

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 November 1979

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

PYAP IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 144 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs. Goldsworthy and Billard.

Petitions received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

In reply to **Dr. BILLARD** (31 October).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: Planning for the Golden Grove development is only in its early stages and no firm commitments on the overall level of activity or on the trust's role in the area can be given. The former Minister for Planning, Mr. Hudson, stated publicly on several occasions that ultimately trust housing would form about 20 per cent of the total residential development. In reaching its operational decisions on the level of development in any area, in any particular year, the trust, subject to the availability of funds, would rely on the real demand for housing expressed by its client group who indicate a preference for living in the area. An objective of the trust is to try to provide its client group with the maximum practical choice of housing locations. The increased emphasis on inner and central metropolitan locations, referred to in the trust's annual report, is one means of increasing this range of choice. This may in turn enable prospective users of trust housing to optimise social and economic costs incurred in living in any particular location.

QUESTION TIME

FOOTBALL PARK

Mr. BANNON: Will the Government be making a further decision on the Football Park lighting issue and, bearing in mind the financial implications of the vacillation that is occurring, when will that decision be made? Prior to the election, the candidate for the Liberal Party in the area of Albert Park claimed that the lights would not go ahead if a Liberal Government was elected. Following the election, the Minister of Marine sent to the parties, on 5 October, a letter backing away from that

position and raising certain points that were to be the subject of negotiation. On Tuesday 23 October in this House, in answer to a question from the member for Henley Beach, the Minister of Recreation and Sport advised the House that a decision had been made in the following terms (and I quote from *Hansard* at page 257):

After further negotiations with the South Australian Football League and West Lakes Limited, the Government has decided (and the South Australian National Football League has agreed) to accept all of the recommendations of the Royal Commission except one.

That one was the recommendation to do with the intensity of the lights. The Minister concluded his statement by saying:

However, all of the other recommendations of the Royal Commission will be instituted, including the restriction on the number of nights per year—25—on which the football league may hold night functions at Football Park.

A day later, after that firm decision had been announced, the Premier entered the arena and said that further negotiations should be conducted between interested parties and ordered the Minister of Recreation and Sport, in his absence interstate, and the Minister of Marine to commence those negotiations on the following Friday. The negotiations have taken a course which has been detailed and recorded in the press since then and which can be said at the least to be inconclusive and at the most to be farcical.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting now.

Mr. BANNON: When will the Government be making a further decision?

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I am not aware of whatever statement the candidate for the local area made during the election campaign. Presumably, he was speaking for himself in his opposition to the lights in total. It was not Liberal Party Policy, as stated at the time of the election. I believe that it is a great credit to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, in particular, that he has been able to get the parties to this whole business around the conference table for the first time in 12 months to try to talk about it and, at least, to give people, even a minority group (and I know that the member for Elizabeth does not care much for minority groups), an opportunity to put forward a point of view. I believe that that is the essence of democracy. Those consultations are still occurring and, while they are going on, I do not intend to make any further statement about it. A decision will be made in due course.

URANIUM

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy reconsider his decision not to table the revised edition of the report "Hazards of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle" dated January 1979?

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: In the interests of establishing the facts on this matter, I called up the relevant files from the Premier's Department. I will now relate, in chronological order, the history of this report.

I refer first, to a memorandum dated 16 November 1976 from the Head of the Policy Division, Mr. B. Guerin, to the former Premier. It canvassed how the Policy Division should approach the matter of investigating fundamental aspects of safety connected with uranium enrichment and subsequent processes. Two alternatives were offered.

Mr. Guerin suggested that, if the end product was to provide information for the Premier's own use, or the private use of the Government, the Policy Division was

capable of that task. However, if it was to be a "technically authoritative public document", then Mr. Guerin felt it would lack public legitimacy. Just to emphasise that point, Mr. Guerin questioned in his advice whether the Policy Division was capable of producing a "technically authoritative public document."

Mr. Guerin sought direction from the Premier and offered two procedures and in either he sought approval for "discreet consultation" with appropriate persons. The Premier decided to ask the Policy Division to undertake an unpublished detailed examination of aspects of safety associated with uranium enrichment and subsequent processes. It was to be a report that only the Government would see, based on discreet consultation with whom we know not.

The report was the basis of the motion debated by this House on 30 March—a report, I again emphasise, prepared by a body that considered itself unfit to prepare "a technically authoritative public document". The Department of Mines and Energy was subsequently asked for its opinion, and in a general statement described the Policy Division report as "seriously deficient in a number of important aspects".

Mr. Payne: What date was that?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: 1976. In a memorandum to the former Minister of Mines and Energy dated 15 June 1977, the former Premier asked that officers of the Policy Division and the Department of Mines examine the report.

He rejected the Minister's suggestion that the Uranium Enrichment Committee undertake this review. He also asked officers of the Department of Mines to give officers of the Policy Division full assistance in the work.

In due course, it was decided that the review should concentrate on the two matters of waste disposal and international safeguards and that the review of the Policy Division report "Hazards of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle" should be deferred until this was completed. However, uncertainty developed between the Policy Division and the Department of Mines on how their joint work should proceed. For example, a meeting was arranged with the Atomic Energy Commission following a request from the former Premier to the Prime Minister.

A memorandum to the Director of Mines from the Government-appointed consultant on uranium mining and development, Mr. S. B. Dickinson, dated 20 December 1977, stated:

The uncertainty as to the procedures now to be taken in the examination of the Policy Division report is accentuated by the recent action taken by the Policy Division in having discussions with the Australian Atomic Energy Commission in Sydney without informing the Mines Department or asking for Mines Department representatives to attend the meeting when it was known to Bob Smith (an officer of the Policy Division) that the Atomic Energy Commission had expected full South Australian representation at such discussions on highly technical matters.

Mr. Dickinson reported that the meeting "caused considerable confusion in the minds of the senior commission officers attending, who had been assembled at some inconvenience to discuss highly involved technical data. At the meeting, and in communications thereafter, the commission officers made the plea that future meetings needed people experienced and knowledgeable in the technological field as well as in commercial and operational activities in order that the best results could accrue to both State and Commonwealth interests."

One can only surmise on the Atomic Energy Commission's attitude to South Australia when, at the request of the Prime Minister, it is asked to have

discussions with officers who do not consider themselves capable of producing a "technically authoritative public document". Nevertheless, the surreptitious approach of the Policy Division to this matter did not end there. In a minute dated 3 April 1978, Mr. Guerin recommended to the Premier that he engage Professor C. Kerr, Professor of Preventive and Social Medicine at the University of Sydney, to provide the South Australian Government with informed and independent comment on work being done with the Government on uranium issues. I am informed that Professor Kerr is rather less than independent on this issue. In fact, he is decidedly anti-nuclear.

Professor Kerr proceeded to consider updating the report "Hazards of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle" independently of the joint work being done by the Policy Division and the Department of Mines and Energy. Officers of the department were never made aware of the specific task given Professor Kerr. Indeed, efforts were made to deliberately conceal his work.

In a memorandum to the former Premier dated 21 November 1978, Dr. Smith of the Policy Division recommended that the Minister of Mines and Energy be invited to comment on notes prepared by Professor Kerr critical of Department of Mines and Energy reporting on waste disposal management. That memorandum recommended that Professor Kerr's notes should not be attributed to him at this stage.

By January 1979, the Government had been presented with three reports; two of them were the result of the joint Policy Division, Department of Mines and Energy work. I tabled them in this House on Tuesday. The third was the revision of the report "Hazards of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle", prepared, as I have outlined quite surreptitiously, without the knowledge of, or input by, the Department of Mines and Energy or the experts retained by the former Government to advise it on uranium matters generally.

They had been under the impression, until this report was leaked initially to the *Advertiser* and to the other media yesterday, that they would be asked to further consider it in the light of their reports on waste disposal and safeguards. It must now be obvious to members why I will not table this report. Most of it was prepared by the Policy Division of the Premier's Department which, on the admission of its head, was incapable of producing a "technically authoritative public document". Need I say more?

I would add only that, during my perusal of the files on these reports, I noted some criticism of the former Premier following a question I asked in this House on 3 August 1978. In his reply, no doubt based on advice from the Policy Division, he criticised work on waste disposal being undertaken by Professor A. E. Ringwood at the Australian National University. A memorandum of 14 August 1978 notes that Professor Ringwood complained about the former Premier's remarks. The memorandum went on:

He expressed concern that you be provided with adequate advice on nuclear matters and expressed his willingness to explain to you personally his views on waste management and other aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle.

Had the former Premier heeded such advice, there would have been no need for me to make this reply today.

I have put the facts before the House because I am not prepared to table a report which was prepared by a body which, on its own admission, was not competent to prepare such a report, and did not undertake its inquiries in an unbiased and comprehensive manner, including the input of acknowledged experts in the field of uranium technology, and the bulk of which has been adjudged to be out of date by the expert opinion not earlier sought.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say whether he has had an opportunity to view the film on industrial democracy produced by the South Australian Film Corporation? Is it true that the Premier has ordered the confiscation of all copies of that film and has instructed that it should not be shown, publicly or otherwise? The film, produced by Lesley Hammond of the South Australian Film Corporation, was a light-hearted "soft sell" of employee participation and was not in any way a political exposition of the worker participation policies of the former Labor Government and the Federal Liberal Government. The film cost \$40 000 and utilised a number of South Australian artists. Will these talents and public funds be wasted as a consequence of the Premier's decision?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answers to the two questions asked by the Deputy Leader are "Yes" and "No".

PLUTONIUM

Mr. DUNCAN: I address my question to the Minister with the yawning credibility gap, the Deputy Premier.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Elizabeth please restate the question?

Mr. DUNCAN: I address my question to the Minister with the yawning credibility gap, the Deputy Leader of the Government.

The SPEAKER: That is an unnecessary way in which to preface a question.

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Minister say whether the Department of Mines and Energy undertook drilling at Maralinga to check on the whereabouts and composition of waste containing dangerous particle plutonium? Was the drilling successful; if so, were the drill cores, or some of them, from this drilling brought to Adelaide and placed in the Mines Department core library, at Conyngham Street, Glenside? I understand that drill cores containing particles of plutonium were shipped from Maralinga to Adelaide and were put into the core library of the Department of Mines and Energy, at Conyngham Street, Glenside, which, as members will know, is in the middle of a residential area represented in this House by the Premier. I understand that the situation, which I believe to be most serious, was that the cores stayed there for some time. Library personnel were not advised that the cores, or some of them, contained particle plutonium.

It was only after some months that the library staff became aware of this when a routine request was received from Lucas Heights directing that the cores should be forwarded to Lucas Heights at the earliest possible time. It is a most serious matter that plutonium apparently can be stored in a residential area. I am interested to know whether the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Australian Atomic Energy Commission were informed that material containing deadly particle plutonium was stored in an urban residential area. In particular, the fact that this has apparently happened is an incredible reflection—

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

Mr. DUNCAN:—on the ability of the Mines Department to have any useful comment to make on the question of safety. I seek this information because I believe that the fact that plutonium apparently has been stored in the Adelaide metropolitan area for a period of some months is a matter of grave public concern. This matter came to light as a result—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat. I warned the honourable member that he was debating the question. He ignored that advice from the Chair. If he proceeds in that manner again, leave will be withdrawn.

Mr. DUNCAN: This matter came to light as a result of information I received from the Health Department, which was apparently requested to urgently undertake some investigations to check on the levels of radioactivity resulting from the particle plutonium which, apparently, was in these drill cores.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Not to my knowledge, but I will get a report from my officers. It is fairly obvious to me that the member for Elizabeth (whose credibility rating I will not discuss) is trying to create a scare situation. He is also reflecting adversely on officers of the Mines Department, who are recognised around Australia as probably the most competent in the Commonwealth.

CONTAINER MOVEMENTS

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Minister of Transport initiate an investigation by his department into the time taken to move containers from the port of Melbourne to Adelaide by rail with a view to isolating the problems and streamlining the current inadequate service? All members would be aware that ships, in the main, by-pass Adelaide and berth in the port of Melbourne. The average time to move a container to Adelaide after it has been unloaded from a ship in Melbourne is approximately three weeks. Once a container has been loaded on to a train it is only an overnight trip from Melbourne to Adelaide. Shipping agents have told me that the railways are claiming that insufficient flat-tops are available. When one approaches the railways one finds that that is not the case. For example, the *M.V. Helene* unloaded in Melbourne on 8 October. The containers turned up in Adelaide on 29 October, which means that they left Melbourne on 28 October. Last Friday I raised this matter with the Federal Minister of Productivity, the Hon. Ian Macphee, whose portfolio includes the free movement of containers between the States. He clearly intimated to me the problem was peculiar to Victoria and South Australia and would have to be resolved at governmental level.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I was not aware of this problem. I thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to my attention because if there is a three-week delay in bringing containers across from Melbourne that is serious indeed. I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated, but it will be necessary to consult with Australian National Railways and the Victorian Government. I will see that that is proceeded with forthwith.

JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Dr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Education had discussions with the Junior Primary Teachers Association about the disestablishment of junior primary schools, either prior to his decision to disestablish three such schools as at the beginning of the next school year, or since that decision? A week or so ago, I put on notice the following question:

Which junior primary schools will be disestablished at the end of the current school year?

The Minister replied:

Three junior primary schools will be disestablished, those at Mitchell Park, Le Fevre Peninsula and Taperoo. Detailed discussions have been held with school councils and the position is accepted.

I would like to say something about the history of this matter. Much earlier this year I was quizzed by people in the profession, particularly by members of the Junior Primary Teachers Association, about the possible disestablishment of anything up to 19 junior primary schools. This arose from the fact that it was generally accepted by many people that the threshold level of enrolments below which a junior primary school should be disestablished was about 150, and in fact 19 such schools were very close to being below that threshold level. I had detailed discussions with senior officers of the department and it was indicated that in fact no decision had been taken to disestablish any junior primary schools at the beginning of 1980.

As the then Minister, I took that further and gave a guarantee to my inquirers, including the Junior Primary Teachers Association, that in fact no junior primary schools would be disestablished. Some time after—the date can be ascertained because it was the night of the blackout—I spoke to a meeting of the Junior Primary Teachers Association at the Gilles Street Primary School, and I specifically raised this matter and gave an undertaking that disestablishment would not occur at the end of this year. More recently, during the election campaign, I became aware of the fact that there was still an ambition on the part of some departmental officers to undertake certain disestablishment, and again I gave a guarantee to those who inquired that there would be no disestablishment.

In view of what has been put to me, namely, the concern of the junior primary school teachers about the withering of promotion positions as a result of such disestablishment, I imagine that possibly the members of that association are feeling a little sore about this matter. It has also been put to me that nobody can ever hold a Minister to commitments that were made by his predecessor, but one perhaps would have thought that the Minister might have checked the situation out more carefully, if only—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is now commenting.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I am sorry, Sir. It has been put to me that the Minister might have checked the matter out more carefully, if only to avoid at least some mild disputation on the matter.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As I understood the situation, there were in fact five applicants for disestablishment of junior primary schools before the former Minister of Education some time before the election. On the advice of departmental officers, I was assured that serious objections were raised to two of these disestablishments and those two schools were removed from the list, but the other three have gone ahead, after consultation with the people most concerned. I have at no time received any representation from the Junior Primary Principals Association, or indeed from any other educational body connected with junior primary schools. It is rather interesting to note that, contained in that file, there was no reference at all from the previous Minister that he had in fact entered into any discussions. There was no docket relating to any discussions or any promises attached to that file, and I am wondering whether the Minister did put any documentary statement with the file which should have been done, or whether in fact the matter was treated quite separately and removed from the office—I just don't know.

Dr. Hopgood: My former secretary could have told you.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, it certainly should have come through with the relevant dockets. Surely, no secretary worth his salt would have removed any relevant material, so the reference to a previous secretary by the honourable member is not relevant to the argument. Dockets come through in their entirety. I make a small issue of this, Mr. Speaker, because there is at least one other relatively important document which I have not been able to trace from the Education Department.

SEAFORTH CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Health ask the Minister of Community Welfare to investigate the future financing of the Seaforth Community Centre at Brighton, which is sponsored by the Brighton Lions Club, together with the Glenelg and Brighton councils? The involvement of the councils in the management of the home is in question and problems are also associated with the financing of it. This successfully run centre caters for many groups and activities, including handicraft classes for elderly people, art groups, training for unemployed young people, social groups catering for all ages, and the Little Patch Theatre, which will be moving into the centre. Will the Minister investigate the situation?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I will ask my colleague in another place to investigate the matter and bring down a report.

PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. PLUNKETT: Will the Premier assure all persons employed by the Government that they are free to exercise their democratic right to take part in peaceful protest rallies and marches in support of issues which run contrary to the Government's stated policies? Members of the Opposition have become aware recently that a number of conscientious public servants decided not to take part in last weekend's anti-uranium rally and march because they feared that their names would be noted and their advancement in the Public Service retarded.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I appreciate the concern of the honourable member in this matter. The Government has no restrictions whatever on members of the Public Service taking part in any activity which is lawful and which is properly organised according to the requirements of the law and the by-laws of the City of Adelaide.

CRYSTAL BROOK RAILWAY

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Transport comment on any negotiations that he has had recently in relation to the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line? On the first day that you, Mr. Speaker, and I sat in this Chamber legislation was passed approving an agreement between the Hall Government and the Commonwealth Government in relation to this matter. However, during the following nine years of the Labor Administration it would appear that little, if anything, has transpired. In view of the fact that the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standardisation will have an effect on the operations of the bogie exchange at Peterborough, I seek from the Minister information so that I can inform my constituents properly. Having taken an interest in this matter, I am aware of the need for this project to proceed as rapidly as possible, but it is also important that those people who will be affected are given due notice.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I appreciate the concern of the honourable member for the citizens of Peterborough because, if another standardisation agreement is signed and the line is standardised, negotiations will have to be made on behalf of the State for the protection of those people.

Regarding the honourable member's question, this was one of the matters I canvassed with Mr. Peter Nixon in Canberra on Thursday last. I am extremely hopeful following the discussions I have had with him; I found the Minister very receptive. I put to him that it was the policy of the Liberal Party before the election of 15 September that this standardisation would be of major benefit to the State and that it should proceed at the greatest possible speed. I found, as I said, that the Minister was extremely receptive. I am expecting further negotiations to continue with him soon, and I expect an announcement within a few months.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education ask the Attorney-General whether the Government intends to give assistance to small business by legislating for business lease rental based on agreement between the landlord and tenant, rather than a percentage gain on turnover? The Minister may be aware that the previous Labor Government tried to achieve this aim by introducing the Contracts Review Bill, which, unfortunately, was not passed by the Legislative Council. Because small business operators are still experiencing difficulties (and I remind the Minister that his Government is supposed to be looking after their interests), and because of their growing need for relief, I should be grateful if the Attorney-General would consider reintroducing that Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will seek a full report from the Attorney-General, and bring it down to the honourable member in due course.

RAINWATER TANKS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether the Government has any present plans to encourage the installation of rainwater tanks within the metropolitan area and outside it as a water-conservation measure? All members no doubt appreciate that, at present, the water shortage is not a great problem, but now is the time to act if we are to avoid shortages during summer periods in future. As most country people are obligated to provide their own household water storages, it seems appropriate that metropolitan people should be encouraged to do the same.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Government intends to embark on a water-conservation programme and to highlight, wherever possible, to the people of South Australia that the need to conserve water is of the utmost importance to this State. I believe it important not only in rural areas but also in the metropolitan area and, although the cost of the storing of water in rainwater tanks is significantly higher than the cost of water through the mains, a real psychological benefit is involved in encouraging people to install tanks, not only because of the water they save and conserve, but also because of their real involvement in the water-conservation programme. As the Engineering and Water Supply Department is examining the matter at present, I expect a submission to be made to me soon on this very subject.

URANIUM

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government will give an unequivocal assurance that a uranium enrichment plant will not be built near a residential area unless such a project has the support of the people living within that area? There has been much publicity over the past few years about the possibility that a uranium plant will be built at Port Pirie, and I quote from the *Port Pirie Recorder* of Friday 26 October as follows:

Half of the female population of Port Pirie do not want to see a uranium enrichment plant built in the area. This has been revealed in a community evaluation study carried out recently by marketing, market research and training consultants, Peter Gardner and Associates, of Adelaide.

Looking at the total results of the survey, there are more people against the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant than there are for it. Males are more favourably inclined to support the concept. Only 37 per cent of the total population is in support of it, with 51 per cent of those being males and 25 per cent females.

The disapproval figures show a percentage of 44, with only 35 per cent of that number being men. Women against totalled 51 per cent. Nineteen per cent of Port Pirie people interviewed said they were not sure about the matter, with 14 per cent of these being men and 24 per cent women.

The question asked of over 300 households in the city was "If uranium were to be mined at Roxby Downs, in the north of the State, would you approve or disapprove of a uranium enrichment plant in your area?" Officially, the survey said males were more favourably inclined to support the project. "Maybe they are looking at the materialistic view of employment while women are looking at the social implications," an official from the research company said.

In the same survey, a 68 per cent support for the building of a petro-chemical works at Redcliff was shown by Port Pirie people. Seventy-six per cent of these were males and 61 per cent females.

The official wording from the survey team was that people in Port Pirie were, generally, more than favourably inclined towards a petro-chemical works at Redcliff. "We don't know why they made the decision—but it does have public support from an area which will be affected." Sixteen per cent of people interviewed disapproved of the petro-chemical works, while a similar percentage were not sure of their feelings.

The result of the survey shows that the Government should put more effort into obtaining a petro-chemical plant for the area and less in promoting—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not comment.

Mr. KENEALLY:—a uranium enrichment plant in a city that does not want it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The plant will not be built without community support. It is interesting to note that the Mayor is in favour of the proposal. I think a letter came from the Port Pirie council some time ago supporting the project.

WORD PROCESSING MACHINES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Education inform the House of the number of word processors installed in the educational establishments and also other technological advances in hardware and the number of jobs that have been absorbed by such innovative changes over the past five years? A great deal has been said about the number of jobs lost through the move into the

technological age, and much speculation has been aired about the causes. Some people are of the belief that this problem is not new—in fact, the previous Government is just as responsible for many of the lost job opportunities within the Public Service because of its acceptance of the change of labour intensive work as opposed to that being done by sophisticated hardware. Will the Minister supply the department's calculation of the number of jobs that have been absorbed by such hardware?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This matter has concerned me, particularly over the past few weeks. On my floor in the Education Department is a word processor, and I believe that two word processors have been in use within the head office over the past 12 months. Prior to that, no technological equipment of this type was in use, so that would take into account the preceding four years. One of those two word processors has, in fact, been returned to the manufacturer because it was not suitable, and the purchase of another machine is currently being negotiated. I know that no staff has been put off from the Education Department as a result of this equipment, but certainly there would be little doubt that the quality and quantity of output in the Education Department in relation to repetitive typed letters would be greatly improved. Also, some of the onerous work imposed on the existing staff would have been lessened.

In the Department of Further Education there is one word processor in the head office, and I believe the open college has another sophisticated word processor which it uses to type out project material for students across the State. There again, I have been assured that no staff have been put off, but that the quantity of work which could be produced in future will have been increased, and therefore one would assume that fewer staff would need to be taken on in future.

One other branch of technology which the Education Department has adopted is in the field of libraries, where we have a microfiche reader issued to almost every school in the State, and the processing equipment is located in the Libraries Branch, so that cataloguing and classification of books can be done at head office, with details being sent out on the microfiche. This would save labour in the field in cataloguing and classification of books in primary and secondary schools. Other than that, I am not aware of any technology which has displaced staff.

WEST LAKES BOULEVARD

Mr. HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the intention of the Government in relation to the use of properties purchased by the previous Government for the proposed extension of West Lakes Boulevard to Port Road, at Cheltenham? As most honourable members would be aware, the previous Government intended, as I understand it, to extend West Lakes Boulevard to Port Road, but, because of the reaction of the residents in the area, the proposal did not go ahead. If the extension of West Lakes Boulevard is not to go ahead, will the people whose properties were purchased by the Government be given the opportunity to repurchase them?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member is quite right. There was a proposal to push through the extension of West Lakes Boulevard. The matter has been brought to my attention, but I have not yet given it any consideration.

SHEIDOW PARK TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Transport inform the residents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park when the

illuminatory lights will be erected at the intersection of Adams Road and Lonsdale Road, Sheidow Park? This intersection has been a matter of contention for some time, and negotiations have taken place between Marion council and the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The community council of Sheidow Park was able to bring negotiations almost to finality, only to find that the intersection had been taken over by the Highways Department as part of the extension of the Lonsdale Road and Brighton Road link. The community is anxious to have the safety aspect of this road improved, and is seeking the illumination of the intersection.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the intersection should be illuminated within six months.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether he and the State Government support the proposal of the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, Mr. Viner, on the new school-work transition policy, which would eliminate unemployment benefits to persons aged from 15 to 19 years? A good deal of publicity has been given this policy recently. The matter was considered by the A.C.T.U. executive, and I refer to a report in today's *News*, as follows:

The executive said it was totally opposed to any move to abolish unemployment benefits for young people in the 15-19 years age bracket and force them to rely on their families for upkeep.

This move would obviously hit the poorest families the hardest and lead to further alienation among young people, the executive said.

The executive said it also believed the Government's apparent unwillingness to initiate a job creation scheme in the public sector would seriously jeopardise the effectiveness of any programme of transition from school to work.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, let me say that there is a problem in our community which needs to be looked at, that is, the ability of people who leave school to be able to get jobs and whether they are suitable to take up employment in existing employment opportunities. I think that there is a growing gap between the type of person turned out by the schools within the education given by the schools and the type of person required by employers. Unless this is resolved, I believe that the unemployment problem will continue to expand. I am pleased to hear that the South Australian Education Department has been specifically considering this matter. A meeting of headmasters last Monday discussed the type of education given to people in secondary schools compared to the job requirements of employers. I am not aware of the Federal Minister's specific statement referred to by the honourable member. If the honourable member will send me a copy, I will examine it and answer any queries that he has.

CEREAL CROPS

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what is the anticipated cereal crop forecast prepared by the Department of Agriculture for this season? As the economy as a whole is reliant on a buoyant rural sector, it is important to understand clearly the future prospects and growth potentials in this sector. There were good falls of rain across the State in early October, and we saw another kick-start to the economy on 15 September. The country looks in good heart, and a second good rural year in a row will do much to boost the economy as a whole in South Australia.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: This little exercise demonstrates how important it is to plan things. Whilst the Government can hardly take credit for the seasonal conditions that have caused what appears to be yet another record season in the rural area, I thank the member for Rocky River for raising this matter. It is true that there were particularly good rains in October, and the favourable weather conditions during the latter half of the month have further boosted crop yield potential. The Department of Agriculture has forecast a record cereal harvest, as I do. Given average seasonal conditions from now on, the total yield from wheat, barley and oats is expected to be 3 738 000 tonnes, and that is marginally better than last year's total of 3 717 000 tonnes, which in itself was a record. The wheat yield is estimated at a little under 2 000 000 tonnes, the barley yield at a little over 1 500 000 tonnes and oats are estimated to return about 250 000 tonnes.

One pleasing feature of the cereal crop is that it is good right across the State this year. Crops are even and, apart from those few crops hit by disease, should yield above average in all areas. Rust in wheat is much more widespread across the northern Mallee than was thought earlier. Infestations are not generally severe but some crops could suffer up to 75 per cent loss in the field. The Halberd strain, in particular, is the worst affected by this. The root disease "hay die", which has developed in the Upper and Eastern Eyre Peninsula and at the top of Yorke Peninsula, is expected to cause some loss in yield in those areas.

Minor crops are also looking good. Apart from the fairly heavy infestation of black spot in field peas in some areas, all minor crops continue to do well. Record crops of peas and oil seed rape are forecast. Pastures, particularly in recent weeks, have developed beyond earlier forecasts this year and, indeed, have generally made exceptional growth over the past month. In many situations they have recovered from the effects of the aphids that were attacking those pastures. Adequate carry-on pasture residue is now assured for livestock requirements across the State. Some hay making pastures in the earlier districts were severely affected by rain earlier in the month, but with improved conditions later in October hay making is progressing satisfactorily in all of those areas of need.

Part of the reply that I propose to give the member for Rocky River is of a strictly statistical nature. It refers to the estimated tonnages for the respective grains grown in the State this year as against the listed tonnages of last year. I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Crop area and production forecasts

Crop	Estimated area		Estimated production	
	'000 ha		'000 tonnes	
	(1978 in brackets)		(1978 in brackets)	
Wheat	1 381	(1 200)	1 975	(2 050)
Barley	1 010	(1 100)	1 538	(1 443)
Oats	181	(213)	225	(224)
Ryecorn	18	(38)	7.1	(18)
Peas	26	(18)	34.8	(27)
Lupins	13.4	(12)	15.9	(12)
Linseed	3.1	(2.7)	3.2	(2.5)
Rapeseed	13.1	(9)	16.4	(8.5)
Safflower	1	(0.7)	0.9	(0.6)
Lentils	0.16	(0.2)	0.14	(0.2)
Sunflower	10.2	(14)	10.2	(11)
Triticale	1.2	(—)	1.1	(—)

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The forecast by the department could mean an increase from cereals of \$410 000 000. Most of this will be spent within South Australia, bringing benefits not only to the rural area but also to the metropolitan area through increased demands for goods and services. This is the second record season in a row that South Australia has enjoyed, and many farmers who were carrying big debts until recent times now have an opportunity to whittle these down to some degree, and this means that they will have more money to spend on goods and services, machinery, farm improvement materials, and so on. We anticipate that this rather tremendous season being enjoyed by farmers at the moment will have a most desirable effect over the whole of the State.

This is the third season in which the total cereal crop was expected to be more than 3 000 000 tonnes. It exceeded this figure in 1968 and again last year. The increase in the total harvest had resulted from an increase in the area sown to 2 580 000 hectares this season, compared to an average of 1 970 000 hectares over the past 10 years. Other influences have been the use of improved varieties, particularly clipper barley, use of pre-emergent weedicides, and good seasonal conditions for the past two years. The increase in the area sown to cereals, which has been due principally to the rise in barley acreage this season, is to 1 018 000 hectares, compared to an average of 764 000 hectares over the past 10 years.

FOOTBALL PARK

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Premier say whether it is a fact that a decision that is yet to be made regarding the installation of lights at Football Park will be influenced by the attitude of the West Lakes sub-branch of the Liberal Party, as its attitude means "lights not on at Football Park"? I raise this matter because three prominent members of the West Lakes sub-branch of the Liberal Party resigned to counter the installation of the lights. Even the Liberal candidate for the district campaigned and advertised against the lights at West Lakes. From press articles it is obvious what is happening.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Perhaps the member for Unley was not in the Chamber when his Leader asked a similar question earlier. Negotiations that are going on involve all sections of the community, including local government and people who are concerned with the area. I notice that the honourable member has made some comment about the Liberal Party branch and that three office holders have left the branch. I understand they have now rejoined the branch because the Government has taken the very responsible step to enable all minority groups associated with the matter to have an opportunity to put forward a point of view, something which the previous Government just had not bothered to do.

BETTING CONTROL BOARD

Mr. BECKER: I was going to ask my question of the member for Mitcham, but he is not here. He has been here for only six minutes in the last two days.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. BECKER: Therefore, I will have to ask my question of the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I definitely prefer the Minister of Recreation and Sport to the member for Mitcham, because the Minister is always here.

Mr. Mathwin: He's not as hairy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order. The honourable member for Hanson will resume his seat. No member in any part of the House will make a mockery of Question Time as is apparent from the activities of the member for Hanson and the member for Glenelg at this time. The honourable member has sought leave to ask a question of the honourable Minister of Recreation and Sport and I ask him to direct it to the Minister.

Mr. BECKER: I am not making a mockery of Question Time. A member can ask—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will decide. Either the honourable member will ask a question of the Minister of Recreation and Sport or leave to ask the question will be withdrawn.

Mr. BECKER: I ask the question of the Minister: what action is the Government taking to fill the two vacancies on the Betting Control Board? I understand that there are two vacancies on the board following the election of the member for Peake to State Parliament. Several bookmakers have expressed concern for a considerable time that, because of the vacancies, appointments that are considered necessary could be delayed. Many bookmakers who are licensed to operate in the Derby desire to nominate for concessions in the Grandstand ring, and they are anxious to know what action has been taken in this regard.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, there are two vacancies on the Betting Control Board, and I expect to be putting a recommendation to Cabinet within 10 days as to the replacements. One of the reasons for the delay in doing this is finding the type of person for appointment on the Betting Control Board who would have the confidence of not only the bookmakers but also the racing industry and sporting public at large.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. McRAE: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask it with the respect appropriate to your high office. In my capacity as member assisting the Opposition Whip it has come to my attention that a number of questions were sought to be put on notice by various members of my Party to a number of Government Ministers, I think, in fact, every Government Minister, although I cannot give you a complete assurance about that. Certainly, I have eight Questions on Notice here, and I can only assume that the intent was to put a Question on Notice to every Minister. The question was:

(1) In what public or private companies does the Minister own shares?

(2) Of what public or private companies is the Minister a director?

Why did you disallow those questions? With respect, I appreciate that Standing Orders of this House do not specifically deal with such matters one way or the other, and I also appreciate that in those circumstances. You must turn to precedents of your predecessors or to Erskine May to determine practice in the House of Commons. The information that the Opposition sought to obtain was information in the public interest. It was not an expedition which was designed as a vicious attack on any particular person; it was directed to every Minister (at least that was the intent). There was no attack involved. I am trying to differentiate between those parts of Standing Orders and

Erskine May which make it clear that we must not use Question Time as a personal smear endeavour.

There appear to be two types of ruling. One says that a member can ask the Minister of Mines and Energy (I take that as one example, without any reflection on that honourable gentleman at all) what shares he might have in, say, Western Mining Company and make that question relevant because, if, for instance, we would know from the other activities in the House that Western Mining Company is involved in an important venture in this State, the precedent appears to be that that question would be allowed. Yet, if a member asked the same question of the Minister of Agriculture (I am careful to make no reflection on that gentleman at all), namely, whether he had any shares in Western Mining Company it might be that that question would not be relevant, the argument being put that that honourable gentleman is not involved in that Ministerial portfolio. The Opposition wishes to make the point that a system of responsible Government and Cabinet decision-making, where every decision on important areas is made, or should be made, by the Cabinet *in toto* (and even if it is not the Cabinet is responsible for it as a body), must necessarily involve, in our respectful submission, the need for the public to be reassured as to the activities by way of company holdings or other interests of all Cabinet Ministers. I seek your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I accept that question and the degree of explanation which was given by the honourable member because I believe it is a serious question which requires proper consideration of this House. The House has no Standing Order relating to the admissibility of questions directed to Ministers. Therefore we immediately go to the practice of the House of Commons as set out in Erskine May. The 19th Edition makes quite clear that:

A question may not be asked which deals with the action of a Minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament.

In my opinion the question submitted to me asked for details for which those Ministers are not responsible to the House. It may also give the Clerks at the Table the power to sub-edit questions and the Speaker power to withhold from publication on the Notice Paper any question which is wholly out of order. The current practice in the House of Commons is as follows (p. 372 of May):

The usual practice has been stated by Mr. Speaker as follows: If the Clerk at the Table decides that a motion or question should be withheld, he informs the member concerned. If the member does not accept that view, he should ask for the matter to be referred to Mr. Speaker. If Mr. Speaker decides to uphold the view of the Clerk the member is informed, and if the member is still dissatisfied he can see the Speaker to argue his case further. If, at the end of this process, he is still dissatisfied, he can raise the matter in the House, and if he disagrees with the Speaker's ruling he can challenge it by a motion. The object of this procedure is to save the time of the House.

The precedent within the House was set by Mr. Speaker Ryan in 1974 when he ruled that a question to a Minister relating to matters not under his Ministerial control was out of order. The House upheld that ruling, and so do I.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CHIEF SECRETARY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: During the Committee stages of the Estimates debate yesterday the member for Elizabeth made some remarks about the absence from the

Chamber and from South Australia of the Chief Secretary. I want to make quite clear in the following terms that his absence is, of course, perfectly in order, as he was attending a meeting of Ministers of Fisheries.

No formal arrangements were made to appoint an Acting Chief Secretary on the occasion of his visit to Queensland to attend the Australian Fisheries Council meeting. The Constitution Act simply requires that, if a Minister is going to be absent from the seat of Government, an acting appointment may be made.

It has been the practice for many years to exercise some judgment in this matter and, in the event that a Minister is to be absent for a period of two or three days, it is normally the case that no arrangements are made for the appointment of an Acting Minister. In situations where a Minister is likely to be absent for periods of up to a week or more, an Acting Minister is appointed. These general guidelines have been applied equally to the Premier and Ministers.

So far as the office of Attorney-General is concerned, on only four occasions were arrangements made for an Acting Attorney-General whilst Mr. Duncan occupied that office. On two of these occasions he was overseas and on the other occasions he was absent for periods of two weeks and one week respectively. On quite a number of occasions, Mr. Duncan, as Attorney-General, was absent from the State for periods of two or three days without making arrangements for the appointment of an Acting Attorney-General.

In this particular instance, the Chief Secretary was going to be absent only for three working days, the dates being 31 October to 2 November, the Minister returning to Adelaide on Sunday 4 November. Throughout the period of his absence, the exact whereabouts of the Minister are known so that if for any reason it was necessary to contact him this could be done through both telephone and telex if any matters of an urgent nature should arise.

A pair was arranged in accordance with the custom of Parliament and no objections were raised when this was negotiated by the Whip, the member for Fisher. Arrangements had been made with the Minister of Agriculture to attend to any matters which arose, including the Estimates, in the event that they came up for discussion.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: I advise the House, as Leader of the Opposition, that the matter which was raised during the Estimates debate was not raised officially by the Opposition. I am perfectly happy with the Premier's explanation today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DEPARTMENTAL DOCKETS

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. HOPGOOD: In reply to a question I asked of him this afternoon, the Minister of Education made certain comments about dockets, comments which, I am sure, would be interpreted by some readers of *Hansard* as an accusation that, in some way, I, or possibly my former and the Minister's former personal secretary, removed material from the Ministerial office that should not have been removed.

I take this opportunity to refute that allegation completely. It is certainly true that, in my time as Minister, I took considerable notes of matters that were relayed to

me verbally, because I have a fairly selective memory, and some of those notes are still in my possession. Having looked carefully through all of my material, I have been able to find one piece of property, which I have taken the trouble to return to the Minister's office—at least I hope it has now been returned. I discovered an empty docket cover which, I think earlier this week, I took to the head messenger's office and asked that it be returned to the Minister's office in the normal way when the courier went down. Having been carefully through my material, I can find nothing else in my possession that is improperly there, including the Roseworthy Report, about which the Minister is obviously concerned and which, so far as I can recall, was never incorporated in a docket, anyway.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Continued from 31 October. Page 625.)

In Committee.

Schedule.

Environment, \$8 739 000.

Mr. PAYNE: I seek from the Minister any information he can give regarding what discussions his Director-General may or may not have had with the present Minister of Mines and Energy before 21 September 1979. I quote briefly from a newspaper cutting of the *Advertiser* of Friday 21 September in which the Minister of Mines and Energy is quoted as saying (referring to the uranium prospect at Honeymoon):

At Honeymoon, the environmental impact will be minimal.

He was referring to the fact that he had given approval for uranium mining at the Honeymoon location. I seek from the Minister any information he can give regarding whether any discussion prior to or on that date (prior to the report appearing in the newspaper) took place between him or the Director-General obviously to his knowledge, or any officers of his department regarding the environmental aspects of that proposed mining operation.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am able to tell the honourable member that there have been close negotiations between my department and the officers of the Department of Mines and Energy. I have been pleased with the negotiations that have taken place, and I can assure the Committee that those negotiations will continue to take place.

Mr. PAYNE: It seems to me that the information I sought was not supplied. The information I sought in connection with this line was: what information could the Minister give on any discussions that took place prior to the announcement being made, in the form of a quote in the *Advertiser* of 21 September, that, at Honeymoon, the environmental impact would be minimal. I tried to be brief earlier, but I now need to expand a little. I believe that members would understand the import of my question. The Minister's assurance in relation to an environmental matter of such importance in respect of this operation might have a certain value and weight with any person who read the paper. It would have even greater weight and value if there is reinforcement to the Minister's statement by any information he could give that direct negotiations took place between him and the Minister of Mines and

Energy prior to this date or subsequent to the Minister of Environment's taking office, and/or any officers of his department, including the Director-General, about which he knows.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As I have already said, there have been significant negotiations between officers of the department. If the honourable member is asking whether I, as Minister, had discussions with the Minister of Mines and Energy—

Mr. Payne: That's what I did ask.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We have had discussions relating to the importance of environmental matters as regards any mining development procedures.

I have been completely satisfied with those discussions; they have been on an informal basis. I should have thought the member would ask about formal discussions; these have taken place between the two departments. I think the honourable member would appreciate that it is necessary, for proper environmental procedures to be followed, that there be close co-operation and communication between those two departments. I can assure the honourable member that that has taken place.

Mr. PAYNE: It seems that I am being forced to use the methods we were forced to use on an earlier occasion in this debate with another Minister. I am surprised at the Minister, because I have some regard for him and for the way he conducts himself in this House.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member ask his question?

Mr. PAYNE: Certainly, Sir. I thought my question would have been clear to almost anyone. I am trying to ascertain what discussions took place on environmental requirements at Honeymoon before 21 September this year, when the Minister of Mines and Energy said that the environmental impact would be minimal.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If the honourable member expects me to say, in exact detail, what discussions have taken place between the two departments, I can only say that I am not in a position to do that, and the honourable member cannot really expect me to be able to provide that information to the House. I am just not able to do that, because I was not present during the discussions that took place. However, I am able to tell the honourable member that the discussions between me and the Deputy Premier have related to general matters such as the necessity to follow certain procedures in regard to environmental protection.

Mr. KENEALLY: A serious problem has occurred in the northern Flinders Range because of goats and donkeys, which abound in hundreds of thousands. The problem is caused more by goats than donkeys. What plans has the Minister's department to eradicate what is now a pest that does considerable damage? Will a programme of shooting goats be implemented? If it will, how will people be employed? Will they be employed as officers of the department, or will they be under contract? If people are employed under contract, is this likely to occur in the immediate future? If the answer to that question is "Yes", will the Minister give as much information on that activity as possible?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: At present, the department is reviewing the matter of the problems caused in the Flinders Range particularly in regard to goats. I am not in a position to say what we, in Government, will do, because I have asked for a complete review of the problem. The honourable member would appreciate that the previous Government was unable to solve the problem in 10 years of Government, and I do not believe that he would think we would be able to solve this problem in some seven weeks. I can assure the honourable member of my concern

regarding this matter. In fact, while in Opposition, I often referred to it. I am keen, as is the honourable member, to overcome this problem as soon as possible. For this reason, I have, as a matter of urgency, requested the department to review the situation and advise me what steps it would take, so that I can speed up the process of trying to overcome the problem.

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister advise his department that it should consider the needs of the unemployed Aboriginal people who live at the Nepabunna community when he is considering plans that the department might have as to the best way to eradicate these goats, whether by shooting or whatever other method is determined? What is the attitude of the Minister's department towards burning off in the Flinders Range? Whilst the reason for burning off seems to be reasonable to property owners, it has a dramatic effect on the environment of the ranges. Will the Minister tell the House of the Government's attitude towards this vexing problem?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: At the risk of sounding like a recording, again I have had a lot to say about this matter in Opposition. I have asked the department to investigate the matter. I believe that there are certain advantages in burning off, but I briefly discussed this matter with departmental officers and I was informed that they see many more problems associated with burning off than I do. A number of people have approached me since I became Minister a few weeks ago in regard to the Government's policy on this matter. Earlier this week, I forwarded another letter through my department to ascertain feelings on this matter. We will examine the matter.

Mr. KENEALLY: I appreciate the difficulties that my questions have raised for the Minister, and I am happy to wait until the Government makes its decision, if it supplies me with a report, and I hope it will do that. Will the Minister take whatever action is necessary to control the indiscriminate abuse of the Flinders Range by off-road vehicles? I draw to the Minister's attention the Warren Gorge, a beauty spot in the Flinders Range, where, over the years, off-road vehicles have done much damage. I know that certain problems are associated with the legislation controlling off-road vehicles. Will the Minister give an indication of the present position in regard to the legislation, and will he say how stringently he is able to apply the legislation to the Flinders Range, particularly to areas like the Warren Gorge and Buckaringa Gorge?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. He may or may not appreciate that the previous Government instigated a report (I think a series of reports) about this problem. I am led to believe that a report has now been completed, although at this stage it has not appeared on my desk. However, I understand that that will happen within a short time. Again, we will not rush into legislation. I know the previous Government churned over this matter for a long time, and we will have to look closely at the problem. I am very much aware of the damage being done, not only in the Flinders Range but also in many other areas of the State.

To some extent, the increased price of fuel and the energy crisis will help overcome the problem, because people will have less money to spend and less fuel will be available for burning up than has been the case in the past. That will not overcome the problem entirely, but, when I have looked at the report and when we have had adequate time, we will consider the matter further.

Mr. PETERSON: What is the policy of the Coast Protection Division in relation to recreational jetties? Is it the policy of the Government to hand them back to local

councils? Which jetties qualify as recreational jetties, and what is the specific amount allocated for each jetty?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will be pleased to bring down a report in relation to the various jetties. I want to look at the responsibilities of the Coast Protection Board generally, but at this stage it is my opinion (not necessarily that of my department, and discussions on the matter will follow within the next few days) that perhaps the work carried out by the Coast Protection Board should be part of the responsibility of local government, or even of the Minister of Marine. There is a great need for research on matters relating to coast protection and I believe we are getting away from the basis of this. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Coast Protection Board, but I am inclined to suggest that too much emphasis is being placed on looking after jetties and building toilets rather than carrying out the research that is necessary in relation to coast protection.

Mr. Peterson: Will you publish that policy when you reach it?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes.

Mr. O'NEILL: Given the nature of the process which is to be used at the Honeymoon uranium deposit, has any provision been made for an environmental study into the impact of radioactive contamination of ground water in the area, and the possible consequences for the environment?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As I said in reply to the first question I answered in this Chamber as a Minister, we are committed to providing proper environmental protection on all major development. We went to the election with that policy.

Mr. Wright: That's very broad.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I accept that point, but as a Government we are very genuine about this, and the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. I have said, in this Chamber and outside, that environmental impact assessments will be carried out on these projects and, as I said in reply to the member for Mitchell, the negotiations in these matters are well under way.

When I became Minister, I was somewhat surprised to find that negotiations were then under way, with the two departments concerned looking closely at problems associated with the possibility of mining. We will be carrying out environmental impact assessment procedures and the companies concerned are already carrying out feasibility studies which are costing a lot of money and which are very thorough in themselves. On top of that, we will be carrying out assessment procedures.

Mr. PAYNE: While I accept the Minister's reply to the member for Florey as being genuine, the Minister of Mines and Energy, speaking at Honeymoon on 21 September this year, said that the environmental impact would be minimal. We have been assured that environmental assessments will be carried out, but it appears that the Minister of Mines and Energy has carried out his own assessment and has issued a statement that the impact will be minimal.

The sum proposed under the line, "Director, co-ordination, policy, Heritage Unit officers and administrative staff" is \$278 000, compared to an allocation last year of \$217 100 and actual payments of \$203 080. Does that represent a modest expansion? Is it a filling of unfilled vacancies, and perhaps a provision for likely wage increases?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: That is what the situation will be. Some positions are unfilled. Prior to the election, I said that the Co-ordination Policy Division was an area we should be looking at. Since becoming Minister, I have had a certain amount of contact with the division, and I have

been impressed with the work that is being done. I have not yet had an opportunity to do many of the things I would like to do in the department, and I have not yet looked closely at the working of this division. The areas I have seen and the communication I have had have impressed me. There are positions to be filled, hence the increase in the allocation.

Mr. O'NEILL: In replying to my earlier question, the Minister referred to an impact study into some areas of the problem. Given the nature of the materials involved, would the Minister see that all aspects of the environmental impact are investigated? Does he intend to see that any impact study report will be released to the public before mining begins, bearing in mind that the process is irreversible?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If I said that some areas will be looked at, let me add that, as in all environmental assessments, any significant issue or any significant areas that can be seen as likely to damage the environment will be looked at. It is the practice that, through environmental impact procedures, the information will be made public.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it intended that any retail or wholesale sales from the nursery established at the Black Hill Native Flora Park will be made at realistic prices which take into account all the costs incurred in production of those plants? People interested in procuring plants are, by definition, 100 per cent middle income or high income earners, and such people should not expect the rest of the taxpaying community to subsidise their hobby or indulgence. These sales put the commercial nurseries in an unfavourable trading position, not only nurseries in the immediate vicinity but also those in the market place in South Australia supplying the same plants. I have checked the costs involved and will bring them to the Minister's attention so that he knows how much nurserymen and I are concerned that not only the cost of land and buildings, but also that the costs of management consultant services are introduced to the cost structure from time to time at Black Hill nursery, are properly charged for. There are also variable costs for items such as fertilizer, pesticide, seed, labour, management and sales service in the preparation and final sale of those plants. Will the Minister reassure me, and nurserymen, that any sales will be made at a realistic price?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: This is an area I have been examining.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the points made by the member for Mallee. I had the pleasure the other night of meeting for the first time the chairmen of the various trusts associated with parks in this State. I met the Chairman of the Black Hill Trust at that time. I am very much aware of the feelings of private nurserymen about Government-owned nurseries. I believe there is a real need, if plants are to be supplied, that they be supplied on a competitive basis. This is one area I hope to do something about shortly.

Mr. LEWIS: I turn to the line referring to improvements and general expenses incurred in the normal operation and maintenance of national parks. Will the department's management policy as pursued under the previous Government be changed, or is it under review, in respect of the way a fuel layer was allowed to develop throughout national parks and vegetation was allowed to proliferate because it was not being grazed by either native fauna or other stock but was left to accumulate to the point where spontaneous combustion or lightning ignited it? The subsequent fires endangered the properties of adjacent

landholders. Not only their crops and livestock but also their homes, possessions and lives were endangered.

Too often in the past, in my view, no attempt has been made to manage the development of the residual fuel layer in native parks. The parks in my electorate include Ferries McDonald, Billiatt, Ngarkat and Mount Boothby. They have all in the past decade posed a threat to the lives, properties and homes of adjacent property owners because of fires that have raged through them and spread to adjacent holdings. Nothing was done by the previous Administration to manage that situation or to prevent fires that started in national parks from spreading. Is that management practice under review, and can the practice of back burning on a regular and organised basis at a time of the year when it will do the least damage, in the same way as the Aborigines did it for thousands of years before the white man came to this continent, be reinstated by those of a different coloured skin who are now attempting to manage the State's natural resources?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I do not know whether the member for Mallee was in the Chamber when I was asked a question by the member for Stuart about the present Government's policy in relation to burning off. I told the House that this area was under review. We came to Government with a policy that stated that a Liberal Government would actively pursue a responsible policy of management towards our national parks and reserves. Having said that and committed ourselves, it is our responsibility to attempt to bring that about. I would see that as being one of the priorities that I, as Minister, have in this department. I am very much aware of the problems being experienced by landholders in rural areas whose properties are adjacent to national parks.

There have been problems in the past, and while in Opposition, as spokesman, I have been extremely critical of the previous Government's management of national parks, and I reiterate that it is one of my main priorities to ensure that the present Government brings about improved management of our national parks.

Mr. PETERSON: With regard to the transfer to the Coast Protection Fund of \$100 000, is that the fund from which money is used for the carrying out of any work on coast protection? How much is in the fund in total?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I shall obtain more information for the honourable member. The information I have is that the sum is a transfer to the Coast Protection Fund for 1978-79, reduced by the cost of work outside council areas. The proposed transfer is for maintenance purposes.

Mr. O'NEILL: Is any provision made for the preservation in South Australia of the *Leipoa ocellata*, sometimes known as the gnaw, lowan, or mallee hen?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I cannot say that any provision has been made. I appreciate that there is concern for preservation in that particular area. I will supply information.

Vote passed.

Minister of Environment, Miscellaneous, \$61 000; Urban and Regional Affairs, \$2 730 000; Minister of Planning, Miscellaneous, \$1 692 000—passed.

Transport, \$10 095 000.

Mr. WRIGHT: For "Professional, Administrative and other staff" a sum of \$799 273 was voted in 1978-79, and actual payments were \$710 972. The proposed vote for 1979-80 is \$594 121. This seems to be a rather large reduction in running costs, the proposed sum being some \$200 000 less than the sum voted for the previous year. Can the Minister say why there has been such a very large reduction?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There are 52 administrative

and planning staff within the department. The difference between the actual expenditure last year and that proposed this year is a carry-over effect of salary and wage increases that occurred during 1978-79.

Mr. WRIGHT: I make no complaint about the increased amount of \$8 000 for the Road Safety Council of South Australia. I would like to know whether that is for wage indexation or the like, or is it intended in those circumstances to improve services in that area? Has the Minister any information for the House concerning ways that services could be improved in that area?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Once again, that difference is a carry-over effect. It is for salary and wages only. The staff of the Road Safety Council comprises 26 people, and if there was an increase in services it would have to come from the allocation that is provided to the Road Safety Council from the \$1 of each licence that is allocated from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles through the Highways Fund. I think that amount comes to \$600 000 a year. As the honourable member would realise, that is a fixed amount paid to the Road Safety Council.

Mr. WRIGHT: With regard to the line for the Government Motor Garage, again there is a rather large increase in the proposed amount. Members will recall that there was a conscious decision some months ago by the Labor administration to change the eight-cylinder cars then used by the Ministers to six-cylinder cars, and in fact that transfer has taken place, although I notice that the new Government has attempted to take some credit for that. I suppose the only proof that the decision was a good one will be the extent of running costs after a given period of time. There are still experts in the community who would argue whether there is a reduction in running costs overall in relation to eight-cylinder cars as opposed to six-cylinder cars.

What I am concerned about at this time is that, although the Government has not altered this decision (in fact, I understand that it supported it), there are still a fairly large number of LTD cars in operation by the Government. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the use of LTD cars (and in fact eight-cylinder cars) or will it follow the pattern and policies determined by the previous Government? I noticed today the Minister of Transport himself driving around in a flaming red LTD; at least I thought he would have chosen a blue one. Nevertheless, there he was in this brand new LTD and in fact it had Queensland registration plates on it. I do not know whether he stole it or whether Bjelke gave it to him—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Deputy Leader must not in any way reflect on the Minister. What he just said is not appropriate language to use in the Chamber.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am sure the Minister took no exception to my pun and I am sorry that you did, Mr. Chairman; I thought that you had a better sense of humour. Nevertheless, the concern that I have is not whether he did buy a car from Queensland or not. Does his trial run in that car give us some indication of a possible change in policy by the Government to go back to the use of LTD cars? I realise that the car in which I saw the Minister today was a six-cylinder car. Although in his election promises the Premier used some nasty words about the types of cars in which the Ministers were driving (which I thought were uncalled for, because the Government had already made a decision on that), is there a possibility that the Government will review that policy, the result of which will be the eventual reintroduction of LTD cars?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The increase is for salaries and wages on the Government Motor Garage line. Since the Deputy Leader is now responsible for transport matters in the Opposition I tell him that the present staff

employed at the Government Motor Garage totals 70. Far be it for me to raise a thorny issue in this place, but I also remind the Deputy Leader that, when an additional car was provided for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, no additional chauffeur was employed.

It is true that I have been driving around in a red LTD this morning, and I believe the Minister of Health was driving around in the same car yesterday; the Minister of Environment has also had a ride in it. It is true that it has Queensland number plates. It was not supplied to me by the Premier of Queensland but it could well have been the Premier's car, I do not know. However, the Deputy Leader did not see me driving around in it at lunch time, when I arrived here in a six-cylinder blue Ford Falcon. Both cars were being tried out by the Government. The Deputy Leader would know that the Government Motor Garage is often approached by motor companies with a request to test run some of their cars. A Ford Motor Company representative approached the Government Motor Garage and Mr. O'Donnell, the chief of the garage, asked me whether it would be all right if he could run a couple of these cars for a couple of days. After some Ministers saw the car in which I was riding, they asked if they could also have a ride in it. It is not indicative of any change in the Government's policy.

Many months ago the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said that the Ministerial car fleet would be reduced to six-cylinder cars and that would have been about the same time as the former Government was ordering the Commodores and Valiants. The Premier did not make the statement about Government cars just before the election; he made that statement many months ago. Only half the Government car fleet has been replaced, and some larger LTD cars still have to run what I understand is the Public Service limit for a car of two years or 40 000 kilometres. When those cars reach that limit, there will be a change to smaller vehicles, and it might not be a Commodore or Valiant, it might be a Ford Falcon. It does not matter, as it will be a reduction in size, and that is the way the Government is looking.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister, because we now have a guarantee that eight-cylinder cars will eventually go. I make no argument about the phasing out of the cars; that is quite proper. The only thing I was surprised about was that the Minister of Health actually got into a red car.

The Government made an election promise that there would be an immediate review of all public transport systems. I place the emphasis on "immediate". Has the Minister instructed that a review of services should take place at this stage? If not, when does he intend to do so? Will he give the results of such a review to me or to the House?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, I have instructed the Department of Transport to start planning for an immediate review of all public transportation systems to take South Australia into the 1980's and the year 2000. It is quite obvious to me and it is probably quite obvious to the Deputy Leader, that many things are occurring at the moment that will have an enormous effect on public transport, not the least being the impending fuel crisis. I hope to say more about this in the House next week during the Address-in-Reply debate when I hope to bring down a statement of the problems and the status of public transport not only in South Australia but also throughout the world. It will be a statement not of Government policy but a statement of some of the problems the Government faces in bringing about a public transportation system for South Australia into the year 2000. The Deputy Leader mentioned the word "immediate". Of course, a review of a public transportation system is not something that can

happen in what one could call the dictionary meaning of the word "immediate"; it will take several months.

One of the things to which we will be addressing ourselves, (and no doubt the honourable member will latch on to this) will be the question of whether the moratorium on the north-south freeway should remain. That moratorium has been existing for nearly 10 years and it has had significant effects on what can or cannot happen in the south to south-western suburbs and even in the near-western suburbs. For instance, many properties have been acquired and land and developmental sites have also been tied up.

It is obvious that this Government (even if the former Government did not) will have to come to a decision. I do not want the Deputy Leader to think that this Government will build the north-south freeway. I assure him that he should not take that view; nevertheless, a decision has to be made about this curtain that hangs over the south-western and western suburbs. One of the results has been that much attention has been given to the north-eastern part of the metropolitan area (I am not saying that the north-eastern area should not have had that attention) and not enough attention has been paid to the southern areas.

Mr. Hamilton: You can only do so much.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I know that. One of the reasons why not enough attention has been paid to the southern suburbs is the matter of the north-south corridor. It has been promoted for many years that the South Road should be widened, but one of the arguments against that has been, "Look, if a Government some time in the future goes ahead with the north-south freeway, we should not waste the money on widening the South Road, because that's an expensive business in itself." I give that as an instance.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister say whether, in view of the halt on the l.r.t. to the north-eastern suburbs and the impracticability of the O'Bahn system, what steps will be taken as an interim move to upgrade transport from the north-eastern suburbs to the city whilst the decisions, to which the Minister has just referred, are being made as regards a permanent system?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The same steps as have been taken by the former Government and would have been taken by the former Government if the l.r.t. had gone ahead. The honourable member should realise that the l.r.t. would not have been completed until 1986. The same steps for servicing the north-east area will be taken if any alternative system is installed and is not completed until 1986. I thought that that would have been obvious to the honourable member. He says that the O'Bahn system is impracticable, but I suggest that he wait before deciding on that until I present the House with the results of a current investigation. The officers have not yet reached Stuttgart, so how can we know whether it will be impracticable. If anything, "impracticable" is the wrong word, because we know that it is just as feasible as is the l.r.t. at present.

The important thing the member for Florey should realise is whether the State can afford to spend \$150 000 000 in one area to serve 11 per cent of the population. That is now the cost of the l.r.t., not \$118 000 000 or \$114 000 000, as the former Minister used to say. The cost is between \$140 000 000 and \$150 000 000. The honourable member should realise that, if we spend \$150 000 000 on the transportation system in the whole metropolitan area, we would make significant differences. For instance, over-passes can be built for between \$4 000 000 and \$8 000 000. Imagine if we could put them on all main intersections what a difference it would make to the road system in this State.

It is not just a question of whether fixed-line transport is required in the north-east; it is a question whether the State can afford it. That is the problem to which the honourable member should address himself.

Mr. HAMILTON: Regarding "Contribution towards transport research projects", can the Minister say what research has been done in respect of decentralised traffic-control equipment for the Adelaide signal cabin? Has the Minister considered the closure of the Glanville to Outer Harbor section of the line, as has been rumoured in some sections? Is it correct that an investigation has been carried out into the use of articulated buses in that area?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Regarding the honourable member's last question, I will have to obtain a report on that matter. I do not know whether an investigation has been called on for articulated buses on that line. Does the honourable member mean as a replacement for the rolling stock if it were to be removed?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will have to obtain that information for the honourable member. The State Transport Authority has been told that it must get on with the job of managing Adelaide's metropolitan public transport, and that there is to be as little interference as possible by the Minister. If the Government goes to the trouble of forming a separate authority to run an enterprise, the authority should be given the power and right to operate with as little interference as possible, bearing in mind that, under the State Transport Authority Act, the Minister has the power to direct. There is no way in which this Government would not review any decisions that the authority took if it thought that citizens or employees of the authority were being disadvantaged.

With that reservation, the authority is to manage its own business; otherwise, it cannot be efficient. The authority has a deficit of \$47 000 000 for the coming year, and that deficit is rising, I understand, by about \$7 000 000 a year. What has to happen is that the authority must be given the guidelines under which to operate within a stated deficit. If the authority decided that such a line as the honourable member has mentioned was uneconomic, that would be its right as a proper operating authority. The Government would review that decision in the light of the interests of the people, as I stated earlier. If that happened, the Government might have to review the deficit. The authority has to be given the guidelines and told to get on with the job of being an operating authority.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is the Minister aware, or could he establish, whether or not prior to his becoming Minister there has been any official or Ministerial investigation into the O'Bahn or similar type systems and, if there has, could I be provided with a copy of that report? If there has not been, is the Minister prepared to brief me on matters pertaining to the Department of Transport in the future, because I think it would be advantageous if we all knew where we were going? Primarily, I would like to know whether that report exists, what is in it, and whether I could study it?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will have to consider the honourable member's request. If there were any investigations into guided bus systems before I took office, I can see no reason why the Deputy Leader should not have the results. I can assure the honourable member that there was certainly no extensive or knowledgeable investigation into O'Bahn. I was surprised, when I was in Opposition, that the former Minister of Transport, when he visited Germany, went to the Mercedes factory and to Mannheim but not to Stuttgart. He did not take the opportunity to see the O'Bahn system in operation. I was surprised about that, because of the flexibility of the

system.

When the honourable member reads my speech next week, he may realise that flexibility has to be a basis for a public transport system, not only in Adelaide but everywhere. I think the honourable member asked whether he could see the present papers that have been prepared on O'Bahn. Or would he like to be briefed on them?

Mr. Wright: I would like both.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will have to consider the latter request.

Mr. Wright: Asking for briefing was a general request, not so much in regard to O'Bahn, but in regard to policy matters and what the Government is doing in that area. The same as—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Olsen): Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I asked the honourable member a question, Sir. I will have to consider the request. I think the honourable member knows me well enough to know that I would let him have the information if I could. I will have to consider the situation in regard to briefing. The honourable member can have some briefing certainly, but it will depend on the subject matter and who would be present with him when he was briefed. I would have to know what he wanted to be briefed about. I will consider the matter and let the honourable member know my decision.

Mr. O'NEILL: I would like to ask the Minister a supplementary question about the O'Bahn system, and I hope the Minister does not think I am trying to be aggressive or smart. I ask this question because I realise that the Minister is probably much more knowledgeable about this subject than I am, because he has had access to much more material, I would imagine. Does this system make use of an approximately three-metre wide concrete gutter? Does it use that only in off-road situations or is it necessary to put a 9ft. gutter down the side of an existing highway? If that is not the case, does the system require the acquisition of property in order to install the 9 ft. concrete gutter in off-road areas?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I apologise to the honourable member if he got the impression that I was getting into him; I did not really think he was being aggressive. The O'Bahn track is approximately the same width as the l.r.t track. The member for Florey may realise that during the intensive NEAPTR studies (and I have paid tribute before to the team involved) on previous occasions several options were promulgated for transport to the north-east. I will not go into these proposals because it would take a long time; however, one proposal was l.r.t., one was heavy rail, one was a freeway, and another was a busway.

One of the problems with a busway is that it is really only a road. The necessary width of a busway is, I think, 14 metres for two-way traffic. One of the advantages of l.r.t. was that it was a much narrower track—I think a total width of eight metres for a 2-way track. The O'Bahn track is slightly less than eight metres for a double track. I will not quibble about that figure or say it is less. For all intents and purposes, we can say that the figure is no more than the width of the l.r.t. track. The O'Bahn system has an advantage over a busway in that not so much property would have to be acquired and it would have less environmental effect, if it was going through an area where it was environmentally desirable to desecrate as little land as possible.

When an O'Bahn bus is running on a track, it is guided by a mechanical piece of technology—a simple lateral wheel is fixed around the steering wheels of the bus. As

the bus runs along a track, the lateral wheels make contact with the concrete guidelines down each side of the track. These are only 12 inches to 18 inches high (I cannot remember the exact height). That is how the bus runs on the track. When the bus leaves the track to travel on the open road, concrete guide rails cannot be used on such a road, unless a specific bus lane, for that type of bus, is used.

There is a problem when an O'Bahn bus, travelling along the guide track, crosses an intersection—the bus has to be guided across by electric means. An electric cable under the bitumen guides it across. As the bus reaches the edge of the intersection, the electric guidance takes it across. That part of the O'Bahn system has not been proved to the satisfaction of Mercedes and Daimler Benz. The rest of the system has been proved; there is no question of that. It is possible to install an O'Bahn system if there is grade separation, because there is absolute flexibility in this system. I do not know if I have answered the honourable member's questions to his satisfaction. If not, he can ask me again.

Mr. HAMILTON: My question relates to duplicated services. When articulated buses come into operation and rail services in the metropolitan area are also used, it has been put to me that there is concern amongst railwaymen about the abolition of some services when there are parallel services within the metropolitan area. Will the Minister say in what areas those articulated buses would be utilised, both in the inner and outer suburban areas?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member. I point out that the railways section of the State Transport Authority runs at a deficit of about \$20 000 000. Some sanity must be brought into this area. This Government will not see men put out of work; we have given that undertaking. No-one will be retrenched. However, the Government has to bring some sanity into the public transport system in South Australia. The State cannot afford a rise of deficit each year of \$7 000 000. Surely the Deputy Leader would realise that, as a member of the former Cabinet. This matter must have been of great concern to members of the former Cabinet.

It will be some time, I think, before we see the delivery of the articulated buses. Significant problems have occurred with the last contract, and I am most unhappy about a few things. At the moment, I am considering the Government's position. The State Transport Authority is embarrassed by the slowness of delivery of its new 100-bus fleet, of which I think 35 are articulated.

Mr. SLATER: I understand that the "Life. Be in It" programme has been successful, in that it has encouraged people to take limited opportunities for physical activity, but, in my opinion, some of the advertising campaigns, especially the television campaigns, are unsophisticated and, at times, trite. Is the \$17 000 allocation proposed to be utilised for similar aspects, or is it proposed that some additional form of promotional advertising will be conducted by the department?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not have with me information on the breakdown of the programme, but I will obtain that for the honourable member. There is no question that the project has been successful. Even though the advertising may be unsophisticated, it is effective. I am sure the member for Gilles realises that the copyright is owned by the Victorian Government. Mr. Brian Dixon, Minister of Recreation and Sport in Victoria, has been the prime mover in this and I congratulate the Victorian Government on selling the idea to the other States. A few weeks ago, I attended a Recreation Ministers' conference in Melbourne, where I met Ministers from all other States.

Negotiations are proceeding for the American Recreation Society to import "Life. Be in It" to the U.S.A., so effective is the programme and so effective is it seen to be by other countries.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Minister, as shadow Minister of Transport, was critical and he still is critical of NEAPTR, but he has locked himself into the O'Bahn system at this stage. Unless he gets a favourable report (and we do not know how long the report will take), we will not know where we are heading. It is vital that some type of system should be determined. Will there be any debarment, philosophical or otherwise, if we reach a fall-back situation in relation to the inability of the O'Bahn system to do the job we are asking of it? It is my information, rightly or wrongly, that it will not do the job. Will the Government change its stance regarding NEAPTR, or has NEAPTR gone by the board? If the Government is placed in a fall-back situation, as it may well be when the report is available, enormous amounts of money, time, and effort will have been wasted if, for philosophical or other reasons, NEAPTR is not acceptable to this Government.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Obviously, the Deputy Leader has information about the O'Bahn system. He was asking if I could arrange for a briefing, but it seems that he has been briefed. So that the Deputy Leader is in no quandary about the Government's position and the statements made on the O'Bahn system before the election, let me give him the facts. Certainly, after I became shadow Minister, the Opposition, as it then was, was investigating alternative methods of transport that, in our opinion, would fit the Adelaide metropolitan area for the next 20 years. We were reasonably advanced in our investigation into the O'Bahn system when the honourable member's Party called the election.

Accordingly, when we made a statement about the O'Bahn system, we said that all work on the NET system would be halted pending an investigation of the Mercedes or Daimler Benz O'Bahn system. That is what we have done. We have halted all further planning work on the NET system, and we have instituted an investigation into the feasibility of the O'Bahn system. In the press release I gave at that time, it was stated that we were looking for a viable alternative that would cost the State considerably less than the \$150 000 000 which I predicted at that time the NET system would cost.

On our investigation of costs (and Mr. Virgo criticised us roundly about this), and on the advice of the firm of consultant engineers which gave us a quick report, because the election had been called, we found that we could build an O'Bahn system for no more than perhaps half the cost of the system under consideration. When we halted further work on the NET system (I am glad the member for Mitcham is here, because he always maintained that the cost was the main factor about the NEAPTR system), I found in some of the latest research papers that work had been done on the cost of rolling stock for the NET system. The now Minister of Industrial Affairs and I costed the O'Bahn system, costing the Daimler Benz buses at \$180 000 each, including alterations to the steering. That was based on the cost of similar buses running in Perth which had cost \$120 000 to \$130 000. We allowed \$50 000, a very generous amount, for the O'Bahn technology.

At that stage, we also costed the NEAPTR scheme, because we compared the two. We costed the rolling stock for that scheme at \$320 000 each, which was the figure in the NEAPTR papers, even though we understood that the cost was nearer \$500 000. We wanted to be fair, despite what Mr. Virgo said, in that costing.

Let me tell the honourable gentleman that, having investigated the most recent work on the NEAPTR

scheme, the preferred railway car for NEAPTR that had been recommended by the consultants was costed at \$850 000 per unit. I am trying to point out to the Deputy Leader, and to the House, the escalation that is occurring in high capital intensive fixed transport systems, and I am trying to convince the honourable gentleman that we must have flexibility. We have an amount of \$850 000 compared to an amount of \$320 000 as costed in the NEAPTR papers.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Regarding recreation and sport, I notice the proposed amount for the sports coaching scheme has been increased by \$2 000 in the proposed allocation. Is it planned to send this coaching scheme to the country? I point out that when some of these schemes are proposed by Governments those Governments seem to forget country areas. There is an example in my own district, where I understand next year the soccer club will have a team in the Rothmans Cup. That will be expensive for the club. I believe that club has had an international soccer coach attend at the club at some expense. I believe that consideration should be given to other sports, not only to soccer, which I am using as an example; after all, it puts this country on the map so far as international sport is concerned. I think consideration should be given by the Government to extending the scheme by sending the coaches concerned into country areas. Clubs in the metropolitan area are only too pleased to obtain talented players of any game (whether it be a national game or not) as members of metropolitan teams. Could consideration be given to the expansion of this scheme?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is possible. It is also possible for coaches from country areas (including the honourable member's district, if he is particularly concerned about his area) to attend the State coaching plan run by the Department of Recreation and Sport. I have said publicly that this is an initiative of the previous Government's which I wholeheartedly support and which I commend the previous Government for implementing. The honourable member's Leader is well aware of the implications of that. Only last week I presented certificates under the State coaching plan to 80 or 90 coaches who graduated. Some of those coaches were from country areas. I think that the member for Whyalla is probably more concerned that we go out into the country areas, so I will bring the matter to the attention of the department and ascertain whether something can be done about it.

Mr. HAMILTON: I understand that a study of the future gauge to be used for the metropolitan railway system was initiated under the previous Government. The working party, under the direction of management services officers, had been formed, and had been given the following terms of reference (and I will ask the Minister to comment on this or, if he cannot, supply me with information about it later):

To study the future gauge requirements for the metropolitan rail system (including light rapid transit systems), having regard to:

- 1.1 The relative merits of broad gauge and standard gauge for future metropolitan passenger operations.
- 1.2 The implications for the metropolitan railways flowing from the current proposals for a standard gauge railway between Mile End and Salisbury, and the conversion of—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The time allocated for the Committee stages of these Bills having expired, I now put the question "That the vote be agreed to".

Vote passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put the question that:

In relation to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), the remainder of the schedule, the clauses and title of the Bill be

agreed to and the Bill and Estimates without amendment be reported to the House and the Chairman do now leave the Chair; and in relation to the Public Purposes Loan Bill, the first schedule, second schedule, the clauses and title of the Bill be agreed to and the Bill and Loan Estimates without amendment be reported to the House and the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Third reading.

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

That these Bills be now read a third time.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Appropriation Bill comes out of the Committee stage half debated and half considered. The Bill, as it comes out of Committee, has resulted from a half-baked consideration. The problems that have been raised for us by the Government in terms of guillotining this debate and restricting the hours under which we may consider Estimates make those statements correct. I point out that those statements that I have made, that the Bill is half debated and half considered and that it has resulted from half-baked consideration, are direct quotes from the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1975 and faced with a situation similar to the one we face in terms of restrictions on the time allowed for debate of this measure.

I think an extremely important principle is at stake here. I want to deal with the Bill as it comes out of Committee, but one of the problems in so doing is the large number of subjects left completely untouched through sheer lack of time. What, indeed, can we say about such important lines as "Community Welfare", "Consumer Affairs", "Health", "Tourism", "Water Resources and Irrigation", "Land", "Repatriation"? Nothing can be said about those lines, because we were not able to properly interrogate and ask questions of the appropriate Ministers. Now the Deputy Premier will contend that we have had five hours more to consider this measure than the average over the previous six years.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is required to discuss the Bill as it comes from Committee; he must not discuss other matters which are irrelevant to the form in which it arrives.

Mr. BANNON: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. As the Premier said in a similar situation in 1975:

That is extremely difficult, but I am afraid if it becomes necessary for me as Leader of the Opposition and Leader of my Party to incur your displeasure in exercising my right of freedom of speech and in standing up for the freedom of speech of every member in this House, I will have to take this risk.

I merely say that with this Bill the Tonkin Government has shown itself in its true colours. It is quite apparent that it is interested only in its own political purposes, and not in the

welfare of the people whom it is supposed to be representing.

They are not my words, but those of the Leader of the Government of today when in Opposition. We may be criticised for the fact that in Government we applied the guillotine, but large sections of this Bill have not been touched, and I am not able in the course of this third reading debate to talk about the Bill as it comes out of Committee in any whole way because of the restriction on time. Worse, after that guillotine was applied, members on the Government side, most notably the member for Mallee, constantly insisted on protracting the debate by asking their own parochial parish pump type questions and thereby refusing the Opposition time to question Ministers on these important later topics.

The SPEAKER: Order! By inference, the Leader is indicating that the Chair was in error in giving the call to the honourable member for Mallee. It is quite within the rights of every member, no matter where he sits in this House, to have the call during the Committee stage as it is in due course their right to have the call at other stages of the Bill. I make that point lest there be any misunderstanding of the rights of members in this matter.

Mr. BANNON: Thank you, Sir. I concur in everything you have said. We certainly do not gainsay the rights of members opposite to exercise their rights. However, there is a tradition in this area and, if indeed we had unlimited time, the member for Mallee could have asked as many thousands of questions as he wanted to, and that applies to any Government member. In these particular peculiar circumstances, one would appeal to him to have exercised some restraint to allow the Opposition to have the full benefit of the very short time that had been allotted to it. The present Government said that this Bill would be looked at in terms of Budget and Estimates committees, and the Opposition would be allowed to scrutinise it closely. It has not allowed us that opportunity, but has behaved in the same way as previous Governments have done. We concede that on two occasions in the past we on this side applied the guillotine, and members opposite strenuously objected to it. The Liberal Party said that there would be a new deal, a new attitude, and we were quite happy to go along with that, but we were not allowed to do so. I support the third reading of the Bill with reluctance, because of the way that it has had to be dealt with.

Bills read a third time and passed.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I intend to take up the 10 minutes which are allotted to me in this grievance debate. It is a slightly unusual step, but I think it is important that I put a few matters on record in the time available. I pay a tribute to the officers of the Treasury Department who have worked so diligently and hard to enable this Budget to be brought in at very short notice. As honourable members will know, they had been working on and had completed a Budget for the previous Government, and it was not an easy task that we set them

when we came into office. I want to make my thanks known to them and acknowledge the work they have done.

There were enormous pressures on the Government following the election on 15 September. There was a need for Supply (a need to maintain the Public Service of this State), and again I am grateful for the way in which the Parliament as a whole accepted that need for Supply in order to keep the Public Service of this State moving and keep the wheels well oiled and moving along as they should.

However, there was more than a need for Supply. I can well understand the Leader of the Opposition's feelings, because, as he quoted to me, we also had a number of things to say when his Party, in Government, applied a similar guillotine on, I think, two occasions. I would say that he is in error in saying that a similar situation applies: it does not. The situation is very different on this occasion from that which was applied when the Labor Party was in Government. I remind the Leader that, because the election was called some 18 months before it was due, we have lost at least seven weeks of the normal sitting time of the session. Under the programme that we would have expected, the Budget would have been brought in during the first week of September, left over for a week, and then debated over the next two weeks. By now it would have been well and truly through this House and the Parliament, and in operation. That is the fundamental difference which has occurred.

The loss of those seven weeks and the delay in the Budget has meant that there have been uncertainties in the Public Service. The Leader of the Opposition has attempted to raise a great deal of furore to build up the bogey of lack of morale in the Public Service in recent weeks. His allegations have been totally without foundation, but what he has totally overlooked in what he has said is that there have been uncertainties in all Government departments as a result of not knowing exactly what is going to happen with the Budget. I know that the Budget is supposed to be a foregone conclusion, but, before it has gone through, there are still uncertainties until it has passed through the House and is operating in the community. A great deal of time has been lost already, and it is a matter of grave concern that the Budget should have been held up as long as it has been.

I would also like to take the opportunity of commending the action of honourable members in another place who have taken the very prudent and sensible step of debating the financial issues concurrently with the debate in this House. I am grateful to them for their consideration, because they obviously see the need for the expeditious passing of this legislation. As the Deputy Premier has said and as the Leader of the Opposition has acknowledged, we have allowed a longer time for the debate on this occasion than is usual—some five hours longer than the average.

Mr. Abbott: That is because you took longer to answer questions.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find that very difficult to accept, because it does seem to me that the ground which was covered by honourable members in the first two or three lines was remarkably detailed. Indeed, I can recall answering the same questions a number of times.

Mr. Abbott: Answered differently.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, they were answered a number of times in exactly the same way, but since members opposite did not seem to hear the first time, I obliged them by giving them the answers they required. I am sure the member for Salisbury would be the first to accept that this was done. I repeat that the so-called

detailed interrogation by the Opposition was literally, on many occasions, a repetitious bore. The question asked had been answered before, and it seemed to me that there was a competition going on at times by some honourable members opposite to see who could ask the same question the most times in different ways.

I make the point that the member for Glenelg, the member for Mallee and, indeed, all members on this side of the Chamber have just as much right to ask questions on the Budget as has any member in the House. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition was not imputing to them some second-class category of membership of this House. One of the fundamental principles of this system of Parliamentary democracy is that all members have a right to be heard as far as is possible. In applying the time limits that were applied, we were unfortunately obliged to put these restrictions on everyone in the Chamber. An examination of *Hansard* will show exactly how responsibly the time allotted was used by members on the Opposition side.

I believe that everyone who spoke from this side asked reasonable, sensible and proper questions. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Budget and Estimates committees. I am pleased that he has raised this matter. He criticises, not strongly; indeed as a former Attorney-General of this House was fond of saying, "He criticised faintly". I think it was a faint criticism. He criticised the Government for not having brought in Budget and Estimates consideration of this Budget on this occasion. This lines up with his criticism of the Government for not honouring all of its promises in the first five weeks of its office. If the Leader really believes it is possible to change a system to provide for Budget and Estimates committees to examine a Budget which had to be brought in under pressure, several weeks behind time, and was urgently needed, he is not as bright as I gave him credit for early on. That was totally impossible.

What I am hoping will happen is that before the Budget comes down next time we will have devised a system of Budget and Estimates committees to examine the Budget in the detail members would like. I share the view of the Leader that this is an unsatisfactory way of dealing with the Budget and I have said so many times. I hope that this will be the last time that we consider the Budget in this way and that we will be able to have a detailed examination with Ministers responsible for the various departments present, with the permanent heads of those departments also available to give advice and with experts, if necessary, to guide the committees of the House. I hope that system can be devised. It will take a good deal of work and it will take a good deal of co-operation from the Opposition and every member of this House, but I hope those committees can be devised and be in operation by the time the Budget is brought into this House next year. I can see no reason why the Budget will not be brought into the House in good time next year to allow that examination to occur.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot let the remarks of the Premier go without some form of response. Quite clearly he has demonstrated his discomfort in the situation that has arisen by the specious rationalisations he has produced in the last 10 minutes to try to justify a situation about which he obviously feels somewhat uncomfortable. I do not blame him for feeling uncomfortable. He feels uncomfortable enough to have to leave the Chamber immediately. That is quite all right, as I do not require him to remain. The Premier feels this discomfort, I think, understandably because of the persistent statements he made as Leader of the Opposition

about the way in which the Budget should be considered, and the time that should be allowed for this House to consider it. What he has done on this occasion has cut completely across all of those statements, all of those fiery speeches about the defence of freedom of speech of the members, or the interests and the welfare of the people, and so on. All of that has been forgotten and thrown over in a few weeks.

The former Leader of the Opposition is grappling with the realities of being the Leader of the Government, and he has found that is often at odds with the rhetoric he used in Opposition, but he is not prepared to come clean and say that is precisely the situation that has developed. He is not prepared to say, "Now that I am on the other side of the House, in Government, I can understand some of the problems a Government has with its business, with the need to get this Budget through, with the need to get on with the job. I dismissed all of those when in Opposition; I said they were meaningless and it was nonsense to use those arguments, but now in Government I understand they were true." If that sort of comment had been made by the Premier I think we could have thanked him for it, we could have believed him, and his credibility would have been restored, but unfortunately he is not prepared to do that. He must rationalise his current position, which is in effect to stand on its head everything he is on the record as having said. Thank goodness we have the *Hansard* record to refer back to, as otherwise I expect we would have denials of the exact nature of statements made by the Premier when in Opposition.

The Premier began his remarks by praising the Treasury officers and their work. We on this side of the House would heartily endorse that. While we were in Government the Treasury served us well. It is probably the best Treasury in the country with extremely skilful and efficient officers, and it is now using these skills and efficiency in the service of the new Government. We certainly support the Premier in his remarks about Treasury officers, but that is not relevant to this debate.

The Premier talked about the need for Supply and the fact that we had lost so many weeks as a result of the election. That was fully understood by the Opposition and we made quite clear there would be no prolonged debates on Supply, no attempt to resist the speedy passage of a Supply Bill through this House. Indeed, if another Supply Bill had been needed it would have been a simple matter for the Government to say so. The Premier has spoken of action taken in another place which also helped speed the consideration of the Budget. That was done with the full concurrence and agreement of the Opposition. We could have stood flat-footed against it; we chose not to do so. At all times we have co-operated. I remind the Premier of my remarks made in the course of the Supply Bill, remarks which were not questioned. I said (p. 73 of *Hansard*):

It is most important, in the case of an Appropriation Bill, particularly with the first Budget of a new Government, that the House spend a considerable time examining the financial implications of that Budget. Of course, that will be done in detail. This Supply Bill ensures that there is adequate time, in the words of the Premier, to deal with the Budget appropriately.

In this instance that adequate time was denied us. Our expectations were high. The experience of the previous Opposition, the statements it had made, suggested to us it would have an understanding, once in Government, of the need to allow the Opposition full scope. It talked about Budget and Estimates committees, about detailed scrutiny. None of these things happened. They were promised again today, but none of them happened in the course of this debate, and if indeed there was no time to

establish committees we should have been allowed to have further time to look at this Budget. Our reward for this expectation and our understanding that we would be allowed to give full consideration was the guillotine.

We are not denying the rights of members opposite to question lines and estimates; that is their function and duty. However, when in Government we were scrupulous to ensure that questions from our side of the House did not cut into the time available to members opposite. If, indeed, there had been unlimited time for this debate all questions would have been able to have been put before the House without cutting into anyone's time, but in a situation where there is a time limit surely the Opposition has the right to expect some common courtesy from members on the other side that they will approach their Ministers, who after all are in the same Party, privately or by letter, to get answers to their questions, and leave the Opposition with the full time to question. That should have been the situation with the guillotine. What happened was that, as soon as it had been applied, we saw what almost amounted to some kind of filibuster from the other side of the House.

In saying that I am not denying the rights of members opposite; I am simply pointing to the fact that rights were denied the Opposition and that the guillotine was compounded by the way in which the members of the Government side behaved. We are extremely unhappy about this situation. I do not think the Premier in his 10 minutes has given any explanation of why he has made such a sudden about-turn. It is a great pity it has taken him only a few weeks to become settled into the role of the Premier in the worst and most complacent and arrogant way. It is a pity he started that way. I hope it does not continue; I hope he harks back to his Opposition days and allows us some rights.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): Unfortunately the new Leader of the Opposition has not been in this place long enough to have a historical perspective of what has happened in this Parliament in the last nine or 10 years since the Premier and I and several others have been members. There is a precedent established by the Labor Party for the application of a guillotine motion. It was applied last year with less reason, when there was no real pressure on the Government to get its business through. It was applied by the then Leader of the House (the then member for Brighton) at somewhat short notice. However, the then Opposition (now the Government) was able to set its priorities so that in fact it could accommodate its business to the times which the Government had given to it.

I put a proposition to Opposition members, the basis of which was that we would allow them the average time over the past six years, plus five hours, for the debate. I have been here for almost 10 years, and we have seen in this current debate the clearest evidence of a filibuster that there has ever been in my experience. If we need evidence of that, I recall a discussion here in the small hours of the morning regarding the moving of the Public Works Committee out of this building. After three-quarters of an hour, the Opposition was satisfied with the reply that had been given it in the first minute. The Opposition spent one entire afternoon on one line in regard to the energy budget. I have never had clearer evidence of a filibuster in any debate since I have been here.

I put to the Opposition what I believed was a fair time allocation, and I put it fairly early in the piece. The manager for the Opposition, unfortunately, was unable to make up his mind in relation to that proposition, and that delayed the Opposition's decision. He went to the Leader

of the Opposition, who was also unable to make up his mind. He then decided that he did not have the authority to make the decision, but would have to put the proposition to Caucus. That delayed the decision for the rest of that afternoon, and that went well into the evening and the following half-day.

The curt reply I finally received was "No deal", and then I was accused of not being prepared to negotiate. How do you start from a point of negotiation when the simple response is "No deal"? I believe I proposed a generous allocation of time, namely, five hours over and above the average of the past six years. I took it that they would accommodate themselves within those constraints but, unfortunately, they have proved incapable of setting their priorities within what I believe was a generous time allocation.

I had discussions with the Opposition negotiator last Friday in relation to the passage of some Bills through the House. We had a tentative agreement that they would be through on Tuesday by about 8.30 p.m.; in the event, those Bills got through by 11.45 p.m. Tuesday. Notwithstanding that, we still added that extra time on to the time for the Budget debate, so that they got their five hours over and above the average. We accommodated them, and allowed for the fact that their negotiator could not do his sums, and added that on to the time.

I point out to the new Leader of the Opposition, who has not been here long enough to know it, that the time allowed to members has been eroded through succeeding Labor Administrations since 1970. We saw the time for questions cut in half, and the time for speeches limited. We saw gradually eroded most of the time available to members in relation to debates, questions, etc. We saw them change the mode of asking questions, because it did not suit their purposes.

I do not apologise for believing that there was some urgency in relation to the passage of this Budget, which is important to the Public Service. Many of the lines that I would call machinery measures flowing on from the previous Administration, were quizzed at length. The Government's new initiatives, as outlined by the Premier, are well known. Many of the machinery clauses that would have come into the debate as the result of decisions the Opposition made were quizzed at great length, thus indicating that, when in Government, they did not know what was going on. I believe that the Opposition has to learn to organise itself better.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Discipline themselves.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I believe that, in the circumstances, the fact that the Budget, as the Premier has pointed out, has come into the House at a far later date than in recent times indicates some urgency. I believe that the allocation of time by the Government was more than generous. The Opposition must learn to organise itself better, and I think it behoves the Leader to study in more detail what has been past practice in the House and not lead with his chin quite to the extent he has been since he assumed office. I speak in the grievance debate because—

Mr. Bannon: You've finished your speech. Sit down!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I still have three minutes left. If the Leader wants to go, he can leave; we will not miss him. If three minutes is a matter of life and death for the Leader, let him go home to mum. We would not miss him, and I would be surprised if his colleagues would miss him. I have summed up succinctly the Government's generosity in relation to the time we have allowed for the Opposition to discuss the Budget papers.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I think that the action we have seen in the Parliament in the guillotining of the debate has been appalling for the future democratic processes of this Parliament. It strikes me that one of the important features we had to consider in this Parliament was to look at the Government's philosophy and the understanding that the new Government had of the Public Service and of the administration of this State.

Members who form the new Government have not been in Government for many years, and it was important for the Parliament to analyse rigorously the way in which the Government proposed to run the State over the next year. We have been told that the aspects we raised were nit-picking and fine in the extreme. If members would look at *Hansard* and read the question we raised, they will see that they create a fine fabric of interpretation of the Budget papers. Add to that one other aspect, namely, the fact that this Parliament has 15 new members, almost one-third of its total.

It was their obligation to find out as much as they could about the operations of the State Government and of the Parliament. We have been told that we had been offered five hours beyond what was the case in previous Budget debates. That works out at 20 minutes for each new member. I believe that I fulfilled my role responsibly in trying to ascertain as much as I could regarding important matters for the State and my own district, and I believe that other new members on this side did the same.

It is worth noting that only one member on the Government benches availed himself of the opportunity to obtain that understanding, and I think that he did it with a fair degree of incompetence. Regarding two points raised by the Deputy Premier, he said that the energy debate last Thursday was an attempt at filibustering, and he roundly criticised the way in which the Opposition handled that debate. However, I refer him to his own comments at the close of that debate last Thursday, when he said:

I think this has been a useful discussion. We have heard much discussion, and points of view expressed by members from both sides of the House, which may help to clarify a few issues. I think the debate has been conducted in better spirit than it was at 4 o'clock this morning.

At that time he was praising the debate. He was saying that what we were doing was useful and successful.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May a speaker refer to a previous debate of this session?

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. In doing so, I inform the honourable member that I noted what the honourable member for Salisbury was doing. Because he is a new member, I intended to advise him quietly of this provision and point out he would not be permitted to do that in future.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your comments would have been quieter than those I have had to put up with from members on the other side of the House. The most concerning feature about the guillotine has been the lack of any debate on the Loan Estimates. We have had figures provided indicating that the Loan Estimates for the Government totalled about \$218 000 000. If one looks through those lines, it will be seen that there are fundamental areas that need investigation and discussion, and that interpret Government policy and philosophy. We have had no opportunity to discuss the way in which over \$200 000 000 is to be spent in this State. I think that is an appalling decision of the Government that it should have allowed that to happen.

Added to that is the failure of the Government to allow any discussion about community welfare, where the philosophy of the Government in power is vitally important. There has been no opportunity for discussion of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs in the light of the fact that price control is under threat. There will be no discussion at all about the Health Commission. Members opposite, when they were in Opposition, made much of the Health Commission and the Minister of Health. We wanted to ask many questions about the Budget papers, but we have been given no opportunity to do so. Regarding tourism, which ranked fairly importantly in the policy of the Government during the election, there has been no discussion whatsoever in the Budget debate.

It is vital that members on both sides of the House should have ample opportunity to discuss issues before Parliament. A Supply Bill was passed to allow for that discussion to take place. That Bill was passed without any interference from members on this side and we looked forward to the rigorous analysis that the Budget deserved.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 6 November at 2 p.m.