: I cannot see the line under which the publicity and design section of the Premier's Department appears. I can see, under contingencies, charges for publicity and design services, but no reference to it under salaries and wages.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That appears on page 13.

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Premier obtain information for me as to which private advertising agencies and media houses are being used by the present Government; whether these agencies are South Australian firms; and what other private business organisations are receiving funds out of the line "Charges for publicity and design services"?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government's present policy is that we will not appoint a specific advertising agency, as did the previous Government. I think that only one small item has been issued.

Mr. Bannon: A full page?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it was prepared by Martin Kinnear Clemenger Proprietary Limited urgently to meet a deadline requirement. It is our policy to put all these matters out to tender.

I cannot think of any other project at the moment, but I shall get a report for the honourable member. It is very much the policy of the Government not to use a specific firm, but to put these things out to tender. Wherever possible, we will be using an Australian based firm.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Premier has not thanked me for any of the questions I have asked him, but he might thank me for this one. There has been a dramatic increase in the funding for the Women's Adviser Unit, the vote having increased from \$67 800 last year to \$148 000 this year. I do not imagine that the women's adviser to the member for Mitcham is included in that sum, but I would be pleased to have a report.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Again, the national wage increase comes in to some extent, but the important thing is that the Women's Information Switchboard is now being funded under that line. The staff of five was working for three pay periods; 1979-80 involved a full year's salary for the Women's Information Switchboard, and the present staff has gone up from five to nine. This service is a most important one, and it is being maintained now at what I believe to be somewhere near an adequate level.

Mr. PAYNE: A sum of \$10 000 is proposed for commissions by the Publicity Branch. Has the Premier any information on what is meant by that?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know. All I know is that the figure is similar to that voted in the previous financial year. I shall get a report on the matter. The Publicity and Design Services charge and act as advertising agents, charging other departments for work done and taking a commission on it. I suspect that that is what is being referred to. It is a matter which is offset by the income.

Mr. DUNCAN: The documents before the Committee refer to the Agent-General in England. I think it would be fitting, and a recognition of the real situation, if he were known as the Agent-General in the United Kingdom, or in Great Britain.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: My personal preference would be for

Scotland, but I am not in any way drawing such an approach. The more modern and appropriate title is the United Kingdom, and some people may take offence at "England" being part of the title. Is the Premier prepared to look at a change in the title? I do not imagine it will be an earth-shattering matter of great political moment, but the member for Glenelg could have one or two things to say about it.

Mr. Mathwin: I am a loyalist.

Mr. DUNCAN: Let us not bring loyalty to royalty into this matter. It is not in relation to that that I raised it, but I think the title of "Agent-General in the United Kingdom" would be more appropriate. The Agent-General sees himself as representing the interests of South Australia in the United Kingdom. If we consider the matter in a proper perspective, now that Britain has joined the European Economic Community it could be appropriately "Agent-General to the European Economic Community", or something of that sort. Will the Premier consider this matter?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the Agent-General in England or U.K., and I hope the Premier will not suddenly give an outburst to this question as he did to the question asked by the member for Mallee. Concerning the reply the Premier gave about his last trip to the U.K., he obviously spent considerable time with the Agent-General and staff, because he said that the morale was low.

Mr. Payne: Maybe it was low because he was there.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I do not think the morale was low because the Premier was there to see them. What is the staffing in the Agent-General's Office in London?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As at 30 June 1979 the staff totalled 13, and the present staff level is 11.

Mr. PAYNE: "Operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries", for which \$7 000 has been allocated to the Women's Adviser Unit. A transfer apparently caused that very large apparent increase to appear on the line "Women's Adviser and Clerical Staff". Obviously, there are more persons involved, because we are looking at a salary amount which shows a tremendous increase. Will the Premier elaborate on this matter and say whether the \$7 000 referred to will be adequate?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The two sums and two lines are not comparable, as I explained to the honourable member. The Women's Information switchboard was operating on contingencies incurred. The establishment expenses were incurred in the last financial year. The increase has come with the full years salaries of those people operating.

Mr. BANNON: I think the Premier has not given us a detailed break-down of that Women's Adviser Unit's operating expenses, etc. I would not be surprised if there was not some assistance, which is hidden under the Libraries Division grant which occurs much later in this document and which would also be providing some support for the Women's Information Switchboard, which is located in the old Institutes Building.

Mr. KENEALLY: Under the line "Ombudsman", I notice there has not been any increase at all in "Investigation and Clerical Staff". I think we will all agree that the Ombudsman has been a tremendously useful officer for members of Parliament in South Australia. We have an extremely efficient Ombudsman, Mr. Gordon Combe. It surprises me that there has not been any funding provided for an increase in the staff because as I understand it, the Ombudsman gets numerous inquiries from all sorts of citizens with problems relating to State Government departments, local government, etc. Can the Premier inform me as to whether or not this is an economy

measure not to increase the funding for this item? Was a request made for additional staff?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We get very fine service from the Ombudsman and his officers. The sums involved at present are roughly comparable; there has been a relatively small increase, but the position basically has been that there have been some reclassifications of investigation officers, but the number of staff remains at seven. There is some anticipated delay in filling vacancies; that is why in fact the figure stays at that level.

Mr. PAYNE: Regarding the provision for the Agent-General, I have no quarrel with the amount proposed for the line "Visit of officer to South Australia", although I note \$8 175 was actually spent last year and \$4 500 is proposed for this financial year. Is this a regular visit that occurs when an officer comes home on leave?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This is a regular visit. The last visit was of the Agent-General himself in 1978-79, and there is provision for the visit of the official Secretary, Mr. Michael Duff, in this coming financial year.

Mr. PAYNE: Regarding the line "Residence of Agent-General—Rent, commission, alterations and maintenance charges", there was an amount voted in the previous year of \$5 000, and \$3 705 was actually spent, and now \$6 000 is proposed to be voted. I take it that there is expected to be some increase, presumably in maintenance, because it seems that, if the amount spent in the previous year covered accurately the total rent, I would expect that there is not going to be a very large increase in the rent.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That provision included approval given in 1978-79 for major re-decoration. It was to be spent over two periods, so it will be spent over the two financial years.

Mr. HEMMINGS: With regard to the Agent-General's office in England, I stress that the Premier said that morale is low over there. I see that under the item "Purchase of motor vehicles" (and I compared this figure with other departments which we have dealt with so far), although \$10 000 was voted in 1978-79, \$11 234 was spent.

The sum of \$10 000 has been allocated for 1979-80, which seems to be a large sum for such a small department. As the cost of motor vehicles in the United Kingdom is less than that in South Australia will the Premier say how that money was spent and how many motor vehicles are maintained in England?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Two motor vehicles are in official use in the Agent-General's establishment in London. One vehicle has been replaced, and the sum set aside this year is for the replacement of the second vehicle. The Agent-General in London has a representative position. He is a member of the diplomatic corps, and it is entirely proper that he represent South Australia as we would want to be represented.

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier obtain from the department information about the number of motor vehicles therein, the persons to whom they are allotted, and the offices of the persons to whom they are allotted? Also, how many of the vehicles have air conditioning? It is important that the House has some appreciation of the number of vehicles made available to public servants. Although I am not suggesting that this is not justified, as such a large sum is invested in motor vehicles, this matter should be brought to the attention of the House.

Also, the Premier would know that the head of his department is the only public servant in the traditional Public Service who has a chauffeur. Does the Premier intend to continue with that arrangement and, if he does, does the Government intend to extend the arrangement to include any other Public Service heads? Also, what is the Government's general policy on the matter of providing

chauffeurs to public servants and other senior Government officials or semi-government officials?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The entire question of motor vehicles in the Public Service and their use by departments has given me some concern. I am grateful to the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention again. It was a subject that I had raised in the department about two weeks ago, and it had slipped my mind. I will certainly obtain the details for which the honourable member has asked. Regarding our policy, I understand that the Director-General of my department is driven by the same person who does many of the delivery and message runs around the city. I will be looking into that matter very carefully indeed.

Mr. PAYNE: No sum allocated or spent was provided last year but \$6 580 is allocated this year for the conference of Ombudsmen. Will the Premier say on what this money will be spent? I understand that the present Ombudsman is either retiring or about to retire, and this may have a bearing on why the money is being provided. Is the \$6 580 intended to enable the South Australian group to be host at any conference to be held in South Australia, or is this money to be spent to enable the Ombudsman or some of his staff to attend a conference elsewhere?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Ombudsmen's conference was held in Adelaide about three weeks ago. I had the honour of speaking at that conference and welcoming delegates. Ombudsmen and inquiry officers from New Zealand, all other States and the Commonwealth attended. Indeed, the conference had the distinction of being the first such Ombudsmen's conference where all Australian States and New Zealand were represented. Although I cannot remember offhand, the number of people who attended, it was a most successful conference and a pleasure for me to be associated with. It was a one-off situation for South Australia this year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: This year's allocation for the line "operating equipment, minor equipment and sundries" for the Parliamentary Counsel's Branch is 100 per cent greater than actual payments for 1978-79. I agree with the member for Stuart and the Premier regarding the work that the Parliamentary Counsel does, but obviously no additional staff is to be appointed under this Budget. Will the Premier therefore explain what other expenses will be incurred or what equipment supplied to justify this 100 per cent increase in payments in 1978-79?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The savings to which the honourable member briefly alluded relate to the amount budgeted for interstate travelling expenses. Those travelling expenses will be added to the amount allocated for this financial year, so that has the effect of adding a similar amount to this year's allocation. Provision is also made for the acquisition of a set of Commonwealth Law Reports.

Mr. PAYNE: It is always interesting when one notices reductions in expenditure. The sum of \$68 220 was voted for operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries for the Planning Appeal Board in 1978-79, \$68 217 having been spent. I presume that that probably involved some transfer warrants to allow it to balance so successfully. This year, \$63 970 is proposed. One would think that that line did not include anything that involved a fairly large expenditure or anything that would not need to be replaced. Will the Premier explain to the House the reason for the lesser amount and where economies will occur?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The only information I have is that the unit expects to operate with lower costs this year, which is very good.

Vote passed.

Public Service Board, \$3 745 000.

Mr. BANNON: I refer, first, to the Contingencies column, the total amount provided in which is \$3 745 000, or about \$200 000 more than was actually spent last year. It is certainly less than the amount that was voted last year, so one can see that some savings have been made. If one looks at the allocation for the provision of computing services, one finds that \$100 000 voted was not spent, and that nothing is proposed to be spent this year.

Last year \$15 257 was spent on the purchase of motor vehicles and \$5 000 is allocated for this year. The vote for the purchase of office machines and equipment is \$10 900 this year, whereas \$31 144 was spent last year. That results in a saving in all of those areas. They appear to be administrative matters that do not require much comment.

However, some of the increases are fairly large. The vote for advertising vacant positions in the press and expenses of applicants for positions and new appointees is \$177 000 this year, compared with \$156 919 which was spent last year. That indicates that in a no-growth situation in the Public Service, stated in the Budget to be the policy (it continues the policy of the previous Government), a considerable increase of about 10 per cent has been made available for advertising new positions and making new appointments. That suggests that, despite the no-growth situation, there is considerable need and that there will be considerable new recruitment in the coming year. Can the Premier give specific details about these increases, which go well beyond the normal inflationary factor taken into account? In view of the transfers of some senior officers, thereby creating a vacuum in some areas of the Public Service, one can understand the need for recruitment, interviewing, and so on. I would like details and an explanation of the provision for advertising vacant positions in press and expenses of applicants for positions and new appointees, in view of the no-growth situation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable Leader is labouring the point. In advertising, particularly for career opportunities, career publicity material rates have increased tremendously. There are also interview expenses, and they include air fares, which have escalated considerably. That also includes relocation expenses when people from interstate are appointed. The honourable Leader knows full well that a no-growth situation does not mean that there are no new appointments. Large numbers of people retire or leave the Public Service each year and obviously all those jobs are not left vacant. The Government hopes to have a no-growth situation and we hope that the size of the Public Service will eventually wind down. We have given an undertaking that we will not lose anyone his or her job, that it will occur by attrition. However, advertisements must still be placed and interviews must still be held; that is the long and short of it.

Mr. BANNON: In the past, when some senior appointments were made by recruitment through public advertisements and applicants from interstate or outside the Public Service were appointed, considerable criticism was levelled by the Premier when he was in Opposition. He constantly stressed the career nature of the Public Service and the fact that there were good and capable officers who, simply by promotion, could have filled some of those senior positions.

However, the Premier has explained this vote in large part by referring to air fares, and so on. Indeed, if it was only to recruit at the lower levels of the Public Service, people would not be flown from interstate. Only when senior appointments are made are air fares and such things needed. What component of this vote is for air fares and

interstate interviewing expenses, and does that indicate a change of policy by the Premier about the way in which recruitment and promotion in the Public Service should occur?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have no further information and I will obtain further information for the honourable member.

Mr. BANNON: Regarding the item "Payments to consultants for services", actual payments last year were \$55 193. This year, a 100 per cent increase is proposed, which seems quite extraordinary. I have already, when speaking to previous lines, referred to increases allowed for, but even though those increases were large, they were not of this nature. This increase is quite extraordinary. It cuts across the rhetoric used by the current Government, when in Opposition, regarding the use of consultants and not taking advantage of the resources within the Public Service to make inquiries, and so on. The size of that increase would represent either a considerable upgrading in the use of consultations or, alternatively, one or two large projects. If the latter is the case, I would like advice as to what it is. If the former is the case, I would like more detail.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Consulting services are in specialist areas—including general management, financial management, computer technology particularly, operational review, executive development and job evaluation, all of which are necessary services, from the board's point of view, in upgrading various departments in the Public Service. In particular, no specialist studies have been done, but feasibility studies were to be done for additional computer hardware and software. The provision for computer software is covered in the next item. The provision for computer hardware has now been deferred.

Mr. BANNON: That might have been deferred, but the Premier has given a very general answer. I wonder whether he is confident, and has made inquiries about the 100 per cent increase. What is it about this financial year that makes it so different from past years, in terms of consultant services?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Without appearing to beg the question, I suggest that the Leader may get his answer when the figures in relation to actual expenditure come down when the next Budget is introduced. With the techniques that will be developed by the Public Service Board and the excellent officers of that department, I think we will see greater efficiency in the Public Service and in services it can offer to the public. I hope that that investment will be more than amply repaid. I will obtain details for the Leader.

Mr. BANNON: Regarding the item "Overseas visits of officers", an increase in excess of 100 per cent has been proposed. This is an extremely large increase. It is interesting to note that actual payments last year were much higher than the sum voted. Actual payments last year totalled \$10 806; \$25 000 has been voted for this year. That sum represents a lot of overseas visits, particularly in terms of what was previously expended. Does this increase indicate an upgrading of the programme, or higher air fares? Clearly, some inflationary factor must be involved, but certainly not of the order suggested by that figure.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand there is some carry-over. The escalating air fares make quite a difference. Overseas trips are, I am informed, particularly for the evaluation of methods and techniques for assessing the operation, efficiency and effectiveness of Government departments. It is designed, I am informed, to increase the effectiveness of the Public Service to South Australia.

Mr. BANNON: For "Officer exchange scheme", a 40 per cent increase has been provided. Actual payments

totalled \$12 537 last year, which was very close to the estimated figure; the sum proposed this year is \$20 000. Does that increase suggest the appointment of an extra officer or an officer at a higher level?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is hoped that the officer exchange scheme will be expanded, not only with the United States of America, but it is hoped that there will be other exchanges within Australia and, indeed, exchanges between the private sector and the public sector in South Australia. It is a very good move. It can only increase the understanding of the different methods of operation, and I think that both the private sector and the public sector can benefit from such exchanges.

Mr. PAYNE: Does the significantly increased allocation for "Advertising vacant positions in the press and expenses of applicants for positions and new appointees" mean that the board will mount a larger campaign and that more vacancies are likely to occur, or is it an attempt to estimate the increased costs of advertising?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have answered the question fully, but perhaps the honourable member was not in the Chamber. The significant form of advertising that is used, plus the escalation in the cost of air fares, have led to an increase in the Estimates.

Mr. HEMMINGS: During my absence from the Chamber, have questions been asked regarding overseas visits of officers?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Yes, and I will bring down a report.

Mr. PAYNE: There has been a distinct drop in the sum proposed for the coming year for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries from actual payments of about \$408 000 to an allocation of about \$368 000. Previously, on another line, the Premier's reply to a similar question by me, regarding a lesser sum proposed for this year, was that the department proposed to operate at a lower cost. A considerably larger sum is involved here, and I hope that the Premier has been provided with information as to how a department proposes to operate under a substantial cut of between \$35 000 and \$40 000.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Clearly, the department is taking advantage of the undoubted expertise it is gaining from expenditure occurring in the other areas, with new skills, etc.

Mr. PAYNE: I take it that what the Premier is saying is that he does not have any specific information on the proposed economies.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is a list of headings on printing, stationery, and motor vehicle expenses—the usual running costs that have been costed at a lower value.

Vote passed.

Premier, Minister of State Development and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$1 194 000.

Mr. BANNON: A sum of \$27 000 is proposed as a contribution towards the cost of the Advisory Council for Inter-Governmental Relations. Is the Premier satisfied that this advisory council is performing a valuable or useful function? What are his comments on the reports and activities that the council, which is based in Hobart, is providing for the State of South Australia for the money spent?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I called for a report on this matter only yesterday. We still have three officers whose specific job it is in the department to look after inter-governmental relations, and I have called for a report on that matter to see what value we are getting for money. I am not able to comment otherwise, but I shall be delighted to furnish the Leader with a report when it becomes available.

Mr. BANNON: An allocation of \$40 000 is proposed for

the State Disaster Committee. What disaster does the Premier expect—flood, fire, or famine, or did it take place recently?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am vastly tempted to treat the question facetiously, but I will not. If the Leader expects that it will be necessary to stop the tidal wave, or whatever, I am not able to guess what the disaster is. Seriously, it is necessary for us to be prepared for any eventuality, in the hope that it will never occur. If anything transpires, we should be prepared for it. There is a State Disaster Plan, of course.

Mr. BANNON: I understand that. However, this is the first time a major allocation has appeared in this line. If there were to be a real disaster, one wonders whether \$40 000 would be adequate. Is this sum, from a Government that is looking to save waste, to go into some administrative cost for a large bureaucracy? That is one of my concerns. If we had an expenditure last year of \$67, what will cost \$40 000 in this financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In any disaster plan which is prepared, any staffing will involve existing officers, so that is no question of increasing the staff of the Public Service or any other statutory body. The problem arises because the full details of the State Disaster Plan were to be printed in large quantities, but in 1978-79 the preliminary costs were deferred. Because of the deferment the printing and production have escalated, and we now have \$40 000 put aside for this year. That is the only information I can give the Leader at this stage.

Mr. PAYNE: A sum of \$23 000 is to be set aside for the Government Royal Show pavilion. I take it that this is for something which has already occurred, because there will not be another show in the current financial year. Like other members, I was otherwise occupied at the time of the show and I am not aware of what would be involved in the expenditure we are now asked to approve. The amount proposed is less than the sum voted last year. Has the Premier any details?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There had been a rather extravagant anticipation of the costs of the hire of equipment and the marquee, costs which were not realised. It was \$37 000, and the reduction in scale will result in reduced costs in the coming financial year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Premier, when answering the Leader concerning costs of the plan, etc., being put out by the State Disaster Committee, referred to "Boards and committees—fees and expenses" as one of the reasons why \$40 000 had been proposed for 1979-80. It seems that it is a figure that has been just plucked out of the air. Can the Premier say how that figure was reached?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will make sure that the honourable member gets the details.

Mr. KENEALLY: I refer to the line, "Official visitors to the State and receptions" where the vote has been increased to \$63 000. I recall the statement of the Premier subsequent to the election that he was going to cut out all unnecessary functions. He believed that a great deal of money was wasted in this area. Will he tell the Committee, in view of the increased allocation for visitors and receptions, what important personages he knows will be visiting the State and, if possible, what type of receptions will make up the \$63 000 voted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not have any details of specific receptions or functions. In 1978-79 the State visit of the President of Serbia had been prepared for and was cancelled. I do not know the details of that. Honourable members opposite probably know far more than I do. The other expenditure was therefore cut and a sum reduced to below that anticipated. Unfortunately, we still did not see the President of Serbia. We did see a number of other

trade delegations and the sum set down for this year includes the anticipated visit of the President of Serbia and a quite marked increase in proposed trade delegates from China.

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say why it is that the Government has decided not to make a grant to the Unemployed Workers' Union for this year? I am not sure why the member for Mallee laughs about the matter, because it is quite clear that he knows nothing about that organisation—

Mr. Lewis: How would you know?

Mr. BANNON:—and what it tries to do for unemployed persons. Well, he would not laugh in a supercilious way about the issue of unemployment if he knew anything about it. It ill behoves a member who has probably been employed all his life, except for some time when he has been on a student's grant or receiving assistance from Governments and who is now on the public pay-roll, to laugh about unemployed persons and sneer about those who seek to help them. In relation to the Unemployed Workers' Union, it is indeed a self-help organisation in that it comprises those who are unemployed and those seriously trying to do something about their plight and about the plight of all unemployed persons, publicising the facts of unemployment, promoting active job search, and raising the morale of people in that unfortunate position. I find it quite extraordinary to see the honourable member's reaction. Indeed, it is most unfortunate that one of the few groups that has actively tried to raise the consciousness of the workers, whether we agree with some of the political lines they push or the causes for the unemployed that they take up, does not get some support from the Government.

It would take very grave reasons indeed to justify terminating the financial support. No doubt the Premier will give those reasons. It is particularly pointed when one looks to the line immediately below: "Various minor grants". It is as if the amount for the Unemployed Workers Union had been chopped off, and the amount of nearly \$2 000 placed under "Various minor grants"—a sort of mini-fund from where there is no particular allocation to groups.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of the reason for that decision; it was taken on advice. I will find out.

Mr. BANNON: Can the Premier say what the McMillan Rural Studies Centre Conference is? Or perhaps this is something that the member for Mallee has dear to his heart.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is provision for eight registrations to attend at Latrobe University in August 1979. It is the cost of a conference for women at that university.

Mr. BANNON: I note the amount for North Malaysia Visits is \$10 000. This may be an amount that has been committed. We had a very active programme of contact with North Malaysia which was scaled down by the previous Government, although some cultural contacts were maintained. Does this indicate that the present Government will upgrade or revive those contacts, or is this something that was committed? Perhaps it has been paid by this stage of the year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Generally this is a change in attitude and policy, with the replacement of large-scale visits to Malaysia, as we have seen in the past, with specific exchanges of groups. It is something that has been committed for some considerable time. I understand that this year's visit will be an educational visit, but I do not know whether that implies students and teachers.

Mr. BANNON: I note that the Premier's award for productivity improvement is to be maintained. It is a starred item. It seems odd that the Premier's award leaves

the Premier's lines and goes elsewhere. I assume the Premier will still be presenting that award and taking a personal interest in it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: There are five specific questions I want to ask but before doing so I would like to correct the lamentable state of ignorance in the mind of Leader of the Opposition about my own background and my awareness or otherwise of the Unemployed Workers Union. I would point out that I attended a couple of meetings of that organisation, and at no time did it discuss in the 1½ hours that I was there on both occasions any matter relating to the subject areas that the Leader mentioned. They were mainly concerned about how they could bash the South Australian Opposition at that time around the ears, or the Federal Government at that time. In policy terms they were literally a political arm of the Labor Party; they made no bones about that, not knowing who I was when I made the inquiries. As a full-time student I have never been in receipt of any grant, nor have I ever applied for a grant, because I do not believe in leaning over my neighbour's fence and asking him to pay for my desires; I have been self-employed for the best part of my life. I trust that that helps him understand why I was amused. Can the Treasurer explain why \$2 000 is allocated to the Asian Association of Management Organisations? How is the Government involved with that body?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I am unable to provide that information for the honourable member, I will obtain it for him.

Mr. LEWIS: The sum of \$50 000 is allocated to the Elton Mayo School of Management and \$2 000 to the McMillan Rural Studies Centre Conference. Why is that allocation made under the grants provision when it is for a conference? I have not previously heard of that organisation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The recurrent grant to the Institute of Technology will provide the basis for the Elton Mayo School of Management. That project is in the planning stages and could be an extremely important institution for South Australia. It is being sponsored by the Australian Institute of Management and, although it is still in the preliminary stages, it deserves tremendous support from the community.

I have already indicated that the McMillan Rural Studies Centre Conference was held at La Trobe University and provided eight registrations for women to attend that conference.

Mr. McRAE: Regarding miscellaneous grants, at the time the Treasurer was considering these documents the plight of the people in Kampuchea and elsewhere in South-East Asia, whilst it may have become desperate, was still not known to be so desperate. Our generosity to all kinds of organisations hardly matches some of the appalling situations that have occurred in South-East Asia in the past year. The Treasurer has provided for a \$10 000 donation in respect of Kampuchea, but that does not match in true comparison terms with the donations made by New South Wales of about \$150 000.

Although the State Government has not got the resources to make the sort of contributions it would like, we have an obligation to the people in our region, and \$10 000 is simply not enough. Both the former Government, which prepared most of this, and the present Government stand condemned, because there is no significant allocation of funds for these people who have been starving in South-East Asia for the past two years or so.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Everyone has become aware of the situation that has applied, but only in recent times.

It is unfortunate that a full-scale tragedy has to draw attention to the serious plight of people in that part and elsewhere in the world.

The Government was obviously prepared to give \$10 000 to this appeal. We have undertaken to keep the situation monitored and to see how the appeal is going. I cannot give any further undertaking other than that. The whole question of donations to that sort of appeal is, in my view, to stimulate public support and to show that the Government is behind an appeal in the hope that the community generally will put its support behind the appeal.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the line relating to official visitors to the State and receptions. The Premier, in reply to the member for Stuart, who asked him about costs in the light of the Government's intention to cut down on waste, said that one of the visits this year would be that by the President of Serbia. Has an invitation been sent to the President of Serbia, and when will he be visiting this State?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is something that happened well before my time. I will certainly ascertain the exact details for the honourable member. I imagine that the original invitation must have been extended some considerable time ago if the visit was expected to occur before the end of the last financial year.

Mr. PAYNE: I was interested to hear the Premier refer to the Elton Mayo School of Management and his support for that project. I understand that school is involved in the business studies area of the Institute of Technology. If my recollection serves me correctly, a former Premier of this State (Don Dunstan) had much to do with the initial stages of that project and gave it great support. Undoubtedly, if that project comes to fruition, as is now suggested, much credit will be due to him. I thought that I ought to put those remarks on record because I believe, as a result of the present Premier's statement that there is considerable value in establishing such a school in South Australia, that he shares the former Premier's beliefs.

The sum of \$9 120 was spent last year on Port Augusta air services, although \$10 800 is proposed for that line this year. I cannot recall ever noticing this item before under miscellaneous grants, but I do not claim to remember everything that we handle in the Budget. I would appreciate any information the Premier can give me about this line. Is it something to do with the Flying Doctor Service operating out of Port Augusta?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest that the honourable member makes his inquiry of the member for Stuart, who will undoubtedly know the details. Either way, I will get a report for the honourable member. The increase has occurred because of the rise in the price of Avgas.

Mr. LEWIS: I refer to the allocation for the "Standards Association of Australia". I see that we subscribe to and support that organisation. Previously, when I tried to get some common sense from Ministers regarding the Government's attitude to documents prepared by this worthwhile body, I could get nowhere. The Deputy Premier, among others, was involved with the inquiries that were made of the previous Government.

I refer particularly to the various forms of contract required in this State. If one wants to build for this Government a concrete wall, whether it is a bridge abutment, for retaining soil, or to go around a tank, one may have to know how to apply and tender on as many as seven different forms. The previous Government refused to do anything to rationalise that situation. Like the present Government, the Opposition previously supported this organisation and its activities in an attempt to bring some common sense into the various ways of measuring and doing things. I wonder whether the present

Government will take the trouble to investigate whether it can rationalise these forms of contract and, as far as possible, end up with one form. It costs so much more to train engineers who must tender for these contracts if they have to know how to do it in seven different ways. We are not really emulating the Kama Sutra in contracting.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will be delighted to speak to the honourable member about this matter because what he has said makes good sense. The increase in that line is from \$10 000, which was spent last year, to \$13 000 proposed this year. This has occurred because of inflation.

Mr. KENEALLY: I refer to last year's allocation of \$12 000 for Redcliff Petro-chemical Project Working Committee. The Committee has now been transferred to the Trade and Industry Department. There are numerous committees dealing with the petro-chemical plant at Redcliff, as I am sure the Premier has found out in the past few weeks. As I have said, \$12 000 was voted for the Redcliff Petro-chemical Project Working Committee last year, although only \$5 375 was spent. However, no vote is proposed this year. I should like to know exactly what the Redcliff Petro-chemical Working Committee does. Then, I would be able to ask why no funds have been voted for it this financial year. I ask the Premier to bring down a report.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest that the honourable member raise that matter when the Committee reaches the vote for the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the vote of for miscellaneous Royal Commissions. All members are aware that the Royal Commission inquiring into the lighting of West Lakes stadium has been completed. However, nothing was paid out for it in 1978-79, and the proposed vote for 1979-80 is \$12 000. Is that because it is, in effect, time payment, so that we can have it now and pay later?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I refer to the vote for 1980 Jubilee ANZAAS Conference. Last year \$17 500 was voted and the proposed vote this year is \$30 450. I assume that this amount is for what could be termed "front end expenses" in relation to its staging. I assume that we are not simply paying money to this organisation so that it can bank it and then withdraw it when 1980 actually arrives. Can we have information from the Premier about the nature of the flow of funds from the Government to the organisation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The sums involved in the 1980 Jubilee ANZAAS conference, which comes to South Australia about once every nine years, are preliminary funds. It is a two-stage, single grant, which was made in the first instance. The funds are for printing, promotion, and all the things relating to promoting a conference of this size in South Australia. No doubt, other requests will be made. Obviously, the Government is delighted to support a conference of such world renown, and will continue to support it.

Mr. PAYNE: For "Various Committees of Inquiry", a sum of \$57 000 was voted last year and \$32 615 was actually expended. The sum proposed for this year is \$50 000. Does the proposed sum signify an outburst of more committees of inquiry at the instigation of the Government, or does this figure relate to estimates made by the previous Government? I would also appreciate some outline of the types of inquiry for which committees have been set up in the past. This sum is considerable, and I hope that the Minister can supply information.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The sum provided is from an excess of caution, to provide for the unexpected, which I think is probably fair comment considering the number of matters that have to be inquired into carefully. In 1978-79,

the following matters were investigated: Public Accounts Committee on hospitals; alternative lifestyles; community development and assistance; Flinders Medical Centre computer system; freedom of information working party; privacy working group; working group on uniform uranium codes; workers compensation inquiry; Aboriginal tribal law; community access press report; and others. The 1979-80 proposal provides for payment of outstanding accounts. This sum is considerable. Regarding the workers compensation inquiry, the Government is liable for \$19 000. Statistical priorities is another major one. The Aboriginal tribal law inquiry involved \$11 000, children's services involved \$30 000, and the review of the Department of Further Education involved \$30 000.

Mr. HEMMINGS: For "Working Women's Centre", \$23 000 was voted last year, and that amount was spent. A sum of \$34 600 has been proposed this year. I do not query this increase, but why has it been made?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is a simple explanation to the honourable member's question. In the 1978-79 Budget, operating costs covered only the period from February to the end of the financial year. The present grant will cover the costs for the full year.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Regarding "Various minor grants", I am aware that in other parts of this document the practice has been adopted to amalgamate a large number of minor grants under one heading.

This seems only sensible, assuming that large numbers of small sums are available. Can the Premier indicate what is the largest grant under that general heading, or would it require an exhaustive search?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think it would require an exhaustive investigation. These sorts of grants go up to about the \$100 level. These small grants must be made from time to time, and this is a convenient way of putting them together in one item.

Mr. PAYNE: The sum proposed this year for the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal is almost three times the sum expended last year. Is this in anticipation of an increased number of appeals as a result of the recent allocations in the Murray area?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The earlier sum resulted from fewer sittings during the year. It is anticipated that there will be reassessments of Murray River holdings and that the number of sittings will increase. Therefore, the fees will increase.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I take it that it would be possible for the Premier to make available specific details of the minor grants.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall be pleased to do that, as they are applied.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I misunderstood the Premier's earlier reply to me. Is this a sum kept in reserve that will be drawn on?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Yes.

Vote passed.

Treasury, \$4 063 000.

Mr. BANNON: For the Deputy Under Treasurer, Assistant Under Treasurer, administrative, accounting and clerical staff, there is a considerable increase in 1979-80, far beyond the normal inflationary figure that appears in most of the budgetary papers, compared to those salaries in 1978-79. What extra staff is involved in this considerable increase and what duties do those staff perform?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There has been an increase in salaries as a result of the national wage case, etc., and that, together with commitments for increments, leave loading, and so on, had a marked effect this year. In addition, a contingency provision has been made for specific new

positions, if they become necessary, to cope with the problems, in the present financial circumstances, of adding particular expertise. At present, it is not proposed that those positions be filled and, therefore, I cannot give details. The contingency fund is there so that experts from within the Public Service can be trained or appointed to positions there as and if the need arises.

Mr. BANNON: For the Public Service Board, there has been an increase of about \$200 000 in a budget of about \$2 500 000, whereas for Treasury there is an increase of about \$200 000 based on actual payments last year of a little over \$500 000. This represents a significant increase that would account, bearing in mind inflationary factors, for a considerable number of positions. How many contingency positions are there? Are they to be filled by wastage of positions elsewhere or recruited from outside, and what specific functions has the Premier in mind in this upgrading of Treasury staff?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Again, I cannot give details, because I do not know what the exact positions will be or whether they will be filled, but they will be filled from within the Public Service, and they will not necessarily be secondments; they could be transfers from other departments within the Public Service. I know that in the hospitals in, the Health Commission, in the redeployment, and, hopefully, the granting of autonomy to various hospitals, there are officers who have been working on the process of giving financial management to the hospitals themselves. Eventually, they will work themselves out of a position, and it may well be that we can use those people.

Mr. BANNON: As with the Public Service Board, so the Treasury has attempted to decentralise in the sense of ensuring in recent years that the accounting and other skills required by departments to administer themselves properly are in those departments. It is a good system and conforms with the principles behind the Corbett inquiry into the Public Service, the basic slogan of which was, "Let the managers manage"—in other words, give the departments responsibility, and they will respond.

It seems that we are getting back to a more centralised situation, that numbers are being increased and are being drawn from areas where the accounting functions and budgetary planning were being done at the departmental level, and pulled back into Treasury. Is this a conscious policy decision?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We are getting into the realms of hypothetical situations. With the Hospitals Commission, there is a paradox. We are trying to give autonomy to hospitals, yet we are running into difficulties with the Health Commission, which sits on top and controls expenditure. There are other departments in which the reverse is true. The contingency is there and the funds are there for the employment of people if it becomes necessary to undertake specific tasks within Treasury.

Mr. BANNON: On past experience, as one would expect with Treasury, the votes tend to be fairly close to actual payments. That is quite proper, because those officers are attempting to instil realism into departments in terms of their budgets and expenditure, and ensure that they demonstrate that they can efficiently do the job they are expecting the departments to do. This is not usual. In a quick look, one finds that expenditure lines up fairly well except when there is some specific reason. In this case, there is a considerable increase in a tight Budget in tight financial times. An amount of \$200 000 has been added to the Treasury, and the Premier suggests that this is just contingency funds, and an amount to be held in reserve in case certain things happen. That is not how the Treasury has operated in the past. If there is not a change in Government policy, is there a change in the thinking of the

Under Treasurer about how he is organising his department?

Mr. KENEALLY: The proposed vote to the State Taxation Office has increased. Because of the reduction in State taxes through succession and gift duties, in which this Government will be involved, I would have thought that there might be a reduction in the staff of the State Taxation Office.

According to the figures we have here it would indicate that that is not the case. Will the Premier say that it is a fact that, although there will be reduced work load for the people within the State Taxation office, there will be no reduction of staff within that office?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member for bringing to the attention of the House the substantial tax cuts which have been made. The honourable member is being slightly optimistic if he expects that we would cut down on the State Taxation office staff in the first 12 months. Even though succession and gift duties will be abolished from 1 January next year, we will continue to collect sums and officers will be needed to administer that department for at least 12 months after that time.

Mr. PAYNE: On page 20, for "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", a large increase is proposed of about \$13 000 or \$14 000, or more than 30 per cent on the amount expended last year. If I took the Premier's remarks literally on earlier lines, it would seem that the Treasury Department, which, I am certain, is one of the most effective departments in the State Public Service, is not going to operate in an economic and careful way, thus making savings in that area. This was the reason offered by the Premier in the absence of specific information on those other departments.

The point I raise is that the line specifies, "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". This is an interesting subdivision of the amounts put before the House, as another line is for "Purchase of office machines and equipment." One would think that many of the office machines bought would be "minor equipment". Perhaps there is some reason that only Treasury officers could define that would explain the separate accounting. We all know that accountants have a language of their own. Surely, when we are looking at Treasury lines, the Premier may have some information in the folder provided for him which will give some explanation of the hefty increases proposed under this line.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member for the remarks about the office of the Treasury. I believe that we have one of the finest such departments in the world. I have been most impressed with the officers in the time that I have been associated with them. They are officers of the highest calibre, and we are indeed fortunate to have them in South Australia.

The honourable member has answered his own question to some degree. If he looks at the purchase of office machines and equipment and sees the amount budgeted for the coming year, it is a substantial drop of over \$12 000. If he takes that and adds it to the figure for "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", we are starting to get a bit closer to the mark. The reason for the increased costs generally is that we are using economic analysis models to identify the interaction between various sectors of the economy and to give us a far better idea and projection of what is likely to happen over the next two or three years. This is of particular importance if we move, as I hope we will soon, towards the provision of more programme and performance budgeting and three-year rolling Budgets.

Mr. BANNON: I would like the Premier to explain the line "Refunds and Remissions" under "State Taxation Office". There is considerable inaccuracy in the Treasury estimates here, with \$20 000 voted and \$87 000 spent last year, while \$40 000 has been provided this year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is a remission of stamp duty on debentures issued by Samcor prior to 1 November 1978. The 1979-80 allocation provides for the remission of stamp duty on the purchase of land by councils for use as public parks and for their normal council operations. That accounts for that remission.

Mr. KENEALLY: With regard to the line "Automatic Data Processing—Operation, maintenance and development of systems", an amount of \$208 000 proposed in 1979-80. Throughout the Budget documents this line will appear in numerous departments. Because it is split up as it is one could get the impression that the amount of money that has been allocated to the development of the systems within the Public Service is relatively minor, whereas in total it is probably a substantial figure. I would expect that the Treasury would have the figure for total costs. Will the Premier get a report for me?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We have instituted an inquiry of that nature to try and bring together all the requirements. As far as I know, that is not available in precise form at present. As soon as it becomes available I will be delighted to make a copy of the findings available to the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: In view of the lateness of the hour, I am disposed to accept the Premier's explanation for the proposed amount of \$61 000 for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries. If one does the arithmetic, it does not quite come out as the Premier suggests. I suggest that Treasury officers and accountants would view with horror his financial accounting methods.

Vote passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$41 962 000.

Mr. BANNON: In the last year \$27 820 was spent in connection with the Softwood Forestry Agreement 1967, and about double that is being provided this financial year. Can the Premier give details of that agreement, how it operates, and why such a large increase is involved in this financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot give that detail at this stage. I will obtain a report. The item provides for repayments under the Softwood Forestry Agreement, and those amounts are, I understand, recovered in turn from the Woods and Forests Department.

Mr. BANNON: The sum of \$260 000 is allocated to the Constitutional Museum Trust this year, which makes sense as the project is now in its final year of construction. Honourable members can see from the outside how splendidly the restoration work has been undertaken, with even the outside boards kept up to date with the new Premier's name painted on them soon after the election. The building and its restoration will be the major consumer of funds, but in any such project it is not just a building but its use that is of importance. Considerable sums have also been spent on the restoration of the Chamber and the displays to be shown in that museum, which will certainly add greatly to what we can show various school groups that come to this House and which will show how the House existed in the past. As conceived, visitors will obtain a magnificent prospectus of how the democratic institutions have developed, leading right through to the contemporary issues of today. Can the Treasurer assure the Committee that there will be sufficient funds available to mount those displays and exhibitions that are in a fairly advanced state of preparation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I echo the Leader's remarks about the restoration of the Constitutional Museum, which is a piece of craftsmanship and workmanship that is remarkably good. The people who have been working on it can be very proud; indeed, South Australians generally can be very proud of it. It contrasts markedly with the rather unfortunate condition that the original building had been allowed to fall into. It had almost got the stage where it was either a choice of pushing it over or propping it up. It has been more than propped up in a more than workmanlike manner.

The equipping of the museum is something that will have to be faced soon. I understood that the museum was originally to be ready in time for the festival next year. What the present time table is I am not sure, but I understand that it may not be ready.

Mr. BANNON: It may be April or May.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is likely to be after that time. We are looking carefully at the question of funds, and we are controlling expenditure as best we can. For that reason we will be looking to suggest what economies we can to the trust. This concept appears to be very exciting and interesting, and we will certainly do what we can to make sure that the work is completed, but whether it can be completed as rapidly as we would like is another matter—time will tell.

Mr. PAYNE: Presumably a prudent Treasurer makes some provision for cash losses: as \$2 000 was allocated last year and is again allocated this year, and as \$1 159 was spent last year, has the Treasurer any information about what is actually dealt with in this line?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As honourable members would know, a similar line has appeared in the Budget for many years. It is a line which I think reflects great credit, when one thinks of the total Budget of the State, this figure representing the losses sustained by departments through cash thefts and other losses. This line simply gives the wherewithal to reimburse departments for those cash losses so that their accounting systems are not thrown out and so that everything is brought under the one line. I repeat that I think it is a remarkable achievement.

Dr. HOPGOOD: An amount of \$50 000 is voted under "Debt Services" for the Libraries Board. One would assume that, in round figures, this would service a debt of about \$500 000. Can the Premier tell the Committee whether this amount represents the total loan raising in respect of the Libraries Board this year, or whether it is partly meeting commitments entered into in previous financial years?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: My information is that it provides for interest and principal repayments on semi-governmental borrowing by the Libraries Board. I cannot say any more than that, but I will obtain the details for the honourable member.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Is the allocation regarding the contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for subsidies in country areas a general subsidy to the trust to help defray its general costs in providing services to country areas, or is it a subsidy to individual householders to help defray their costs?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The subsidies scheme provides a subsidy to establish electricity supplies, or perhaps to extend electricity supplies in country areas. It is payable to country electricity suppliers. It is based on the need to maintain the policy to keep tariffs to within 10 per cent of that charged in the metropolitan area. It has been operating for quite a long time. The Electricity Trust acts as the agent. It is a worthwhile scheme from the point of view of people in the country.

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Premier confirm my surmise that

the line "Reimbursement to State Bank of South Australia for arrangements with Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd" refers to costs incurred by the State Bank in arranging financial accommodation for the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd? I note that \$7 000 was voted for this line and \$21 000 incurred last year, and that \$14 000 is projected for this financial year. Does this relate to, in effect, a rolling-over loan, and are these the charges incurred?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, it is purely and simply to provide for interest repayments, and it has rolled, as the honourable member suggests. The recoveries, of course, will be expected when the co-operative meets its obligations to the bank under the revised arrangements.

Mr. BANNON: A line that would be dear to your heart, Mr. Chairman, is the one relating to the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, which is doing some valuable work in those areas outside local government in this State. I see that \$97 000 has been maintained for this financial year. As I understand the Premier, these items are, in fact, repayments not just of interest but of interest and principal.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Not all of them.

Mr. BANNON: The first question is whether this is simply an interest repayment, and is that the maximum borrowing possible, or is there some further capacity so far as the Outback Areas Community Development Trust is concerned in terms of moneys at its disposal for its valuable community projects outside local government areas?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Until recently, the statutory limit on borrowings for individual authorities was \$1 000 000 in any one year. That sum has now been increased to \$1 200 000. The proposed sum of \$97 000 is for interest repayments on a semi-government borrowing of \$1 000 000, which was the maximum sum allowed in June 1978. It is a recurring interest repayment.

Mr. TRAINER: I refer to the allocation of \$1 for the purchase of a share in Salger Propriety Ltd. I am curious to know what sort of bargain the Government got for \$1.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is a very interesting question and I will be delighted to bring down an answer for the honourable member, because I do not know, either.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to the vote of \$290 000 for the State Opera of South Australia. I believe that that sum is for the refurbishing and restoration of the Opera Theatre. Does the sum for 1979-80 represent the last payment on that project, or is there a continuing recurring expenditure?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it is interest and principal repayments on borrowings so far.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the vote of \$2 550 000 for a contribution to the Commonwealth pursuant to urban and regional development agreements, relating specifically to Adelaide water treatments. Is that a matching commitment requirement and does the Premier have any information to assist my understanding of that allocation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is also interest and principal repayment on the sums advanced by the Commonwealth Government under the scheme for improving water quality.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the allocation relating to debt services for the board of the Botanic Gardens. The proposed vote this year seems to be a considerable increase on the amount of \$42 000 voted in 1978-79. Although the actual payment in that year was \$16 525, the proposed allocation this year is \$93 000. Will the Premier explain this increase?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of the reason

for the difference between the \$42 000 voted and the \$16 525 in actual payments. I imagine that difference arose because the period involved was straddled over two years at the end of the financial year. The amount payable is an interest and principal repayment on semi-government borrowings. If the honourable member so desires, I will get details for him.

Mr. HAMILTON: I refer to the contribution to the Commonwealth pursuant to the Railways Standardisation and Equipment Agreements. Would the Premier explain what that means?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The negotiations for a new agreement for the Adelaide-Crystal Brook standardisation is yet to be resolved. Therefore, the State is still obliged to make repayments under the Adelaide-Crystal Brook Standard Gauge Agreement Act, 1974. Once agreement is reached the cost of servicing that debt will be borne by the Commonwealth. In the meantime, we must make provision for paying that interest out of State funds.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I refer to the transfer to Loan Account of \$6 000 000 to supplement capital programmes. This is a very important entry, because one of the major features of the Premier's Budget is that \$6 000 000 has been transferred from Revenue to Loan Account.

This was, in part, forced on the Government by the size of the Loan allocation that was granted to us. In the Premier's Financial Statement, a good deal is said about what the Premier hopes he may be able to achieve at the forthcoming Premiers' conference, in relation to renegotiating the tax-sharing arrangement. Much is also said about the future weighting of the distribution of Loan funds as between the States. As far as I can see, little was said about the future size of the actual Loan allocation that is to be made available. I realise that predictability is difficult in this area, because, in part, the Commonwealth Government uses Loan Council policy as a weapon of control on the economy. I am not sure how sound a policy that is, but that is beside the point.

I am aware that the Treasury tends to try to work in triennia when looking at capital programmes. I have never quite understood (and I should take the opportunity to speak to Ron Barnes about this) how it is possible, with any degree of predictability, to match these two, given the vagaries of the Loan Council decisions in this matter.

Will the Premier say on what sort of assumptions his officers are working as to Loan Council policy next year, in relation to the sort of allocation we get, whether it is assumed that the Commonwealth may cut back even further in relation to the loan, or whether, in terms of purchasing power, South Australia will get roughly what it got this financial year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me say from the outset that I certainly hope South Australia gets a better allocation this year than it did last year by way of Loan Council. Loan Council certainly has relaxed its guidelines on infrastructure borrowing, and has allowed the States to come back before 1981, as was the original agreement.

All States received a pretty raw deal from Loan Council last year. Having looked at the allocations that were made, I would like to see a considerable increase this year. I will push very hard for a considerable increase in Loan Council funds for South Australia next year and I imagine that every State Premier will do exactly the same. With a bit of luck, and a lot of hard work, we should be able to impress the Commonwealth Government regarding our needs.

Mr. PAYNE: The Premier gave information earlier about cash losses. Regarding the line "Cheques for departments", one can only marvel at the service provided by the Treasury. It seems not only that cash losses incurred by other departments are made up by the Treasury, but

also that cheques are written for departments. That inference could be gained from this line. I should like a greater understanding of what is provided in this line, for which a sum of \$30 000 has been allocated.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The sum allocated is purely and simply for the provision of cheques for the use of all departments. I do not know how many cheques it represents. In fact, I shudder to think about it. It seems to me that the Treasury does a remarkably fine job in getting through the amount of paperwork it does by way of cheques, and coming out on the right side.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Regarding "Contribution to Electricity Trust of South Australia—For subsidies in country areas", \$1 300 000 was voted last year, yet actual payments rose considerably to \$1 810 985. I am particularly concerned, although I do not represent a country district.

Mr. Langley: What about One Tree Hill?

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is considered to be a country area. The vote is \$1 700 000. As we increased actual payments by nearly \$511 000 over 1978-79, will the vote be sufficient for this financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I imagine, but I do not know, that a specific project is responsible for the increase. I will obtain the information for the honourable member. I have already outlined the basis behind the subsidy scheme. Obviously, once that is established as a working figure, it should remain fairly constant, and that is why we see about \$1 800 000 and \$1 700 000.

Mr. SLATER: The purchase of a share in Salger Proprietary Limited indicates that the Premier is a subscriber to the company, because it was set up in relation to the company being formed from the signing of a contract, in 1979, between the Algerian Ministry of Agriculture and the Government of South Australia as the contractor for this integrated development programme in Algeria. Will this project continue?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member. I had put more connotation on the letters and initials, but I was not prepared to commit myself on a guess. The Minister of Agriculture is well aware of those projects, and we have been discussing them only recently. Not knowing the details, I cannot give any undertaking. I should be pleased to obtain a report on the progress of those projects.

Mr. DUNCAN: I presume that the \$57 000 debt service allocation for the Whyalla Hospital is simply an interest payment service sum. What was the loan for, how old is it, and what is the Government's policy in relation to incorporated hospitals under the Health Commission? Is it the Government's intention to grant status, through legislation, to hospitals incorporated under the commission to enable them to borrow, as small semi-government authorities? If so, when is it likely that the Government will introduce such legislation, because, as I understand it, it would be necessary to have such legislation?

If the Government is serious in its expressed intention to grant hospitals a marked degree of autonomy, this is the kind of power that is highly desirable if hospitals are to be able to plan their own future and to develop their resources as they see fit. Most hospitals in the State, in terms of bricks and mortar, are now fairly well set up. For instance, for the Mount Gambier Hospital or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital it would not take vast amounts of capital to be able to develop the minor alterations needed from time to time.

I should imagine that the funds available under the semi-government loan programme for small instrumentalities would provide adequate funds for this type of institution. I seek information on the Government's

policy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The line provides for the payment of a debt which has been incurred to the City of Whyalla, because the corporation raised loans on behalf of the Whyalla Hospital, which is now a Government hospital. I imagine that the debt is of some standing—obviously before the change. The matter of incorporating smaller hospitals will be considered when the matters of funding for hospitals and of the Health Commission come under consideration, which will be soon.

Mr. BANNON: The Premier was asked a question earlier but was unable to supply information about the purchase of a share in Salger Pty. Ltd. The Auditor-General's Report refers to that company at page 298. The name is an acronym of South Australian and Algeria. It seems to be a \$1 company in which the \$1 has been paid. I take it that the blank does not imply that the company is being wound up in this financial year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I explained to the member for Gilles, in answer to his question and his informative explanation, for which I was most grateful, the Minister of Agriculture has further details on this. They will undoubtedly come up under his vote. I would say that there is no indication at all that this is anything other than a token involvement in the company by the South Australian Government.

Mr. PAYNE: Treasury does not seem to be taking too many tricks. I would have thought that, if anyone should get unclaimed moneys, it should be Treasury, but we are providing for repayment of unclaimed moneys. A sum of \$30 000 is proposed for this year, and the actual payments last year amounted to \$21 929.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The only information I have here is that, after certain specified periods have elapsed, unclaimed moneys held by departments and instrumentalities are paid into Treasury. If a legitimate claim is subsequently made, the cost of meeting it is charged against that line.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I refer to the provisions for the insurance of cash, motor vehicles, and so on, and transfer to the Government Insurance Fund for the payment of claims in respect of Government buildings. This could mean one of two things, and I seek information as to what is meant before I ask my substantive question. It could mean that the Government has to make provision for accidents occurring to individuals as a result of their being in a Government building or a Government motor car, or being hit by a Government motor car. Alternatively, it could be that part of the Budget which has to cover the fact that the Government carries its own insurance.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Both.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Thank you. I know that, mostly, costs continue to rise but generally the incidence of calls on this money had resulted from what the insurance industry calls "acts of God". One would have thought therefore that the incidence of such things will not vary all that much from one year to another. Despite the provision last year of \$1 300 000, only about \$900 000 was paid out and this year \$1 450 000 has been provided. Is it assumed therefore that last year was a good year in that there was less vandalism to schools or fewer people being unfortunately involved in accidents with Government motor vehicles, or what is the reason?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I ask the honourable member not to get too excited about it. My reading of it is that it was not particularly a good year or a bad year but that payments have not caught up yet and that is why the sum for this year has had to be increased somewhat. The line provides for general insurance, and I have a detailed statement as follows:

(1) Cash in hand and in transit, which covers the possible loss of cash held in Government departments and in transit between banks and offices.

(2) Furniture removed for Government employees, which provides transit cover for household furniture and effects of Government employees shifted to suit departmental requirements.

(3) Government buildings, etc., against fire and provision for premiums for special purposes—transfer to Government Insurance Fund. As members would be aware, the State carries its own risk on Government buildings, through the Government Insurance Fund and takes out policies with insurance companies for special purposes, such as air travel of Ministers and members of Parliament.

(4) Motor vehicles used for Government purposes. All Government motor vehicles are insured against third party liability (bodily injury).

Thus all the insurance requirements of the Government are covered.

Mr. HEMMINGS: For "Reimbursement to State Bank of South Australia for arrangements with Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited" there is a 200 per cent increase in actual payments on what was voted in 1978-79. There is a proposed sum of \$14 000 for 1979-80. Why is \$14 000 proposed, when payments in 1978-79 were \$21 000?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I did answer the question. It is an interest repayment owing by the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited to the State Bank. The difference is in multiples of seven and comes about because of a roll-over situation. Recoveries will be expected from that when the co-operative meets its debt to the State Bank.

Mr. PAYNE: For the Coast Protection Board, \$400 000 was voted in the previous year and \$363 410 was expended. The proposed amount of \$500 000 on a debt services basis could indicate an increased borrowing of over \$1 000 000. Does this figure signify some increased activity or a special project that the Coast Protection Board is undertaking for which a loan is arranged?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is both principal and interest repayment.

Mr. DUNCAN: Supplementary to the information I just obtained in relation to the Whyalla Hospital loan, has the Government any intention of repaying that loan to the Whyalla Corporation at an early date? I imagine that the fact that such a loan is outstanding disadvantages the Whyalla Corporation, as against other corporations in similar positions, such as the Mount Gambier Corporation. I understand that the Mount Gambier Corporation has no liabilities in relation to the Mount Gambier Hospital.

It seems from the information that the Premier supplied that the Whyalla corporation apparently is owed this money by the State Government, but I may have misunderstood the Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that the Corporation of the City of Whyalla raised funds for the Whyalla Hospital. Therefore, the payment of debt charges is made to the council as reimbursement for the debt charges incurred. I imagine it cannot in any way be affecting the viability of the corporation.

Vote passed.

Services and Supply, \$4 083 000.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to the heading "Office of Director-General". Actual payments for management services officers, administration and clerical staff were \$78 119. For the current financial year the provision is \$134 699—a remarkable increase. It is in excess of that provided under the Treasury line. In a situation of no

growth in the Public Service, clearly such a major increase in the salaries allocation for staff indicates some extra positions that are to be created. We have already seen one or two departments earlier where this is the case. We have seen a large increase in the allocation for advertising for recruitment for jobs made under other lines. Here we have another considerable increase. I think we deserve some detail on this, not the sort of reply we got previously in relation to the Treasury, which was along the lines that the Government had just put a sum of money on, because it may need these positions later in the financial year.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In 1978-79 there were some savings which resulted from deferment of filling vacancies. The 1979-80 provision is for salaries of existing staff plus officers who will be transferred from other divisions to provide a central group to improve financial management operations of the department, including known commitments for increments, leave loading, etc.

Mr. BANNON: That is the same sort of disturbing information that we had in relation to the other matter. One cannot put much weight at all on the inflationary and other factors. In fact last year the actual payments were very close indeed to the Budget. Now it is being suggested in the reply that has just been given that part of the reason for the increase is that certain positions were not filled, yet an allocation of \$82 000 was made available and \$4 000 was left unexpended, which is not a bad result. It certainly does not show a large number of positions that have not been filled. The positions must have been created for the purposes of this Budget. We deserve a full explanation of this, as it appears to cut right across the principle that was embodied in the Corbett Report on public administration, to which the Premier nodded enthusiastically when I quoted it—the principle of “let the managers manage”, of actually sending out to the various departments, decentralising those functions or facilities, whether they be accounting, personnel services, management services, or in this case of services and supply, the ordering of particular equipment, and so on.

It was obviously a desirable process that had been set in train. It was appreciated by the department. It certainly puts more responsibility on it, but that has the effect of improving its efficiency. It puts pressure on it for greater co-ordination, and it means that we do not have centralisation.

Is this a conscious move to ensure that a number of functions that were being handed out in the various departments are being pulled back into this central department, and often with accompanying staff? That could create problems in itself, since those officers on the staff may have a range of duties. Bring them back into the Department of Services and Supply, and their function becomes much more narrow. Again, we are looking at a situation where inefficiencies are being created.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader seems to have read a lot into that reply. I stress the words in that part of the reply applicable to the point he is making: “. . . plus officers who will be transferred from other divisions to provide a central group to improve financial management operations”. Implicit in that is the fact that there will be no increase in the head count, if the Leader is talking about overall numbers in the Public Service. That is in line with present Government policy, but the Leader is well aware that in a number of departments moves are made to improve financial efficiency, and that involves the transfer of staff from one section to another. That is implicit in the answer I have given.

Mr. BANNON: I am disturbed at the apparent lack of briefing that has been given to the Minister. Certainly, there is a paucity of information that is available for us.

We cannot be too hard on him as it is a new area that he has taken over. It requires the mastery of considerable detail, and we all know that he is having quite a battle with one of his other functions to try to master that detail. I imagine that he has no spare time to try to look at this detail. It is fair enough that he cannot go into the depth that I would like, although I think on another count his department should have given him adequate briefing notes. In a sense the Deputy Premier has been left without a feather to fly with.

If what he says is true that, without increasing the head count, the stress must be laid on bringing officers in from other divisions, one must ask from which division. If they are divisions within the Department of Services and Supply, an examination of the salary lines of each of those divisions gives no indication whatever that officers are being transferred back into the central management service, administrative and clerical area of the Director-General. If that was so we would see reductions in those divisions. In the Chemistry Division, the general salary payment last year for the Deputy Government Analyst, Analysts and Inspectors was \$759 000, and \$784 000 is proposed for this year. That is the normal percentage that has been applied for inflation, and that suggests no change whatever in staff. No staff is being brought back from that division.

In the Government Printing Division, the actual payment of \$3 228 948 is to become \$3 788 000, an increase of about \$500 000. Again, an allowance is made for inflation and perhaps extra positions, but certainly nobody is taken out of that division (thus reducing that line) and put into the central function. In State Supply, the other large division, the Minister will see the same pattern. Actual payments under the general staff line are \$935 000, with \$993 000 proposed expenditure, including inflation increments and possibly even some positions. They are the only significant divisions in which staff is involved and, in each of those divisions, it would appear that it is either business as usual or perhaps a slight increase in staff.

If the officers are to come without increasing the head count, they are not coming from within divisions of the Department of Services and Supply. Where else can they come from? If they are coming from other departments, then that is precisely what I was talking about—they must be officers in those departments performing supply functions who are going to be brought into this central pool. It would be interesting to know the attitude of the various departments that are having officers removed, if there is no change in the head count, to this considerable increase in staff in the office of the Director-General. I think that the Committee is owed a further explanation from the Minister about this matter.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that the briefing notes provided to me are any more scant than those provided to my predecessors, nor do I believe that the answers given by our predecessors were any fuller than those given by the Premier in answer to the Leader's rather patronising remarks. I recall on numerous occasions that former Deputy Premier, latterly Premier, Mr. Corcoran, getting to his feet here time after time, even at an earlier hour than this, and simply saying, “I will get a report”. For the Leader to get up and sound off about the paucity of information that my officers have supplied me is, I believe, insulting to those officers. I do not believe that any less information has been made available to the current Ministry than to the former Ministry. I make no apology for the fact that the sort of detailed information that the Leader is seeking is not available in these notes.

I recall members of the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations on numerous occasions saying nothing in

these debates other than, "I will get a report", particularly when they were getting a bit testy at this hour of the night. I have given this information to the Leader, who has not been here long enough to know what this is all about. I resent the implication that my officers have not briefed me adequately to suit him. I have given the Leader the information available. In some cases Ministers in the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations would not even bother to read the briefing notes. I am happy to get a report for the Leader and to seek further information in relation to the line to which he is referring.

Mr. PAYNE: In the State Supply Division, I note that under the line "Produce office, Light Square," the administrative, accounting and clerical staff are grouped together. Taken in conjunction with the line "Light Square Works—Works Manager, Foreman, Inspectors, labour as required," the actual pay-outs last year on those two lines are less than the amounts proposed. Is this an area demonstrating part of the avowed policy of the present Government to cut down on the number of people employed or to exercise zero growth, and at the same time not do it except by natural wastage? Is this an example of an estimate that there will be a fall-off in the labour requirements in that area?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The allocation for the Light Square works provides for salaries of existing staff as at 1 July 1979, including known commitments for increments and leave loading. The reduction from 1978-79, reflect staff reductions taking place in association with the phasing out of these operations. The Produce Office, Light Square allocation, provides salaries for existing staff as at 1 July 1979, including known commitments for increments, leave loading, etc.

Mr. PAYNE: The two lines taken together indicate a reduction in salaries. In view of the fact that presumably there would normally be an inflationary component, is that an indication of the Government's policy of trying to reduce staff?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member had listened carefully, when I was referring to the Light Square works allocation. I said that the reduction from 1978-79 reflected staff reductions taking place in association with the phasing out of these operations. However, I understand that one of the operations taking place at the Light Square works Department involved the redistribution of meat from the Port Lincoln abattoirs, and that that operation is being phased out. If that is not correct, I will certainly bring down the correct information for the honourable member. It is quite apparent that there has been a reduction in staff in real terms.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer under "Contingencies" to "Office of the Director-General". The proposed vote for "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries" for 1979-80 is \$35 500, the actual payments for 1978-79 being \$19 167. This increase seems considerable when compared to other areas within the department. Will the Minister explain the reason for that?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In 1978-79, increased expenditure resulted from further establishment of the office of Director-General of this newly-amalgamated department. In 1979-80, provision was made for expenditure associated with the further establishment of the central administration functions of the department. If the honourable member requires any further detail, I will obtain it for him.

Mr. TRAINER: Regarding "Office of the Director-General" the total salary allocation voted for 1978-79 was \$151 984. Actual payments were \$11 240 838. The proposed allocation for 1979-80 is \$196 600. Yet, the pay-roll tax relating to each of those figures is about double the

figure for the total salaries involved. For example, pay-roll tax for 1978-79 was voted at \$328 000. Salaries amounted to about \$151 000, so the pay-roll tax is double the amount of salaries to which the pay-roll tax applies.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the pay-roll tax for the whole department, excluding the A.D.P. Centre and the Government Printing Division, borne by the office of the Director-General in 1978-79. The savings resulted from deferment of filling vacancies. In 1979-80, the reduction in provision resulted from a change in methods of funding the Government Printing Division from 1 July 1979. In this case, pay-roll tax will be recovered by way of charges on its clients.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is quite obvious that the Deputy Premier does not have the faintest idea of what he is reading to the Committee. I will give him another opportunity and perhaps he can do a little better. Regarding "Government Printing Division—Planning, composing, machining, binding and other printing staff", for the whole department there has been an increased allocation of \$500 000. In the whole Government Printing Division, there has been an increased allocation of about \$800 000. Will the Deputy Premier tell the Committee whether this figure reflects increased employment within the Government Printing Division, and, if it does, what that increased employment covers?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In 1978-79, savings resulted from vacancies unfilled. For 1979-80, the sum provided for salaries and wages of existing staff as at 1 July 1979, including known commitments for increments, leave loading, etc. It also includes provision for the establishment and operation for part of the year of a central micro-film bureau for the Public Service, and satellite document reproduction centres.

Mr. BANNON: I cannot understand that. The Minister has just read something and said that savings resulted from unfilled places. I cannot see where those savings are. If one looks under this heading, one sees that the voted amount is less than actual payment in 1978-79. In turn, the actual payment in that year is less than the voted sum in 1979-80. So, there are no savings. Rather, increases are shown throughout the line.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader did not listen very carefully. The savings to which I referred amounted to nearly \$100 000. There was an actual decrease in expenditure on that line in the 1978-79 Budget, resulting from unfilled vacancies. The other remarks referred to the overall increased allocation for 1979-80 that I have just given to the Committee.

Mr. BANNON: Under the 1979-80 proposed allocation, the total sum is about \$4 400 000, and a similar sum is charged to other accounts. In other words, it ends up being no charge at all. The asterisk indicates that all receipts and payments previously recorded in the Revenue Account are now directed through a deposit account. I cannot understand what is meant by that accounting device. Does it mean that the Government Printing Division is being treated as self-financing in that all work done is charged out elsewhere? What implications does that have for the division, or is it merely an accounting device to put into deposit accounts sums that are not immediately being used?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: For planning, composing, machining, binding and other printing staff, less was actually spent last year than was budgeted for. Regarding the line "charged to other accounts," from 1 July 1979 the division commenced operating in a commercial manner, on a deposit account, recovering all of its costs from clients through charges for its services.

Mr. LANGLEY: Anyone who has been to the office will

know that it is an excellent place. Is the staff there fully occupied on Government commitments, or are they also competing with outside work? I have an idea that they compete with private enterprise.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The question is a general one, not referring to a specific allocation. The Government Printing Division, I understand from my preliminary discussions with the Government Printer, seeks to operate on a commercial basis and to do what is its prime function, namely, all printing in connection with government. It is also competing, I understand, with private enterprise in the field, and seeking to do printing for statutory and semi-government authorities. It is not my understanding that this office intends to compete generally in the open commercial market.

I shall get a report for the honourable member on the operations of the Government Printer in relation to the wider question, but my understanding is that the Government Printer is seeking to do the printing, not only in his role as printer for Government departments, but for statutory authorities. I do not think it is his intention to get into the general printing market, but I shall get that detail for the honourable member.

Mr. TRAINER: I refer again to the line in relation to the office of the Director-General. The Deputy Premier has not answered my question. I do not think that he knows that he has not answered it. I am genuinely concerned. I do not have a great understanding of accountancy, but we have a series of salaries listed, and the pay-roll tax listed below each is double the total amount of the salaries. If he could give me a straight answer by looking at page 24, the Minister would do better than trying to work from the briefing notes put together by his department. He seems to be extracting answers at random. He gets a question and pulls out one of the sheets of the briefing notes and, if it happens to match the question asked, I think he will shout "snap". If he could look at the line relating to the Office of the Director-General, without getting out a calculator he could see that the total is about \$150 000, which is only about half the amount of pay-roll tax anticipated. A similar result occurs with the next two columns. I want a simple explanation of why the pay-roll tax is double the total salaries.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the honourable member should clean out his ears and listen more carefully, because I gave the information. Pay-roll tax for the whole department—not just the office of the Director-General, but including all the other personnel in the other lines, and excluding the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division and the Government Printing Division—is borne by the office of the Director-General.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to page 25, and the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division. If you look at page 25—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Order! The honourable member must address himself to the Chair.

Mr. PAYNE: My humble apologies, Mr. Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not want any personalities across the floor. The member for Mitchell has been here long enough to know the rules of this place.

Mr. PAYNE: The amount of \$1 408 567 actually paid for expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance last year has escalated to a proposed sum of \$2 149 010 this year. Does this indicate, since it is under contingencies, a considerable increase in the activities of the division, or is it in relation to a major maintenance operation that needs to be mounted this year? I understand there have been problems with the centre and difficulties with air-conditioning.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that

this related to air-conditioning. Regarding the expenses incurred in 1978-79, increased expenses resulted from higher utilization of the centres computing facilities than was initially anticipated but the increase is the one which is of interest to the honourable member. For 1979-80, this is provision for increased expenses associated with lease payments for the upgrading of the centre's computing equipment to meet demands of clients. It is a fact that the demands on the centre are increasing. The honourable member is probably aware that the facilities are fairly adequate, but the increased expenditure is associated with lease payments for upgrading computing equipment.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to page 25 and the item "Contingencies—Office of the Minister—Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". The Deputy Premier replied to a question which I directed on an item for the Office of the Director-General. The answer was that, owing to the amalgamation of these departments, the proposed vote of \$35 500 was justified. For the life of me, I cannot see how, for 1979-80 the proposed figure is \$19 000, when we are just dealing with the office of the Minister. One can understand an increase where it is dealing with the Office of the Director-General. In the figure of \$19 000, we are dealing with the office of the Minister and not salaries but merely administration expenses and sundries, we have a figure of \$19 000 proposed for the 1979-80 financial year.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In 1978-79, \$10 000 was allocated and none was spent. The reason was that the office of the Chief Secretary was transferred to the Police Department on 7 June 1979. This department has come under the purview of the Deputy Premier as a result of a change of Government. For 1979-80 provision is made to meet the expenses to be incurred in operating the office of the Deputy Premier for a full year.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information from the Deputy Premier in relation to the office of the Minister. Could the Deputy Premier state the number of persons employed in the office of the Minister and Public Service classifications of those personnel?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall obtain the details. I understand the number of people employed in the office of the Deputy Premier is the same as the number employed by the previous Deputy Premier and considerably fewer than our predecessors. As to details to that classification and status, I shall obtain for the honourable member.

Mr. KENEALLY: I refer the Deputy Premier back to the office of the Director-General as to pay-roll tax and the questions that have already been asked. The question asked by the last member on this side who spoke was whether the item included pay-roll tax for the whole department, excluding the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division and the Government Printing Division. As the amount of pay-roll tax to be paid in 1979-80 is less than half of that paid in 1978-79, does that indicate that the personnel within that office of the Director-General will be halved?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: For 1979-80 the reduction in provision results from the change in method of funding the Government Printing Division from 1 November 1979. In this case pay-roll tax will be recovered by way of charges on its clients.

Mr. McRAE: I understand that there has been some reference to the Produce Office, Light Square, and the Light Square works. There is a long history in relation to the Produce Office and the Light Square works. There seems to be a continuing tendency on the part of various Administrations to run down the Produce Office and the Light Square works. That is not greatly evinced in relation

to the Produce Office itself, but certainly in relation to the Light Square works it is, where the drop is marked. As a consequence of that, I ask the Deputy Premier what precisely is the Government's policy in respect of those matters. Is it intended that those units, which I consider to have potential, will be run down, or is this merely a passing phase and, if it is, for what reason?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Although I do not have notes to this effect, I think that the reduction refers to the fact that some of the meat handling facilities are, in fact, being run down; they were being run down during the previous Administration. I think there are 12 butchers there now, and it is proposed that the operation will be phased out. In line with the present Government's policy, there will be no retrenchments. It will be done by a process of attrition or by finding other employment for those employees affected. I think it is true to say that the present Government's policy is in line with moves that were already afoot to reduce some of the operations of the Light Square works. If that information is not satisfactory to the honourable member, I shall get him a full report.

Mr. McRAE: I thank the Deputy Premier for that reply and for his undertaking to get me a more detailed report. Could he also tell me from his report what it is proposed to do with the various quite large facilities that are still available in that area? I am not saying they are necessarily terribly modern or as efficient as one would want, but for the moment I think they are reasonably adequate. Perhaps the Deputy Premier could indicate exactly what is proposed in respect of each of those works.

Mr. DUNCAN: In relation to the line concerning management services officers, administrative and clerical staff of the office of the Director-General, I notice that the figure has increased from an actual payment of \$78 119 to \$134 699.

Presumably that involves a series of additional positions. How many new positions is it intended to create or fill in the office of the Director-General, and what levels those positions will be?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member had been listening or had been in the House earlier he would have heard me say that I will get a report. For the his benefit, I repeat that provision is for salaries of existing staff plus officers who will be transferred from other divisions to provide a central group to improve financial management operations in the department, but I shall get details for him in a report.

Mr. LANGLEY: Who are the members of the Supply and Tender Board and what fees do they receive?

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The actual breakdown of payments to individuals is not provided. My note indicates that it provides for payment of relevant allowances to members of the Supply and Tender Board. The honourable member knows that there is a multiplicity of Government boards, all of which carry fees. I do not have the actual scale of fees for this line, but if the member is interested I do not believe there is any difficulty of confidentiality in relation to that information, which I will obtain for him.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information about the number of motor vehicles used by the Department of Services and Supply. What officers have normal use of those motor vehicles? Are they garaged in the Adelaide metropolitan area or the country area? Do they have air-conditioners?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It would be unreasonable for the honourable member to expect me to carry that sort of information in my head, but I am happy

to obtain it for him.

Mr. McRAE: I refer to the Chemistry Division and the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division at the same time. I am concerned that it may be the policy of the Government, particularly in relation to the Chemistry Division, to contract out a large part of the work currently performed by that admittedly rather small division in the way in which it could be said that work is already being contracted out in the Data Processing Centre. I do not want to confuse the two, but there is a certain analogy working there. I ask for a direct assurance to be given now or soon that it is not the intention of this Government to contract out work currently done by permanent staff of the State Government employed in the Chemistry Division. Perhaps at some subsequent time, the Deputy Premier could also give an assurance that the work currently done by permanent employees of the State Government relating to data processing will also be maintained in the service instead of being contracted out?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that the Government recognises the value of the Automatic Data Processing Centre and the work that it does for major Government departments. I understand that it does work for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Highways Department, to name two major Government departments. There is no proposal to reduce the operations of the A.D.P. Centre relating to its work done for the Government. I do not believe that I am in a position to make any long-term policy statement relating to the operations of the Chemistry Division because, quite frankly, I have not yet had an opportunity to go to the Chemistry Division and come to grips with details of its work. I believe that it does work for the Government, much of which would not be appropriate to be done elsewhere.

Of course, the general, overriding policy of this Government is that the Government should not necessarily be involved in operations, particularly in the constitution field, about which the Government has some fairly firm policies relating to the respective roles of Government and the private sector. However, in relation to the A.D.P. Centre I foresee a need to go ahead with proposals to rehouse that centre. I believe that there is a necessity to rationalise the computing facilities of a number of Government departments so that we do not have a repetition of the fiasco we had under the Labor Government with the Flinders Medical Centre computer and the T.A.B. computer.

If one is talking about policy relating to the A.D.P. Centre and computing, I believe that there is a necessity for rationalisation of the total computing operations of the Government and a necessity to pull together the strands relating to computing. I will be developing a policy in relation to that, but, as part of that policy, I would not see a diminution in the operations of the A.D.P. Centre. I am not prepared to make any firm policy statement relating to the operations of the Chemistry Division, except to say that I believe that there are some operations performed by that division that could not be performed elsewhere.

Mr. PAYNE: I am a bit worried about that response from the Deputy Premier in respect of the Chemistry Division. I trust that we are not being asked to vote for the purchase of laboratory equipment with an estimated value of \$39 000 that is subsequently going to be disposed of. That is looking ahead a bit, but we certainly got a qualified response from the Minister relating to the question about policy asked by the member for Playford.

However, I will persevere. There is a fairly reasonable increase in the allocation for the purchase of laboratory equipment in the Chemistry Division, \$24 714 having been

spent last year, and \$39 000 being provided this year. Can the Minister say what will be purchased with that \$39 000? Is some new special laboratory item required?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I said that I was not making any policy statement in relation to the Chemistry Division. Although I have come to grips with some of the problems in relation to computing facilities, I say quite unashamedly that I have not come to grips with the details of all the work done by the Chemistry Division. I am in no position to make, nor will I be making, any definitive policy statement during the Committee stages, and it would be unreasonable for the honourable member to expect otherwise. I do not have the details of the actual equipment that will be purchased under this line. I am assured in general terms that essential items of laboratory equipment need to be replaced, and if the honourable member requires those details I will obtain them for him.

Mr. DUNCAN: My question is supplementary to a question asked by the member for Playford and in particular to the Deputy Premier's reply. I refer to the vote for the Department of Services and Supply under the line "Automatic Data Processing Centre Division—Director, Programmers, Computing, Administrative and Clerical Staff". Does the significant increase in staff allocation include a component to enable the type of policies referred to by the Deputy Premier to be implemented? A few moments ago the Deputy Premier referred to the need, in his view, to rationalise and co-ordinate computing facilities throughout the Government. To undertake such a project, quite clearly a very much upgraded automatic data processing centre staff arrangement would be needed. In particular, it has been recognised for some time that the South Australian Government could well do with the services of a computer super sleuth—somebody who really is an expert in this field. By that I mean a real expert, and a person of international standing, not an expert in nuts and bolts.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Elizabeth does not need any assistance from the member for Stuart. The member for Elizabeth has the floor, and he is trying to ask intelligent questions.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your assistance in protecting me even from members on this side of the Chamber.

This matter is important, and the Deputy Premier has referred to a couple of instances where there have been unhappy experiences with computers. I think he was being somewhat partisan in his comments, because he would know as well as anyone that every organisation that has been involved in computer technology has had its ups and downs, successes and failures. That has not been limited to the Government area. There are innumerable examples of computers in private industry that have been disasters. I simply ask the Minister what proposals are included in the lines to increase the level of expertise in the Data Processing Centre so that such a co-ordinated rationalised Government programme of computer installation could be undertaken.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member seeks to brush off the computer fiascos that occurred during the life of the previous Administration.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be surprised if one could find, in South Australia, instances of the massive waste of millions of dollars in relation to the provision of computing facilities similar to those revealed in the reports of the Public Accounts Committee recently in relation to the Flinders University. I remember the legislation considered in this House relating to the fiasco

of the Databet operations of the T.A.B. The previous Government's track record in relation to the provision of computing centres was appalling. There was an appalling waste of public funds in relation to Government computing services during the life of the previous Administration. The member for Elizabeth could not persuade me that the same sort of failures occurred in private industry. I know that problems occur in private industry with computers but I would be surprised if the honourable member could point to any other operation in South Australia in the private sector in which the sort of money involved in those losses could be pinpointed.

Regarding the line referred to, at present there are some vacancies in the staff allocation at the centre. Provision is made in this current Budget to fill those vacancies. Approvals have been gained for the filling of those vacancies, I understand, and suitable personnel are being sought to provide the service which the Government believes, as the previous Government believed, should be provided and which is necessary for the satisfactory operation of the A.D.P. Centre.

Mr. McRAE: I understand that the information I sought from the Deputy Premier earlier about the Data Processing Centre Division cannot be provided for a while. What really concerns me, however, is the question of the Chemistry Division, in which, on my calculations, about 40 or 50 people are employed. The impression I distinctly have is that, while the present Government may be reluctant to commit itself to the Data Processing Centre Division, it is far from committed to the Chemistry Division. On the basis of the problems experienced earlier tonight in obtaining clear information, I am now more than concerned. I appreciate the Deputy Premier's statement that not everything can be done overnight, although we are being asked to sit overnight, but I ask him to at least put these people out of their misery and give a firm deadline as to when the decision will be made. Surely he can say, for instance, that by 1 January next year a firm decision will be made on what will happen to this division of what appears to be an important Government department.

If he cannot do that, could he do it at least by 1 February or 1 March? Reverting to the Chemistry Division, will the Deputy Premier tell the Committee specifically when he will be able to undertake that this division will be implemented, or otherwise?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am prompted to make the first observation that we are sitting at this hour of the morning, because the new Opposition took an inordinately long time (a far longer time than that ever taken in the living memory of most members) to deal with the Premier's votes. The member for Playford should not whinge about having to sit into the morning. The Opposition knows that the Budget is being dealt with at a rather later time of the year than normal because of an early decision that it made. I do not apologise for sitting at this hour. If we are to make reasonable progress with the passage of the Budget, and the Opposition continues to ask the sorts of question it has asked of the Treasurer, it can expect to sit late.

Mr. McRae: It took us an hour.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Playford is trying to drum up a phoney situation in relation to the Chemistry Division by putting words into my mouth. The Government has no proposals at this time to make any alterations to the division.

Mr. TRAINER: Will any of the staff of the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division be assigned to the problem of computer crime, which is now significant? Indeed, such crimes and white-collar crimes seem to leave

bank robberies and the sort of things one sees on television as rather small game?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know which computer will be used, if at all, in the detection of white-collar crime, but I shall try to ascertain that for the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: A large actual payment of \$127 522 occurred last year for terminal leave payments in the office of the Director-General, resulting presumably from some circumstances either in that office or in the department generally, if those amounts were all charged to the office of the Director-General, as we have been informed in the case of certain other lines. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The increased terminal leave payments resulted from unforeseen voluntary retirement and the resignation of senior officers and staff. Obviously, there was a larger number of resignations and voluntary retirements than had been anticipated.

Mr. DUNCAN: Although I know that he will not have the information available, will the Deputy Premier obtain for me a list of all publications purchased on a subscription or regular basis by the office of the Minister and the office of the Director-General?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: All publications?

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes. I intend to ask this question of all Ministers. There is a considerable potential waste in Government departments, which are inclined to enter into contracts for the purchase on subscription of magazines, and so on. They go on for ever and a day without those subscriptions being cancelled. I think it is one of the duties of this Committee to look at such things.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be happy to supply that information. One magazine to which we will not be subscribing, as the previous Deputy Premier did, is the glossy publication of the former Government known as *Vantage*, because that is not to be continued.

Mr. TRAINER: Does the Government plan to go ahead with the Government computing centre in Wakefield Street, on the site of the old Menz biscuit building?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: A decision has not yet been made in relation to that matter.

Mr. PAYNE: A sum of \$45 000 is proposed this year for the purchase of motor vehicles, a substantial increase on the amount of \$22 504 paid last year. In view of some of the statements made by the new Government regarding economies in these areas, I should like to make the point—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Order! I suggest to the honourable member that a question has been asked regarding all motor vehicles within the department, and the Deputy Premier has said that he will bring down a report on that matter.

Mr. PAYNE: I am more concerned about the vehicles and the aspect I wish to pursue. Judging from some of the information supplied by the Deputy Premier, he has quite a reasonable brief, and it may save time and the additional expense involved in transferring this section back to the department. I am interested in the degree of detail he has been able to give in relation to other items.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will resume his seat. I said earlier that the Minister had been asked by the member for Elizabeth for details of all vehicles purchased or in operation within the department. I suggest that this question is a repetition of that previous question.

Mr. McRAE: In view of the Deputy Premier's comment in reply to the member for Ascot Park, I am growing alarmed about yet another division of Government

employees, namely, those involved in data processing. The Deputy Premier, as I understood him, said that no decision had been made to proceed with the data processing centre in Wakefield Street. The former Government, if I understand the position correctly, was committed to that centre.

It concerns me that there may be another contracting-out arrangement going on. We have seen the potentialities for that again, the Minister has dodged on the Chemistry Division. What is going to go on with the data processing centre? Will this be another wind-down and a handout to private industry?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Playford is trying desperately hard to whip up a phoney situation. The fact is that there is no proposal by the Government to consider winding down the A.D.P.

Mr. McRAE: How can the Deputy Premier reconcile that bland statement with his previous statement to this House that the Government is not permitted to proceed with the data processing centre in Wakefield Street, which had been committed by the previous Government?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not say that we would not proceed. I said that no decision had been made.

Mr. PAYNE: With your permission, Mr. Acting Chairman, I would like to again obtain from the Deputy Premier information on the number of vehicles it is proposed to purchase with the amount we are asked to vote on. The item I was speaking to was "Purchase of motor vehicles", and my understanding is that the previous member who had asked for detail on motor vehicles was for the total number of vehicles in the department in operation. I respectfully submit that the item I am speaking to is in that form—purchase of motor vehicles. I seek your ruling.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: My understanding (and I was in the Chamber and the honourable member was not), was that the honourable member from Elizabeth wanted to know the number of vehicles within the department and the number of new vehicles, but I am quite happy to let the member proceed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that it is a replacement programme.

Mr. KENEALLY: We were given some assurance that there would be no running down of the A.D.P. Centre or the Chemistry Division, accepting that, it appears that there might have been within these lines some political patronage to the Deputy Premier because of his exalted position in the Cabinet. Has there been sufficient allocation within the Department of Services and Supply to increase employment within that department, contrary to the policy of no growth within the Public Service?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The question is simply, "What is the Government's policy?" The previous Government had a policy in relation to staff ceilings and the policy of the present Government has been made quite clear.

Mr. HEMMINGS: On page 26, under "Congingencies—State Supply Division—Purchase of plant and equipment," I notice that in the 1978-79 Budget some \$21 000 was voted and actual payments were \$11 549. Going back to some of the replies that the Deputy Premier has given in respect of motor vehicle administration expenses, this Department of Services and Supply is an expanding department and an amalgamation of different departments and that has justified the increase of the vote for the 1979-80 Budget. It disturbs me that, in the purchase of plant and equipment for 1979-80, we are at \$12 000.

Mr. Mathwin: In motor vehicles you spent \$40 000 on plant.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I hope, Mr. Chairman, to receive

your protection. When the member for Glenelg was sitting in the exalted seat, he made sure that we on this side were not interjecting. I would have expected a little bit of protection from the Chair. Obviously the Deputy Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: I can assure the honourable member that the Chair will make sure that he is given all the protection that is necessary.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It seems to me that the figure of \$12 000 could be insufficient. I do not think the members on this side would like to see a situation where we vote a sum of \$12 000 and then find at the end of the financial year that the actual payments exceed that figure. Can the Deputy Premier give me some information on this sum?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Provision is made for the replacement of essential items of equipment associated with warehousing functions.

Mr. WRIGHT: I became alarmed by the Deputy Premier's answer to the member for Playford with regard to the continuation of project for the A.D.P. centre. The Deputy Premier said that the Government had made no firm commitment about the continuation of that programme.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He did not say that.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not need to be told what he said. When will the Government give a firm commitment about the continuation of this project, because I think it is very important to Government processes, to the people of South Australia, and to those who have to work under those conditions?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The matter is under active consideration at present.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Deputy Premier give the House some information as to when the decision will be made?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member wants some specific details, I suggest that he put the question on notice. If he wants me to get a report, I will do so. Opposition members try to put words into my mouth that I have not said. There has been no question of winding down the A.D.P. centre; all I have said is that the matter is under consideration, that planning is under way, and that a decision will be made I think in the reasonably near future.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Deputy Premier used the terminology, and I wrote it down this time—

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Chair protect me from the attacks of this person?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader will not direct the Chair on what course of action the chair will take. I can assure the Deputy Leader that all members will get a fair go.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish the Chair would stop that bully from attacking me. The Deputy Premier said it was under active consideration, so I assume that the government has looked at it closely. Is not proceeding with the A.D.P. Centre one of the cuts that the Government is considering to fulfil its promises?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No.

Mr. TRAINER: I am not sure that the Minister took my earlier question seriously or that he even understood it. Armed hold-ups normally involve between \$5 000 and \$7 000 per theft, whereas computer abuse concerning bank frauds and embezzlement average \$430 000 a case in the United States, and the largest one concerned Equity Funding Corporation and involved one billion dollars. Do the salaries cover anyone capable of providing professional expertise to legal authorities to assist them in

detecting computer crime and providing information on how to combat it?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have already told the honourable member that I will get a report on it.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Of the replacement vehicles to be purchased by the department, how many will run on l.p.g.?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will get the information for the honourable member. I would not think any.

Vote passed.

Deputy Premier, Miscellaneous, \$520 000.

Mr. BANNON: What is the composition of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Sector Supply Function for which \$22 000 has been allocated? Was it initiated by the previous Government? What is the time scale and what are the terms of reference under which it operates?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that the committee was set up during the life of the previous Administration. I have had discussions with the Director-General in relation to the committee. I am not aware of the personnel, but I can find that out for the honourable member. I understand the committee is to report within a matter of months, but I will make further inquiries.

Mr. DUNCAN: What are the titles of the official publications that we exchange with other countries for \$1 000 a year?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have no more information than is available on that line, but I will get it.

Mr. DUNCAN: In obtaining that information I ask that the Deputy Premier review whatever publications we do exchange, as \$1 000 seems to be a lot to be spent on exchanging publications with other countries. It rather reminds one of the exchanges that went on with school magazines and that sort of thing. I rather think that the type of exchanges entailed here involve the swapping of Government Gazettes and various Government publications with other countries in the English speaking world. I think that that is the sort of nice nostalgia that the public purse should not be forced to support. In particular, I think that some of the hidden costs involved in this would blow the figure out to a more substantial one than the \$1 000; that is probably merely an amount for subscriptions and that type of thing. Our publications are probably bundled up and sent off and labour expended doing that so there are costs which would raise the overall cost to a good deal more than \$1 000. I think, in the light of that, some consideration ought to be given to whether or not this line could not either be pared or removed altogether.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will certainly get the information for the honourable member. I welcome this new-found emphasis on the part of the honourable member on the saving of public funds.

Mr. KENEALLY: Undoubtedly the Deputy Premier has a nice neat little note typed giving him the reasons for the increased funding in the line involving the *Government Gazette*. I would not want to disappoint him by not asking a question about what caused the increase, because this might be one item that he might be able to answer.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is very charitable of the honourable member. I think that the present Opposition has been well served by the Premier and me, when I think of the answers that we got when in Opposition. That amount is to provide for the increased cost of printing.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Supplementary to the question asked by the member for Elizabeth, who wanted a list of official publications, could the Deputy Premier supply me with a

list of the countries to which those publications will be sent?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I hope the honourable member will not want a translation if the magazines are in a foreign language. I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. WRIGHT: I seek information about the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Sector Supply Function. Will the Deputy Premier give an assurance to the House, and therefore to the public of South Australia, that on receipt of the report from the inquiry he will make that report public?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The general policy of the present Administration is to make reports public. It will not be suppressing reports, as was the habit of the previous Administration when it thought it was politically expedient to suppress them. I think that the Deputy Leader appreciates that there is information in some reports which is confidential and which could be embarrassing if it were made public. I can think of a number of reports that I think the previous Government was probably justified in withholding, I cannot see any problem with this report, but I think that it would be unreasonable to ask for an unqualified assurance until we know the details in that report.

I can think of the example of the suppression of the Duncan report by the previous Government. I think, without having read that report, that there may have been good reasons for not publishing it, but I also know that there were other reports suppressed by the previous Government when it had an obligation to make those reports public. The general approach of this Government will be that, if there is no reason for confidentiality or no harm can be done to people by the publication of a report, then that report will be made public.

This is a report to government, not a public inquiry. The Deputy Leader should appreciate that each case must be treated on its merits. I do not think reports were treated on their merits by the previous Administration, but they will be by this Administration.

Mr. WRIGHT: I refute the allegation that the previous Government did not release and examine reports on their merit. If the Government continues its present form regarding the releasing of these reports (and the only one that is available is the Allert Report, and so far that has not been made public), the Government will be 100 per cent down. I suggest the Government give much stronger consideration to the releasing of this report than it has to the Allert Report.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the vote for the *Government Gazette* which, for this financial year, is \$497 000, a considerable amount of money. We are all aware that members of Parliament are allowed a certain number of copies to distribute to individual people within their electorate. Copies are also distributed to public libraries and local government authorities. Of the numbers of copies of the *Government Gazette* that are printed, how many are not disposed of and are reduced to pulp? We may be printing far too many copies, and we could save the cost of pulping them.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is indeed a strange observation. If that is happening it indicates some of the inefficiency of the previous Administration. I have never been given a *Government Gazette* since I have been in Parliament. I believe the honourable member is a little confused and may be thinking of the issues of *Hansard* that are made available to members. To my knowledge there is no automatic issue of *Government Gazettes* to members of Parliament. If members want access to the *Government Gazette* they must get it themselves, unless private arrangements were made for some members of the Opposition, when it was in Government, to be supplied with it, but those arrangements were not made for members on this side of the House. I do not know whether the *Government Gazette* is over-printed or whether a surplus is pulped. I find it hard to believe that that would happen, but I am quite happy to find out for the honourable member and let him know.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe the Deputy Premier gave a general answer about the vote for the *Government Gazette*. The information I seek refers to the increased amount shown as a vote for this financial year. Where does the greatest amount of that increase actually occur: is it in the printing or in the supply of the paper?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The only information I have is that the increased cost of the *Gazette* is caused because it costs more to print. I will see whether the Government Printer, Mr. Woolman, can supply a breakdown of printing costs.

Vote passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.54 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 October at 2 p.m.