

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 November 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all the Questions on the Notice Paper except Nos. 23, 31, 65, 145, 166, 168, 185, 192, 193, 196, 197, 199, 205, 208, 210, 212, 213, 215, 216, 236, 250, 255, 256, 258, 265, 270, 274, 284 to 286, 302, 307, 314 to 317, 320, 321, 323, 327, 330, 337 to 359, 368, 374, 375, 388, 392, 402 to 408, 411, 413, 415, 416, 418 to 420, 435, 437, 443 to 445, 447, 450, 459, 462 to 465, 467 to 475, 477, 479, 480, 482 to 484, 486 to 496, 498, 501, 502, and 504 to 506.

AVGAS

14. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. What supplies of avgas are currently held in South Australia?
2. What steps is the Government taking to help overcome the present shortage and make provision for future essential needs?

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON**: The replies are as follows:

1. Stocks have returned to the April-May level and are in excess of two months requirements.
2. Liaison with the Commonwealth Government and with the head offices of the oil companies is continuing through the Oil Supplies Advisory Committee and the Commonwealth State Oil Supplies Liaison Committee. Liaison with the State managers of the oil companies is continuing through the South Australian Oil Industry Supply Committee.

REREFINING OF OIL

75. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Does the Government have any plans to encourage the rerefining of used automotive lubricating oils and, if so, what are these plans and, if not, why not?
2. If the Government has such plans, will private operators do this work and, if not, why not?
3. Will the Government support the rerefining of used motor oil as an energy and fuel conservation measure and, if not, why not?

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: The replies are as follows:

1. No. Consideration of such a proposal in the past has resulted in the conclusion that it is more economic to dispose of the waste oil by other means—such as blending with fuel oil for use as a fuel. The Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy is keeping the matter under review so that the appropriate Government support can be provided when the rerefining process becomes a more economic proposition.
2. (Not applicable—See 1.).
3. (Not applicable—See 1.).

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

79. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What progress is being made with respect to the investigations which are being carried out by the Department for the Environment on the areas to be set aside for the use of off-road vehicles?

2. When will these investigations be completed and will the legislation then be introduced to regulate their use?

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The replies are as follows:

1. The inter-departmental working group, established to select suitable areas to set aside for off-road recreational vehicles, has completed its investigations.
2. The nature of any legislation will be decided upon following consideration of the report of the working party.

SOLAR ENERGY

87. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Does the Government support any research projects which plan to develop air-conditioning equipment operated entirely by the use of solar energy?
2. What benefits would the successful development of such equipment for use in houses and other buildings provide environmentally and in conserving fossil fuels?
3. What priority does the Government put on the development of such equipment?
4. When does the Government anticipate that solar air-conditioning equipment will be commercially accepted, manufactured and available in South Australia?

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Widespread use of solar air-conditioning devices would assist in reducing the rate of growth of peak demand for electricity during summer.
3. High priority.
4. It depends on the rate at which research in the area progresses in Australia and overseas countries.

DRAINAGE

138. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is the Minister aware of the serious damage already caused to residences in the lower section of Salisbury East by stormwater flooding off the hills face, across Bridge Road and proceeding in general alignment with McIntyre Road towards Parafield?

2. Does the Minister acknowledge the need for a drainage scheme similar to that already provided in the south-western suburbs in the general areas abutting Sturt Creek and, if so, what investigations have been carried out to implement such a plan and what are the results of the investigations?

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Stormwater drainage is the responsibility of local government.

At the request of the then Minister of Local Government, the Commissioner of Highways, who is the Government's agent in the administration of its stormwater drainage subsidy scheme, convened a meeting of representatives of the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth, Corporation of the City of Enfield, Corporation of the City of Salisbury, Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully, District Council of Gumeracha, and District Council of Munno Para to discuss the drainage of the region which encompasses the Dry Creek and Little Para catchments.

Corporation of the City of Enfield, Corporation of the City of Salisbury and Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully have engaged a consultant to conduct hydrological studies to ascertain information required in relation to the Dry Creek catchment and this is expected to be completed by January 1980. A similar study will then be undertaken for the Little Para catchment.

The two studies are essential to determine what future action is necessary.

ROXBY DOWNS

180. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Will the Minister table a copy of the environmental review carried out by the Commonwealth (as referred to in the answer to the member for Rocky River, on 11 October 1979) relating to its approval for foreign investment for Roxby Downs exploration to continue?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No.

COAL DEPOSITS

186. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. When were tests on the Polda coal basin deposits completed by the Department of Mines and Energy and ETSA?

2. What is the quality and estimated quantity of these coal deposits?

3. Is this coal deposit considered by ETSA to be a suitable prospect for a future power station?

4. Have any tests been carried out on coal from the Balaklava, Inkerman and Clinton area to determine whether the fouling problem associated with the high sodium content of the coal can be overcome and, if so, who made the test and what were the results and, if not, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. December 1978.

2. The POLDA deposit contains approximately 150 000 tonnes of coal with a slightly lower heating value and much higher ash content than Leigh Creek coal.

3. Possibly, but it is not being considered any further by the trust at present because of its relatively small size, remote location, and likely mining difficulties due to the fragmented disposition of seams and the presence of a number of saline and fresh water aquifers.

4. Yes. Various laboratory scale tests have been done by the Electricity Trust and on the trust's behalf by the following:

Australian Mineral Development Laboratories;
Australian Coal Industries Research Laboratories;
State Electricity Commission of Victoria, Herman
Central Scientific Laboratory; University of Melbourne,
Department of Chemical Engineering; and
Babcock and Wilcox U.S.A.

As a result of these tests the trust is now obtaining a large bulk sample of coal for pilot scale combustion tests in the United States and Germany.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT INQUIRY UNIT

189. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is it a fact that the Inquiry Unit in the Premier's Department has been disbanded and, if so, why?

2. Is it a fact that the unit used to receive in the vicinity of 60 inquiries per week and, if so, is the demand for some such facility continuing?

3. Are there plans in hand to meet this demand in some other way and, if so, what are these plans?

4. Who were the people working in the unit and, what arrangements, if any, have been made for their continuing employment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The former Inquiry Unit in the Premier's Department has not been disbanded. The typist/receptionist in the unit will continue to serve and a newly appointed officer has been seconded from another department.

2. I have no figures as to the precise number of inquiries dealt with by former officers, but it is obvious that the number of callers has decreased significantly.

3. There are no plans to establish other means of answering inquiries as they have diminished. A Public Service position has been advertised in relation to the Riverland.

4. The three Ministerial appointees have been removed and of these one is now an electorate secretary and another has been offered a position in the department from whence he came. Ms. Eva Koussidis was not offered alternative employment.

MINISTERS' OVERSEAS TRIPS

191. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which Ministers will travel overseas at public expense in the next 12 months, for how long will each Minister be outside Australia and what will be the cost of each trip?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No Ministers plan to travel abroad during this financial year, except the Minister of Environment and the Minister for Local Government. The Minister of Environment will be overseas for approximately one week. Estimated cost is \$1 300. The Minister of Local Government will be overseas for approximately six days. Estimated cost is not yet available. The Minister of Agriculture will travel to Kangaroo Island regularly.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

217. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What trips abroad, at Government expense, are planned for Ministers and other members of Parliament, during the present financial year?

2. In the case of each such trip:

(a) what is the purpose;

(b) when will it be undertaken;

(c) how long will it last;

(d) who are expected to make up the party travelling; and

(e) what is the total estimated cost and how is that cost made up?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No Ministers plan to travel abroad during this financial year, except the Minister of Environment and Minister of Local Government.

The Minister of Environment:

1. Plans to travel to New Zealand.

2. (a) Attend the Australian Environment Council Meeting in Christchurch.

(b) December.

(c) Five days.

(d) This has yet to be determined.

(e) Vide (d).

The Minister of Local Government:

1. Plans to travel to New Zealand.

2. (a) To attend the 1980 Local Government Ministers' Conference and the 1980 Housing Ministers' Conference.
- (b) In April and February 1980, respectively.
- (c) Both conferences are scheduled for three days each.
- (d) No decision has been made.
- (e) Not yet available.

Certain members of the Parliament will be undertaking overseas tours arranged under the auspices of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

PROSTITUTION

223. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does the Government propose to move to set up a Select Committee on prostitution, with the same terms of reference as that appointed previously and, if so, when and, if not, why not?
2. Is it proposed to take any, and what, action to alter the law relating to prostitution and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A Select Committee as described by the honourable member was set up during his absence from the House on Thursday 8 November.

GOLDEN GROVE HOUSING

229. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it still proposed to proceed with the housing development at Golden Grove, or is it now proposed to sell off the land and develop elsewhere and in the latter case, why and in what areas?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The proposed development at Golden Grove by the South Australian Land Commission is under review by the committee which the Government has established to review the operations of the Land Commission.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT INQUIRY

234. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What are the terms of reference of the inquiry being carried out by the police into the activities of the Department for the Environment?
2. Why is such an inquiry being made and who requested it of the police?
3. When is it expected to be finished?
4. To whom is any report of the inquiry to be given and will it be made public and, if not, why not?
5. What progress, if any, has been made so far in the inquiry?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no terms of reference.
2. The inquiry is being made because of allegations about illegal trapping and trafficking of protected birds.
3. Not known at this stage.
4. Depends upon the result of the investigation.
5. Disclosure of progress would expose the nature and extent of police inquiries and may hinder further inquiries.

FLINDERS RANGE REPORT

235. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does the Government intend to acquire any of the

properties that were mentioned in the Flinders Range Draft Planning Report as suitable areas for recreational purposes or national parks and, if so, which properties and when would acquisition take place?

2. Has the Minister's department or any other department advised the current owners of the Government's intention towards the properties mentioned in the report?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The matter will be considered if the properties are offered for sale. They are: Wilpena, Upalinna, Arkaba, Merna Mora, Willow Springs, Rawnsley Park Stations.
2. Yes.

MARKET GARDEN PRODUCE

241. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What has been the commercial value of market garden produce exported from South Australia for each year since 1975-76?

2. What efforts does the Government propose to take to promote an increase in this type of export?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No precise figures are available on the value of market garden produce exported from South Australia. On available Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for gross production, the value of export is calculated as:

1975-76—\$14 114 800

1976-77—\$14 367 000

1977-78—\$14 904 700

1978-79—\$81 500 (overseas exports only; value of produce sold interstate not available at present).

2. Glasshouse tomatoes, which have been one of the main vegetable exports to Eastern States for many years, recently have met strong competition from Queensland produce. To meet this competition the Department of Agriculture has given increased attention to grading, presentation and transport of tomatoes. Problem areas have been discussed with industry organisations, field days and seminars on post harvest handling and packaging have been held and trials on varietal suitability for the glasshouse industry are in progress.

The prospects for direct overseas sales of vegetables were examined by an officer of the department, Mr. D. R. Harvey, during a trade mission to Asian countries and the Arabian Peninsula in October 1978. The mission also included representation of commercial organisations involved in the packaging and marketing of fruit and vegetables. Since his return, Mr. Harvey has discussed marketing prospects for vegetables with marketing and grower groups. He is available for consultation by any interested person or organisation.

RESEARCH PAPER

245. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the Minister provide a copy of the scientific research paper by the C.S.I.R.O. referred to in the answer to a question without notice on 17 October 1979?

2. Who is the author of the paper?

3. Where has the paper been published?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister's reply of 17 October made no reference to a specific research paper by the C.S.I.R.O.

2. See above.

3. See above.

LAND TENURE

251. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many hectares in South Australia are there in the following categories—

- (a) crown lease;
- (b) perpetual lease;
- (c) miscellaneous lease;
- (d) war service lease;
- (e) pastoral lease;
- (f) freehold;
- (g) national parks and wildlife reserves;
- (h) coastal reserves; and
- (j) any other form of land tenure?

2. What area of land in South Australia is used for—

- (a) agricultural purposes; and
- (b) forests?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 June 1979 there were 4 166 984 hectares proclaimed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act in South Australia. The precise details requested are not easily obtainable.

2. Refer to S.A. Year Book.

1. Is the Minister aware of the damage caused to Government and private buildings in Port Pirie by the installation of the sewerage scheme in that city?

2. Does the Government accept responsibility for such damage?

3. How many claims for compensation have been received by the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

4. How many offers of compensation have been made by the department?

5. What is the total amount of compensation paid to date?

6. What is the position relating to Government buildings?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, the Government is aware of damage caused to private buildings. It is not aware of any damage to Government buildings.

2. Yes, in cases where it can be established that the Engineering and Water Supply Department's activities caused the damage or a proportion of it.

3. 50.

4. 38 to date.

5. \$7 117.50.

6. See answer to part 1.

SOLAR POWERED IRRIGATION PUMPS

262. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Government aware of the development overseas of solar powered irrigation pumps and, if not, why not?

2. Are such pumps suitable for use in Riverland irrigation areas by individual growers and are they of sufficiently large capacity to be of use to the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No. The low pumping capacity of solar pumps renders them unsuitable for use by both individual growers and the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

CHIRONIMIDS

271. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Will the Government provide funding to the Port Augusta City Council to assist in the eradication of chironimids?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Port Augusta City Council has approached the Government for financial assistance to help in eradicating chironimids (midge flies) in the lagoons at the southern perimeter of the city, through the aerial spraying of Abate granular.

Before giving consideration to this request, the Government has suggested that the city council thoroughly explore alternative control measures which have been successfully implemented by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to control chironimids in lagoons at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works.

CAR PARKING

267. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What measures are being contemplated to provide adequate car parking facilities for dropping off and picking up patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. When will the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's by-laws be confirmed to provide adequate provision for the control of illegal parking within the hospital grounds?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has recently acquired a property on Woodville Road immediately in front of the out-patient entrance and has allocated this specifically for the use of visitors dropping off and picking up patients.

2. The proposed by-laws of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital have been considered and approved by the South Australian Health Commission and will be submitted for approval in Executive Council in the near future.

RED SCALE INFESTATIONS

272. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many prosecutions for red scale infestations were launched by the Citrus Organisation Committee in each of the years 1975 to 1978 and 1979 to date?

2. How many of these prosecutions were successful and, in each case, what penalty was imposed and on which date?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 1975—one, 1976—one.

2. Both prosecutions were successful.

	Prosecuted	Fined
24-5-75.....		\$50
26-5-76.....		\$55

TOXIC CHEMICALS

275. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Government aware that the New South Wales Government is considering tougher industrial health and

PORT PIRIE SEWERAGE SCHEME

269. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

safety legislation to control mercury and toxic chemical contamination?

2. How many industrial establishments are involved in the handling of mercury products in South Australia?

3. Is the Government considering similar legislation?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The N.S.W. Government has recently commenced an inquiry into the effectiveness of existing legislation for health and safety at work. The terms of reference of the inquiry are broader than the control of mercury and other toxic chemicals and cover all aspects of health and safety at work.

2. There is no register of industries handling mercury and mercury products in South Australia. These substances are used in industries ranging from laboratories, hospitals and dental surgeries to battery manufacturers, the chemical and drug industries, photo-engraving and in paints. There is also widespread domestic use of mercury in thermometers and barometers.

3. No.

TATTOOING

280. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to control the tattooing of persons, especially young persons, and when will any such action be taken?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Government proposes introducing legislation to prohibit the tattooing of persons under the age of 18 years. Regulations relating to the hygiene of premises and processes involved in carrying out skin penetration procedures (including tattooing) will be considered by the Government shortly.

MURRAY RIVER

287. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What pesticides, herbicides, and chemical fertiliser residues are monitored by the State water laboratories in the waters of the Murray River in South Australia?

	PESTICIDE		HERBICIDES	FERTILISER CHEMICALS		
	Dieldrin	Aldrin		Nitrate	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	Total Phosphate
	(Micrograms/Litre)			(Milligrams/Litre)		
RESERVOIR						
Hope Valley.....	0.08	0.01	Not detected	1.5	0.8	0.23
Happy Valley.....	0.04	0.01	Not detected	0.7	0.8	0.20
Barossa.....	0.09	0.13	Not detected	0.2	0.8	0.08
Kangaroo Creek.....	0.04	0.01	Not detected	1.2	0.8	0.16
Millbrook.....	0.17	0.07	Not detected	0.4	0.8	0.25

*Note: With respect to pesticides, monitoring of levels is carried out for those listed under the answer to question 1. Apart from aldrin and dieldrin, no traces of the remainder have been detected.

3. There are no World Health Organization standards for pesticide residues, total kjeldahl nitrogen or phosphates. The W.H.O. recommendation for nitrate is 45 milligrams per litre.

288. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Has the Engineering and Water Supply Department commissioned a group of consultants to carry out an overview study of management plans and certain remedial measures for the Murray River?

2. What are the concentration levels of these substances in the—

- (a) Murray River waters;
- (b) Mannum-Adelaide pipeline; and
- (c) reservoirs which provide Adelaide's water supply?

3. What are the World Health Organization recommended maximum levels of these substances?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. *Pesticides.* The organochlorine group (aldrin, dieldrin, D.D.T., D.D.E., endrin, lindane, chlordane, mirex, heptachlor, etc.). The organophorus group (malathion, pirathion, ethion, etc.).

Herbicides. Includes 2, 4, D and 2, 4, 5, T.

Chemical Fertilisers. Nitrates, total kjeldahl nitrogen, phosphates.

2. *(A) River Murray Waters

Pesticides	Micrograms per Litre		
	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Dieldrin.....	0.06	0.001	0.250
Aldrin.....	0.02	0.01	0.07

Pesticides have only been detected in 10 per cent of samples collected.

Herbicides

Below detection limits.

Fertiliser Chemicals

Nitrate (NO ₃).....	0.65	<0.1	3.0
Total kjeldahl nitrogen	1.0	0.1	3.5
Total phosphate (PO ₄)	0.52	0.05	2.25

*(b) Mannum-Adelaide Pipeline

Pesticides

Dieldrin.....	0.04	0.003	0.19
Aldrin.....	0.03	0.01	0.07

Herbicides

Below detection limits.

Fertiliser Chemicals

Nitrate (NO ₃).....	0.6	0.1	2.0
Total kjeldahl nitrogen	1.0	0.1	1.8
Total phosphate (PO ₄)	0.5	0.19	0.9

*(c) Reservoirs which provide Adelaide's water supply—average concentrations.

2. Have any environmental guidelines been included in the brief for this study and if so, what are these guidelines and if not, why not?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Messrs. Kinnaird Hill de Rohan and Young have been commissioned to prepare a position statement describing the current status of Government involvement in the planning, servicing and managing of aspects of River Murray affairs concerned directly or indirectly with irrigation based industry. The consultant is required to

review information from all sources and identify any conflicts, inconsistencies and deficiencies which may exist in current policies and programmes.

2. As the study is a fact-finding exercise on total Government involvement, no specific environmental guidelines have been included but the consultant would be expected to examine this aspect along with all other activities having implications for irrigation based River Murray communities and industries.

ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND

291. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. When did work commence on the adventure playground in Belair Recreation Park?

2. How much money has this project cost so far?

3. Were tenders called for the construction of this project and, if so, how many were received?

4. Who is actually carrying out the work on the project?

5. Is work presently in progress on the project and, if not, why not?

6. When is it anticipated that the playground will be completed?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. 4 April 1978.

2. \$180 000, including toilet facilities for general park use.

3. No.

4. Previous work on this project was carried out by employees under the SURS scheme. Completion work is being undertaken by employees of the National Parks and Wildlife Division.

5. Yes.

6. The Playground is largely complete and open. Levelling and grassing of the area is continuing.

CLELAND CONSERVATION PARK

292. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What was the cost of the ticket box situated at the main entrance to the Cleland Conservation Park and is this facility now in use, and, if not, why not?

2. How many different exhibits have been staged at the Park Visitor's Centre since the centre was opened last year?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost of the ticket box, which was an initiative of the previous Government, was \$46 000. It is not in use. The Cleland Conservation Park Trust, formed in late 1978, is undertaking a full examination of proposals for the development of a major fauna exhibit at Cleland. This may materially change the nature and concept of the existing fauna zone from that envisaged some years ago. Current entrance arrangements are therefore to remain until future plans for the fauna park have been resolved.

2. The exhibit at the Cleland Interpretation Centre is a static display and not designed to be altered on a short term regular basis. Consideration is being given to a different main exhibit in the near future. Special exhibits have been on display during school holidays and World Environment Day and regular slide/movie shows and small mammal displays are being held on weekends and public holidays.

NORTH-WEST PARK

293. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Since answering a question in the House

on 2 August 1978 relating to the unnamed conservation park in the north-west of the State, has the present or any previous Minister received any submissions from environmental groups about the future of the park and, if so, how many submissions have been received and what was the nature of these submissions?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, three. One requested that the park be protected no matter what the outcome of any claim made over the area by the Pitjantjatjara people, one asked that the conservation park not be included in the land given to the Aboriginal people and the other supported proposals for control of their lands by the Pitjantjatjara people and asked that the protection of the conservation value of any land, which is the subject of a successful claim, would be ensured in some way. The submission further expressed the hope that no action would be taken without prior discussion with the Pitjantjatjara people.

CLELAND CONSERVATION PARK

295. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What was the cost of the work which has been done to 30 June 1979 on the new wombat "enclosure" at Cleland Conservation Park?

2. What is the estimated cost of work which remains to be done in order to complete this wombat "enclosure"?

3. Who is carrying out this work?

4. When will it be completed?

5. Were tenders called for this work to be done and, if not, why not?

6. How many wombats are presently housed in the new "enclosure" and, if it is not yet being used, when is it anticipated that it will be used?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. \$33 857

2. \$3 000

3. This work has been carried out by persons employed under the SURS scheme, staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Division and by contractors.

4. When the consultants to the Cleland Trust have examined the fauna area and released their report.

5. Vide 3. Tenders were called for concrete walling works.

6. None—Vide 4.

RESERVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

296. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many times has the Reserves Advisory Committee met since it was established on 1 February 1979?

2. If it has not met, why not?

3. If it has met, what matters has it considered?

4. Have any management plans for national, conservation or recreation parks, or game reserves been finalised since the formation of the committee and, if any, which parks now have formal management plans?

5. Which parks and reserves are proposed to have plans drawn up for their management in the 1979-80 financial year?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Eleven times.

2. Vide 1.

3. The matters it has considered include: Recommendations concerning the Innes National Park

Draft Management Plan; Study of Flinders Ranges National Park Draft Management Plan; Recommendations for the use of Wildlife Conservation Funds; Development of Wetland Reserves.

4. No. The Cape Gantheaume Conservation Park had a formal Management Plan.

5. The Innes and Flinders Ranges National Park Draft Management Plans should be finalised in 1979-80. Management plans for Belair and Para Wirra Recreation Parks and Cleland Conservation Park are in the advanced stages of being compiled.

GENERAL RESERVES TRUST

297. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many times has the General Reserves Trust, which was established on 30 November 1978 met?

2. If it has not met, why not?

3. If it has met, what progress has been made?

4. How many management plans have been finalised for the 17 parks under its care?

5. What priority for the preparation of management plans has been given for these 17 parks?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. 12.

2. Vide 1.

3. Following its initial formative period the trust is establishing guidelines on its methods of operation and priorities. Whilst the trust has funded several minor projects relative to those parks under its control, it has considered and recommended provisions of finances for the following major projects:

(1) Upgrading of the road and parking area east of the lake at Para Wirra Recreation Park.

(2) Provision of an adequate water supply for the Belair Golf Course.

(3) Purchase of Balconoona Station to provide additional land for the Gammon Ranges National Park.

(4) Provision of a comprehensive report on the requirements and availability of water for the Belair Recreation Park.

4. None.

5. Production of essential management plans is considered to be one of the Trust's highest priorities and to date it has provided funds to finalise management plans for the Belair Recreation Park, Para Wirra Recreation Park and the Hallett Cove Conservation Park.

Management plans for caravan parks under the trust's control are in the moderate to high priority and the remainder of parks in the low to moderate priority.

CATERING STAFF

300. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: How much annually are the wages of the catering staff of Parliament, by whom are these wages paid and where does the money come from to pay them?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Wages for 1978-79 totalled \$134 396. The estimate for 1979-80 is \$142 803. The wages for the catering staff are paid for by the Government out of General Revenue.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

301. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does the Government receive an annual balance sheet or other form of report setting out its financial affairs (and which) from the Joint House Committee and, if so, will it make such balance sheet or report public and, if not, why not?

2. If the balance sheet or report will not be made public, will the Government introduce legislation to amend the Joint House Committee Act to provide for the publication of a balance sheet or other form of financial report (and which)?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Not applicable—see 1.

WOODVILLE NORTH SERVICE

303. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it intended to close the present train shuttle service on the Woodville North spur line and if so, is it intended to replace it with one bus in the morning and one in the afternoon and if so, how will this provide an adequate service for the commuters who work in the Woodville North area?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The rail service on the Woodville North spur line was discontinued on 17 August 1979. A replacement bus service (one in the morning and one in the evening) was provided for those employees required to work between 7.30 a.m. and 4.00 p.m. This service operates between Port Road, Woodville Railway Station and Finsbury.

Alternative travel is available on the City-Port Adelaide via Torrens Road and Addison Road bus service, Route No. 3. Buses on this route operate more frequently than the previous rail service.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION

306. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Were any sales of clothing from the State Clothing Corporation made to Government departments during the first six months of production and if so, which departments were involved and what was the value of sales to each?

2. What was the total value of sales from the corporation during the first six months of production?

3. What was the value of sales to customers other than Government departments?

4. What are the details of any sales in excess of \$5 000?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN replies are as follows:

1. Sales were made to—

Department of Services and Supply \$283 000

Department of Correctional Services \$5 200

Public Buildings Department \$400

2. \$292 700.

3. South Australian Health Commission \$4 100.

4. Sales in excess of \$5 000 were made as follows:

Department	Item	Price \$
Dept. of Services and Supply	Sheets	92 100
Dept. of Services and Supply	Hospital Gowns	45 000
Dept. of Services and Supply	Coveralls	24 200
Dept. of Correctional Services	Shirts and Trousers	5 200

BALCANOONA STATION

308. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Have negotiations been completed between the Government and the owner of Balcanoona Station relating to its purchase?
2. How much of the station is to be added to the Gammon Ranges Conservation Park?
3. When will this area be proclaimed?
4. What plans does the Government have for the area not included in the park?
5. What measures will the Government take to control pest animals, including feral goats, in the intervening period?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. It is anticipated that, approximately 80 000 hectares will be added.
3. Not yet determined.
4. Any area not to be included in the Park would be leased for pastoral purposes.
5. Interim management of the Balcanoona area for pastoral purposes is proposed for up to five years. During that time, the Government will adopt a similar approach to goat control to that in other parts of the Flinders Ranges.

ST. KILDA BOAT HAVEN

309. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has a decision been made by the Government in relation to the construction of a boat haven at St. Kilda and, if so, what was this decision and when was it made?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No.

HOUSING LOANS

310. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many complaints has the Discrimination Board received over the past two years at the "age limit" imposed on single persons by the State Bank for housing loans?
2. What recommendations has the board made to the Government and, if none, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. None. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has no jurisdiction in the question of discrimination only on account of a person's age.
2. None. Because Federal Funding is involved the matter has been referred to Federal authorities.

ENROLMENTS

322. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What have been the total enrolments in primary and secondary schools during each of the past five years?
2. What impact will the projected enrolments for 1980 have on the student-teacher ratio?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1.	*Primary	*Secondary	Special Schools	Total
1975.....	150 428	82 708	1 576	234 712
1976.....	149 988	82 062	1 564	233 614
1977.....	150 578	81 079	1 553	233 210
1978.....	148 483	80 439	1 533	230 455
1979.....	145 301	77 690	1 534	224 525
1980 est. . .	143 300	75 950	1 550	220 800

*Primary and secondary include children in special classes, speech and hearing centres and the Correspondence School.

2.	Primary	Secondary	Special Schools
1979 (preliminary)	19.0:1	12.0:1	5.0:1
1980 (estimated)	18.6:1	11.7:1	4.8:1

The projected enrolments for 1980 will result in decreased student/teacher ratios in both primary and secondary schools. Using projected enrolments for the August Census 1980 the student/teacher ratio in primary will fall to 18.6:1 from 19.0:1 in August 1979. A similar fall to 11.7:1 from 12.0:1 will occur in secondary. However, it should be borne in mind that August enrolments do not represent the peak of student numbers in either primary or secondary. Primary enrolments reach their maximum during December and the estimated student/teacher ratio for December 1980 is 19.0:1. Secondary enrolments, however, will be at their peak during February and the estimated student/teacher ratio in those schools at that time will be 12.3:1. The figures referred to in both answers relate to Government schools.

METROPOLITAN RAILWAY

324. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What plans does the Government have for upgrading the section of the State's railway network under its control?
2. What effect does the Government anticipate a future fuel shortage will have on the metropolitan rail system and any plans for improving the same?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A programme of upgrading the metropolitan railway system currently being pursued by the State Transport Authority includes the following:

Introduction of new railcars; renovation of existing rail cars; upgrading of permanent way; replacement of older signalling installations; upgrading of railway stations; construction of new workshops and servicing; facilities, and improvements to communications systems.

2. There is little doubt that patronage on rail services could increase substantially in the event of there being a future fuel shortage. With this in mind the Government is considering, in addition to the programme outlined in 1. above, the extension of existing rail lines into developing residential areas and the acquisition of additional rollingstock.

In a short term, all rail rollingstock which has been made redundant by the introduction of new rollingstock will be retained by the authority for further use if required.

URANIUM OXIDE PLANT

325. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the Government been approached by the Port Pirie City Council with a request that the Government purchase the former uranium oxide plant at Port Pirie?
2. If the Government has been approached, does it intend to purchase the plant and, if so, what action has been taken to do so?

3. For what purposes will this plant and site be used if it is purchased or being considered for purchase?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. The Government has not made a decision on purchase of the land.
3. Not appropriate (see 2. above).

DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE

328. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Will the Chief Secretary undertake to seriously consider alteration to the method of punishment of persons driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs by the provision of indeterminate disqualification linked with bonds and in the case of imprisonment, by the provision of numerous weekend allocations instead of continuous time or an increased term on a live-in-work-out basis and if so, will he amend the legislation or, alternatively, appoint a Select Committee to advise him and, in either case, when?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Mitchell Committee recommended the introduction of a system of punishment by imposing work orders on offenders and the Government is currently examining the proposal. The Chief Secretary proposes visiting Victoria shortly to examine at first hand the weekend work scheme which is operating there. At this stage the Government is not considering any revision of penalties which might involve indeterminate disqualification from holding driver's licences.

URANIUM REFERENDUM

329. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the Premier's policy to permit the people of South Australia to decide the question of the mining of and treatment of uranium by way of a referendum and, if so, when will such a referendum be held and what will be the question put and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

COPYING MACHINES

331. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will the Minister allocate a copying machine to electorate offices on the basis that a small inexpensive model will be provided (e.g. a desk top model)?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government does not propose to allocate copying machines to electorate offices.

THE PADDOCKS

333. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When is it proposed to provide bus transport facilities along the lower portion of Kesters Road for residents in the new S.A.H.T. estate on The Paddocks at Para Hills West?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The provision of a bus service into Para Hills west is currently under consideration. The proposal is for the re-routing of bus route 503 via Kesters Road in lieu of Maxwell Road. If agreed to, it is likely that the route alteration will be made in mid-1980 when time tables in the area are reviewed in conjunction with the opening of the State Transport Authority's new Elizabeth bus depot.

OPTICAL SERVICES

360. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Does the Government propose to provide pensioner optical services through the Port Pirie and Port Augusta Hospitals and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Government envisage using the private opticians in these cities to provide the services and, if so, will it be on a fee for service basis and, if not, what will be the arrangements?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Pensioner optical services are to be provided progressively to eligible country residents.

2. Both ophthalmologists and optometrists have been approached to provide the service. Negotiations concerning the necessary financial arrangements are at an advanced stage and it is expected that final details will be completed shortly.

DENTAL SERVICES

361. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Does the Government propose to provide pensioner dental services through the Port Pirie and Port Augusta Hospitals and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Government envisage using the private dentists in these cities to provide the service and, if so, will it be on a fee for service basis and, if not, what will be the arrangements?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has yet been made on the provision of pensioner dental services at Port Pirie and Port Augusta.

2. As above.

WATER FILTRATION

362. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Can the preliminary planning and design work necessary for the filtering of the northern cities water supply take place within the Engineering and Water Supply Department without there being a special vote for this project in the budget and, if not, why not and, if so, why is such work not being done?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The preliminary planning has already been undertaken as part of the project's feasibility study. Further work on the project has been deferred pending reconsideration of the scheme in approximately 12 months. Whilst the Government is aware that the physical quality of water supplied to the area is generally unsatisfactory and is sympathetic to the needs of the people in the area, this decision has been taken in light of the many financial commitments facing the State as a whole. As soon as the economy permits, action will be taken to improve the quality of water supplied to northern towns.

GLADSTONE RAIL SERVICE

363. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the intention of the Minister in respect to proposals by the Australian National Railways Commission to discontinue all rail passenger services to Gladstone and a number of such services between Adelaide and Peterborough?

2. Is it the intention of the Minister to allow the A.N.R.C. to curtail these services in a similar manner to that which occurred between Adelaide and Port Pirie?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No advice has been received from the A.N.R.C. that it proposes to discontinue all rail passenger services to Gladstone or reduce such service between Adelaide and Peterborough.

TRANSPORT POSITIONS

364. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Government's deployment policy still adhered to and, if so, why does the S.T.A. encourage applicants to submit applications for positions with promise of a job in six to eight weeks?

2. Will the Minister direct the employment section of the S.T.A. to give all applicants for jobs the details of the Government's policy?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority is co-operating with Government departments which have surplus labour by seeking replacements for vacancies from within the public sector. Where suitable personnel are not available from within the public sector, employees are sought from outside. Applicants for positions in the Authority are not promised a job in six to eight weeks, but advised that it could take that time to process their applications.

SPECIAL BRANCH

365. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it Government policy to change the structure of the Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force and, if so, in what manner and why and if its role is to be changed, in what manner and why?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: See reply to Question on Notice No. 190.

INJURY INSURANCE

366. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Transport Department have personal injury insurance to cover rail lines when the service has been discontinued and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority does not insure against personal injury on rail lines on which the service has been discontinued, but carries this risk itself. It is the policy of the Authority to carry all normal risks itself and to insure with outside insurers only against calamities. This has proven to be the most economical arrangement.

SUNDAY TRADING

369. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What evidence is available of any pressing demand for the extension of Sunday trading hours for hotels?

2. What intention does the Government have for any change in hotel trading hours?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no evidence of any pressing community demand.

2. The Government has no intention of changing hotel trading hours at present.

BRAY STREET

370. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. On what date did Bray Street, Morphettville, become a priority road?

2. How successful has this priority road status been in Bray Street?

3. What effect on the speed of cars in Bray Street and adjacent residential areas has it had?

4. Has any strong opposition to this priority road status been expressed by local residents?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 16 August 1978.

2. There has been a reduction in the number of reported accidents in Bray Street.

3. It has not been assessed by the Highways Department, but studies on other priority roads have indicated that there has not been a measurable increase in the speed of traffic on such roads.

4. The Highways Department is unaware of any opposition by local residents, but, as the Corporation of the City of Marion is responsible for Bray Street, it is possible that complaints have been made direct to Council.

TOXIC WASTES

371. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does a "black market in dumping highly toxic liquid wastes" similar to the Victorian problem reported in the *Advertiser* of 10 October exist in South Australia?

2. Do officers of the Department for the Environment have any reason to suspect that illegal disposal of toxic liquid wastes is taking place?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department for the Environment is not aware of a black market in dumping highly toxic liquid wastes in South Australia.

2. No.

COMPANIES

372. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. When will the proclamation take place of the Companies Act Amendment Act, 1979?

2. Will the Government consider publication of the ages of company directors passing the age at which they must stand for re-election each year under section 91 of the Act?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Companies Act Amendment Act, 1979 was proclaimed to come into force on 9 July 1979. The proclamation suspended the operation of a substantial part of this Act, because of the need for consequential amendments to the Companies Regulations and to the Rules of Court under the Companies Act. It is expected that amendments to the Regulations and Rules will be completed shortly.

2. No: it is not a matter for the Government.

OFFICER BASIN

373. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What specific plans has the Government for assessing the hydrocarbon potential of the Officer Basin and when will these plans be implemented?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Department of Mines and Energy has drilled three stratigraphic wells in the Officer Basin at Wilkinson Lake, Byilkaora No. 1 and Marla 1B. It is proposed to drill another stratigraphic well in the southern portion of the Basin early next year, depending on results of interpretative studies now in progress.

SHOPPING ZONES

376. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Which allotments not presently zoned for shopping have been recommended by the City of Noarlunga to be rezoned as indicated in an article on page 8 of the *Advertiser* of 24 October?

2. Which zoning category has been recommended and which land uses are permitted, not permitted and subject to consent in that category?

3. When will the Minister make a decision on this matter?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Corporation of the City of Noarlunga has submitted rezoning proposals for the Beach Road area to the State Planning Authority. The proposals, if implemented, would result in 26 allotments presently zoned Residential 2 being incorporated in proposed Local Business or Local Commercial Zones. It should be pointed out, however, that only eight of the 26 allotments are not currently being used for retail or commercial purposes. Specific allotments involved in the proposed extension to the supermarket complex referred to in the *Advertiser* of 24 October, are Lots 60, 61, 62, 716, 714 and 715, Saltash Avenue, and Lots 706, 708 and 709 Beach Road.

2. The zoning category proposed for the land involved in the proposed supermarket extension is local business. Within the proposed zone permitted use groups are 6, 7, 10 and 18 (shops, hotels, offices and minor public facilities); consent use groups are 4, 8, 11, 12, 14, 19 and 21 (health centres, petrol filling stations, motor show-rooms, squash courts, light industry, fire stations and recreation areas). Prohibited use groups are 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23 and 27. Land uses in the prohibited category include residences, institutions, warehouses, stadiums, general industry, special industry, extractive industry and large public facilities.

3. The rezoning application made by the council will be referred to the State Planning Authority under section 38 (2a) of the Planning and Development Act for assessment of the proposed form of the regulations prior to their being placed on public exhibition. Following public exhibition the proposed amendments to council's zoning regulations, including any alterations to the original proposals deemed appropriate by council in the light of submissions made to it during the public exhibition, will be forwarded to the State Planning Authority and subsequently to the Minister of Planning for authorisation.

An application for a proposed extension of the supermarket complex was referred to the Minister of Planning under Section 36c of the Planning and Development Act, and on Friday 2 November 1979 the Minister of Planning authorised the Noarlunga council to deal with the application. This authorisation was based on the understanding that the rezoning of the site would proceed as soon as possible and that the proposed amendments to council's regulations would include measures designed to protect adjoining residential areas.

Now that council has been authorised to deal with the application the latter will be placed on public exhibition for ten (10) days during which time written objections may be lodged with the council. Should an objector subsequently be aggrieved by council's decision on the application, there is a right of appeal to the Planning and Appeal Board.

FLOODING

377. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How often in the past 10 years have floodwaters in the Brownhill Creek and the Glen Osmond-Parkland-Keswick Creek systems threatened either life or property?

2. Is the Government prepared to honour its predecessor's commitment to a 50-50 subsidy for the building of a basin in the South Parklands to control flooding from these creeks?

3. Is the diversion of any of the water northwards into the Botanic Creek part of the system?

4. What is the current state of negotiations with local government?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Not known.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. Representations have been made to the Minister of Local Government requesting that a drainage authority be formed, comprised of local government bodies with interests in the drainage system.

PUBLIC SERVICE

380. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979, three officers of the Public Service under the Minister of Health's administration—

(a) have been transferred.

No other officers under the Minister's administration—

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer.

The information provided includes transfers of base grade staff requested by officers for personal and developmental reasons, which are not necessarily related to a change of government.

2. 1. (a) Robert Broughton Nicholls

(b) Finance Manager AO-2 in the Health Commission at a salary of \$19 059 per annum.

(c) Temporarily transferred as Research Officer AO-2 in the Premier's Department at a salary of \$19 059 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Transferred at the request of the Premier.

2. (a) Bruce Guerin

(b) Substantively Executive Assistant EO-4 in the Public Service Board at a salary of \$32 928 per annum. On extended leave without pay. Appointed as Executive Commissioner EO-5 in the Health Commission at a salary of \$36 901 per annum.

(c) Returned to substantive position as Executive Assistant EO-4 in the Public Service Board at a salary of \$32 928 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Mr. Guerin's position as Executive Commissioner was abolished by the Health Commission. Therefore, Mr. Guerin returned to his substantive position.

3. (a) Wendy Anne Symons

(b) Substantively Typist-in-Charge Grade I (MN-2) in the Premier's Department at a salary of \$11 060 per annum. Temporarily transferred as Steno-Secretary Grade III (MN-4) in the Health Commission at a salary of \$11 699 per annum.

(c) Temporarily transferred as temporary Steno-Secretary Grade III (MN-4) in the Public Service Board at a salary of \$11 699 per annum, pending consideration of the most appropriate permanent position.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Transfer of Mr. Guerin to whom Ms. Symons was providing a stenographic service.

Health Commission.

Department of Tourism.

381. Mr. PAYNE (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979 one officer of the Public Service under the Deputy Premier's administration—

(a) has been transferred;

No other officers under the Deputy Premier's administration—

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer.

The information provided includes transfers of base grade staff requested by officers for personal and developmental reasons, which are not necessarily related to a change of government.

2. 1. (a) Jayne Townsend Nolan.

(b) Office Assistant (AO-1) in the Department of Services and Supply at a salary of \$8 953 per annum.

(c) Transferred as an Office Assistant (OA-1) in the Woods and Forests Department at a salary of \$8 953 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) The transfer was personally requested due to domestic circumstances.

Department of Services and Supply.

Department of Mines and Energy.

382. Mr. PAYNE (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Since 15 September what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) Was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979 no officers of the Public Service under the Minister of Water Resource's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer.

2. Engineering and Water Supply Department

3. Department of Lands

383. Mr. WRIGHT (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Since 15 September what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) Was the officer advised that the transfer could not

be to certain departments and if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979 three officers of the Public Service under the Minister of Transport's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

No other officers under the Minister's administration—

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or have been requested to transfer.

The information provided includes transfers of base grade staff requested by officers for personal and developmental reasons, which are not necessarily related to a change of Government.

2. (1) (a) Diana Angela Duzcek.

(b) Office Assistant (OA-1) in the Highways Department at a salary of \$5 452 per annum.

(c) Transferred as Office Assistant (OA-1) to the Police Department at a salary of \$5 452 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) This officer was transferred as a result of the legislation administered by the Road Charges Section being repealed.

2. (a) Deborah Joan Dowling.

(b) Office Assistant (OA-1) in the Highways Department at a salary of \$5 452 per annum.

(c) Transferred to Office Assistant (OA-1) to the Police Department at a salary of \$5 452 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) This officer was transferred as a result of the legislation administered by the Road Charges Section being repealed.

3. (a) Julian Emmaline Almond.

(b) Substantively Steno-Secretary, Grade III (MN-4) in the Department of Transport at a salary of \$12 441 per annum.

(c) Temporarily transferred as Steno-Secretary, Grade III, to the Minister of Local Government at a salary of \$12 441 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Displaced when the previous Minister of Tourism (Mr. Casey) resigned. Still to be permanently placed. Highways Department.

Department of Transport.

384. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer, from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979, two officers of the Public Service under the Minister of Education's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

No other officers under the Minister's administration—

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer.

The information provided includes transfers of base grade staff requested by officers for personal and developmental reasons, which are not necessarily related to a change of government.

2. 1. (a) Ronald Charles Bateman.

(b) Chief Administrative Officer (AO-2) in the Minister's Office of the Education Department at a salary of \$19 392 per annum.

(c) Temporarily transferred as Senior Project Officer (AO-2) in the Education Department at a salary of \$19 392 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Mr. Bateman was transferred at the request of the Minister of Education.

2. (a) Sandra Gay Fawcett.

(b) Substantively Office Assistant (OA-1) in the Education Department at a salary of \$9 542 per annum. Ms. Fawcett was on leave without pay and appointed as Ministerial Officer, Grade V in the Deputy Premier's Office on a salary of \$11 060 per annum.

(c) Temporarily transferred as an Office Assistant (OA-1) in the Department of Further Education at a salary of \$9 542 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) Ms. Fawcett was not required by the new Minister and did not wish to return to her substantive position.

385. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer, from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what

departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Since 15 September 1979, one officer under the Minister of Agriculture's administration—

(a) has been transferred;

No other officers under the Minister's administration—

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer.

The information provided includes transfers of base grade staff requested by officers for personal and developmental reasons, which are not necessarily related to a change of government.

2. (a) Anthony James Roach Clancy.

(b) Substantively Publicity and Promotions Officer, Grade III (PP-3) in the Department of Agriculture at a salary of \$17 053 per annum—on leave without pay and appointed as Press Secretary (MO-II) to the Minister of Agriculture at a salary of \$19 990 per annum plus 10 per cent allowance in lieu of overtime.

(c) Transferred as Publicity and Promotions Officer (PP3) in the Department of Fisheries at a salary of \$17 053 per annum.

(d) This officer was not advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments.

(e) This officer personally requested a transfer to enable him to work effectively as a Public Servant.

Department of Agriculture.

Department of Woods and Forests.

ARTICULATED BUSES

386. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister of Transport advise how many articulated buses are on order for the S.T.A., the timetable for the phasing in of those buses, the inner and outer suburban routes those buses will be used on, what effects those buses will have upon the passenger service operations of the S.T.A. Rail Division and whether these buses will be used in the future to eliminate the Bridgewater-Belair to Adelaide passenger rail services and/or any other rail passenger services?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: The State Transport Authority currently has on order 35 articulated buses. The buses are to be delivered progressively commencing in September 1980. It is planned to use the buses on the express type services from the Elizabeth and Noarlunga areas to Adelaide. The new buses will replace older type buses presently operating the same services. It is not anticipated that they will have any effect on the authority's rail passenger services. There is no plan that these buses replace the Bridgewater-Belair to Adelaide rail services or any other passenger rail services.

DIMENT ROAD

387. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the

Minister of Transport:

1. What is the traffic volume in both directions along Diment Road, between Bolivar and Whites Roads, during the periods 8-9 a.m. and 3-4 p.m.?

2. What proposals are being considered by the Road Traffic Board with regard to ensuring the safe crossing of pedestrians, particularly children, across that road and when will such proposals be implemented?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Traffic volumes on this section of road were last recorded on 13 September 1978 and at that time, the count was as follows: 8.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. 335 vehicles; 3.30 p.m. to 4.30 p.m. 382 vehicles.

2. The Highways Department is currently investigating the need for pedestrian protection on Diment Road for children attending the Direk Primary School. The investigation, which will include re-assessment of traffic volumes, is expected to be completed next month. Any work found to be necessary will then be implemented as soon as resources are available.

MARTINS ROAD

393. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

What is the present status of the proposed Martins Road expressway and, if it is to be proceeded with when will this take place and what peak traffic loads would such an upgraded road be capable of carrying?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Martins Road expressway is one of a number of alternative options under consideration for improving access to Adelaide from the North. No decision has yet been taken as to whether this option will be proceeded with.

BUSES

394. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

What is the average running cost per bus, per hour, of S.T.A. buses operating at the following times—

(a) week-day evenings;

(b) Saturday afternoons and evenings; and

(c) Sundays?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The average operating cost per hour of S.T.A. buses, exclusive of depreciation and finance charges, is estimated to be:

(a) \$13.00

(b) \$14.70

(c) \$17.10

COMMERCIAL VEHICLES

396. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is the Government concerned at the traffic hazard created by heavy commercial vehicles which are often parked overnight in streets in residential areas?

2. What controls are available to the Government or local government to control this practice?

3. What relevant amendments to legislation or regulations are being considered and when will such amendments be implemented?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The weight of a vehicle using residential streets is controlled by Councils under By-law provisions. The

parking of vehicles of excessive length is controlled by regulation 3 of the Local Government Act—Controls of Traffic—Parking Regulations 1979 and are directly administered by local government.

3. Amendments to regulation (No. 3) are at present being considered.

NOARLUNGA INTERSECTION

398. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister prepared to over-rule the decision of the Commissioner of Highways to refuse a request from the City of Noarlunga to prohibit U-turn movement at the junction of Dyson and Lambert Roads and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: No. Traffic signals should be installed at the nearby Dyson Road-Beach Road intersection by Christmas. The signals are expected to result in improved control of traffic movements in the abutting area, including a reduction of U-turn movements at the Dyson Road-Lambert Road junction. The Corporation of the City of Noarlunga has been advised to this effect by the Highways Department and the department has given an assurance to council that it will keep the situation under review.

HEALTH COMMISSION

399. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Have any officers of the Health Services Department been transferred to other areas of the Health Commission and if so—

- (a) how many;
- (b) to what areas have they been transferred;
- (c) what positions do they hold?
- (d) what salaries do they receive; and
- (e) will these transfers affect in any way the lines of communication between the Health Commission and community health centres?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: No.

TRADING STAMP ACT

400. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: If the Government does not propose to introduce legislation to repeal the Trading Stamp Act, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: See No. 249.

ENERGY POLICY

401. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Will the Minister provide the member for Mitchell with a copy of the draft green paper on energy policy for South Australia, mentioned in the 1978-79 annual report of the South Australian Energy Council, as soon as it is available?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No. The Green Paper will be released for public comment in due course.

DREDGE CAPSIZE

409. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has the Minister received the letter of 29 October from Mr. D. W. A. Kappelle concerning the capsizing of the dredge *H. C. Meyer* and, if so, what action, if any, does he propose to take as a result and if not, does he require a copy of the letter?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: A letter has been received from Mr. D. W. A. Kappelle. The correspondence has been referred to the Director-General of Marine and Harbors for the information of the officers involved in the departmental inquiry.

SURS GRANTS

410. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

- 1. What grants have been made since 1 July 1979 under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and when was each made?
- 2. What further grants are contemplated between now and 30 June 1980 and what is the total amount available for such grants?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

- 1. See attached list.
- 2. No provision has been made in the 1979-80 Budget for new projects not approved prior to 15 September 1979. An amount of approximately \$700 000 has been allocated to enable existing commitments under the scheme to be met.

GRANTS MADE SINCE JULY 1979 UNDER THE STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF SCHEME

Sponsor	Approval	
	Date	Amount \$
New Projects		
C.C. Burnside		
Burnside Rugby Club—club rooms	10.9.79	64 000
Far-West International rules basketball		
Ceduna indoor stadium	27.8.79	74 268
C.C. Salisbury		
Adams oval change and club rooms	27.8.79	129 000
Para Hills community house	27.8.79	110 000
C.C. Campbelltown		
Hectorville sporting club complex	27.8.79	114 659
C.C. Noarlunga		
Restore six community halls	27.8.79	67 440
C.C. Port Augusta		
Chinnery Park oval improvements	27.8.79	14 848
Mansfield Park Primary School		
Upgrade school grounds	27.8.79	11 000
C.C. Mount Gambier		
Blue Lake sports complex changerooms	27.8.79	50 000

Sponsor	Approval Date	Amount \$
New Projects		
Cumberland United Soccer and Social Club		
New change and club rooms	27.8.79	56 000
West Beach Trust		
Construct cinerama building	27.8.79	94 000
Department of Environment		
Shepherd's Hill Recreation park	27.8.79	25 508
Home Handyman Scheme—Various Councils		
(Budget allocation only—specific grants yet to be made)	27.8.79	350 000
Additional allocations to allow previously approved projects to be completed		
Education Department		
Survey of school leavers	6.11.79	2
Pilot programme	6.11.79	117
Special resource unit	6.11.79	1 353
C.T. Hindmarsh		
Redevelop Port Road/Milne Road site	17.10.79	20 000
C.C. Port Augusta		
Completion of State emergency headquarters	11.10.79	18 828
Minda Incorporated		
Upgrade accommodations	15.10.79	115 000
C.C. Salisbury		
St. Kilda community hall	11.9.79	5 000
Australian Railway Historical Society		
Dry Creek depot development	3.9.79	47 198
C.C. Marion		
Renovations to building at Marion oval	10.7.79	5 000
Construction of clubrooms Marion oval	10.7.79	10 000
Reynella Community Centre Incorporated		
Extensions to club rooms	4.7.79	22 000
		\$1 405 221

BRIEFING

412. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it Government policy that representatives in Parliament of the Australian Labor Party, Australian Democrats and National Country Party be briefed by departmental officers on matters in the same way as the Hon. Dr. Cornwall is to be briefed on environmental matters and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) who is to be so briefed;
- (c) when will such briefings begin; and
- (d) what conditions, if any, are attached to the use to which the information given may be used, and if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. Regarding paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d), Cabinet has approved instructions detailing methods to be adhered to by public servants in supplying information to members of Parliament, and these will be issued shortly.

PRESS SECRETARIES

414. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to appoint more press secretaries and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) when;
- (c) at what estimated annual cost; and
- (d) what are to be their duties,

and if not, will the Government give an assurance that no additional press secretaries will be appointed in the next 12 months?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One press secretary is still to be appointed. Details concerning this position were advertised in the press on 3 November 1979.

PORNOGRAPHY

417. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Government any present intention of introducing legislation to further control the production and/or sale of pornographic literature and, if so, when will such legislation be introduced and what will be its form and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The matter is currently under active review.

CARE OF AGED

421. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Why has there been a significant reduction in the proposed payment passed in the Estimates for the year ending 30 June 1980 for the purchase of plant and equipment in the area of aged care, compared to the amount of actual payments during the year 1978-79?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Plant and equipment needed this year is expected to cost \$1 000.

RESIDENTIAL CARE CENTRES

422. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Why are the proposed payments for provisions and expenses incurred in normal operation, development, maintenance and training, improvements, staff houses, buildings, purchase of livestock, plant, machinery, implements and equipment for Aboriginal affairs, now provided under "Residential Care Centres" and how much has been allocated for each of those items in the Estimates for 1979-80?

2. Is it Government policy to incorporate many aspects of Aboriginal affairs under "Residential Care Centres" and, if so, what is the new policy in respect of those aspects under the Department for Community Welfare's responsibility?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The department is no longer directly responsible for the administration and operation of any Aboriginal reserves. The Commonwealth Government is providing funds for Aboriginal communities on reserves and former reserves to manage their own affairs. The only amounts allocated for Aboriginal Affairs under "Residential Care Centres" for 1979-80 are \$8 000 for Klemzig home and \$600 for Largs Bay family home.

2. See 1. above.

ABORIGINAL WELFARE OFFICERS

423. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Does the provision for proposed payments for Aboriginal welfare officers, stock overseers, domestic and general staff under "Residential Care Centres" in the Estimates for 1979-80 mean a shift for Aboriginal welfare officers and stock overseers into residential care positions?

2. Why are Aboriginal welfare officers and stock overseers not mentioned under "Residential Care Centres" in the Estimates?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. The only remaining Aboriginal welfare officer (Industry) is now employed at Wami Kata, a home for aged Aboriginal persons at Port Augusta. Provision for his salary is included under aged care in the category "General staff". No stock overseers are employed.

CHILD WELFARE CENTRES

424. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Why has there been a significant reduction in proposed payments for purchase of plant and equipment for child welfare treatment centres, where are the cuts to be made and how will the "treatment programmes" be affected?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The reply is as follows: Essential requirements in 1979-80 are estimated to cost \$2 000. The treatment programmes will not be affected.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

425. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What cut-backs and other savings have been taken into account in calculating the proposed payments for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries under the item—Department for Community Welfare—Contingencies—General, in the Estimates for 1979-80?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The reply is as follows: Cut-backs and savings taken into account were Community Councils for Social Development, which are now under the Local Government Department, \$44 000, and purchase of equipment for computerisation of trust maintenance accounts, \$90 000.

MAINTENANCE OF CHILDREN

426. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How much was specifically allocated and paid during the 1978-79 year under the items—Assistance to non-statutory children's homes—Operating grants and maintenance of children; and Maintenance of children under private care, respectively?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The reply is as follows:

	Allocated	Paid
	\$	\$
Assistance to non-statutory children's homes—		
Operating grants	660 000	726 327
Maintenance of children	200 000	215 543
Maintenance of children under private care	650 000	804 000

COMMUNITY WELFARE

427. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the amount of \$9 925 399 in the Estimates for the year ending 30 June 1980, for salaries, wages and related payments to Deputy Director-General of Community Welfare, directors, professional, clerical and other staff, taking into account inflation and expected salary rises, be adequate to maintain current staff numbers?

2. If there are to be no reductions in staff numbers, how does the Minister propose to meet the salary payments?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Under the previous Government, the Public Service Board directed the department to reduce its staff by seven positions. When the department's preliminary estimates were being framed at the beginning of the financial year, it was anticipated that eight other positions would become redundant during the year. With these reductions the amount provided should be adequate.

2. See 1 above.

WELFARE EXPENDITURE

428. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Does the small increase in the Estimates for the year ending 30 June 1980 for salaries and wages to personnel employed in child welfare treatment centres, residential care centres and aged care imply a reduction of staff and services to these areas?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Funds are being provided to maintain services at the same level as at 30 June 1979. Staffing will remain at approximately the same level.

SOCIAL WORKERS

429. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware that a case is presently before the Industrial Court to establish a first award for social workers?

2. Is the Minister also aware that in the case before the Industrial Court, the term "social worker" is being used in a "generic" sense to include residential care workers, group workers and other welfare workers as well as professionally qualified social workers?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

WELFARE EXPENDITURE

430. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How much money was allocated and paid during 1978-79, specifically for emergency assistance and how much has been allocated for the year ending 30 June 1980?

2. How much was allocated and paid in financial assistance specifically to deserted wives, single mothers and wives of prisoners during 1978-79?

3. How much was allocated and paid for financial assistance specifically to other sole supporting parents during 1978-79?

4. How much has been specifically allocated for the year ending 30 June 1980 for assistance on account of hardship due to unemployment?

5. How much specifically was allocated and paid during 1978-79 for funeral expenses, rates remissions and miscellaneous assistance, etc.?

6. Can the Minister provide a complete breakdown of the 1978-79 allocation and payments and the 1979-80

proposed expenditure in each of the specific areas included in the items—other financial assistance, including family and special assistance, funeral expenses, etc.?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

	1978-79		1979-80
	Allocated \$	Paid \$	Allocated \$
1.	412 300	424 585	419 000
2.	7 340 000	7 871 000	
3.	165 000	177 000	
4.			131 000
5.	194 200	296 531	
6. Rates remissions	50 000	127 066	127 000
Non-Statutory Children's Homes—			
Operating grants	660 000	726 327	890 000 (the other \$25 000 provided is for the Emergency Foster Care Scheme)
Maintenance of children	200 000	215 543	239 000
Christmas grants	41 000	46 345	46 000
Funeral expenses	12 000	26 962	27 000
Special and family assistance	412 300	424 585	419 000
Sundries	3 200	2 064	2 000

MOTOR VEHICLES

431. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has a new directive been given for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Department for Community Welfare and, if so, what is that directive?

2. Why has there been an increase of \$127 279 for the purchase of motor vehicles compared with actual payments during 1978-79?

3. How many six-cylinder vehicles will be replaced by four-cylinder vehicles in the Department for Community Welfare?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No new directive has been given by the present Government.

2. There was a substantial delay in delivery of vehicles in 1978-79 and the cost of these vehicles has to be met this year. In addition, vehicle costs have increased.

3. Seventy-six.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

432. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What are the reasons for the reduction in the contribution towards administration and maintenance of Aboriginal housing?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The funds provided are to recoup the balance of the deficit for 1978-79 only. There has been a change in the recoup arrangements and future deficits will be recouped out of funds provided in the following financial year. The Commonwealth now reimburses the State for 50 per cent of the deficit.

WELFARE EXPENDITURE

433. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Why have sundry grants as recommended by the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee been reduced?

2. Will the Minister give an assurance that the payment of minor grants will continue?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Some funds have been transferred for grants to be made by the Department of Local Government.

2. No.

HOSPITALS FUNDING

434. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following recognised hospitals and nursing homes: The Adelaide Children's Hospital Inc.; Andamooka Outpost Hospital; Angaston and District Hospital Inc.; Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Barmera District Hospital Inc.; Berri District Hospital Inc.; Bishop Kirkby Memorial Hospital; Blyth District Hospital Inc.; Booleroo Centre District Hospital Inc.; Bordertown Memorial Hospital Inc.; Burra Burra Hospital Inc.; Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital Inc.; Clare and District Hospital Inc.; Cleve District Hospital Inc.; Coober Pedy Hospital Inc.; Cowell District Hospital Inc.; Crystal Brook District Hospital Inc.; Cummins and District Memorial Hospital Inc.; The Elliston Hospital; Eudunda Hospital Inc.; Flinders Medical Centre; Great Northern War Memorial Hospital Inc.; Gumeracha District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Hutchinson Hospital; The Jamestown Hospital Inc.; Kalyra Hospital; The Kangaroo Island General Hospital Inc.; Kapunda Hospital Inc.; Karoonda and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Kimba District Hospital Inc.; Kingston Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Lameroo District Hospital Inc.; The Laura and Districts Hospital Inc.; Leigh Creek Hospital; Lower Murray District Hospital Inc.; Loxton District Hospital Inc.; Lyell McEwin Hospital; The Maitland Hospital Inc.; The Mannum District Hospital Inc.; Marree Emergency Hospital; Meningie and Districts Memorial Hospital Inc.; Millicent and District Hospital Inc.; Minlaton District Hospital Inc.; Modbury Hospital; Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Mount Gambier and District Hospital Inc.; Mount Pleasant District Hospital Inc.; Murat Bay District Hospital Inc.; The Murray Bridge

Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Naracoorte Hospital Inc.; The Onkaparinga District Hospital Inc.; Oodnadatta Hospital; Ororoo and Districts Hospital Inc.; Penola War Memorial Hospital Inc.; Peterborough Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Pinnaroo Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Port Augusta and District Hospital Inc.; Port Broughton District Hospital Inc.; Port Lincoln and District Hospital Inc.; Port Pirie and District Hospital Inc.; The Queen Elizabeth Hospital; The Queen Victoria Hospital Inc.; Quorn and District Memorial Hospital Inc.; Renmark District Hospital Inc.; Riverton District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Royal Adelaide Hospital (Excluding Northfield Nursing Home); The Snowtown Memorial Hospital Inc.; South Coast District Hospital Inc.; Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital Inc.; Southern Yorke Peninsula Hospital Inc.; St. Anthony's Hospital; St. Margaret's Hospital Inc.; The Strathalbyn and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Inc.; Streaky Bay Public Hospital Inc.; Tanunda War Memorial Hospital Inc.; Tarcoola District Hospital; Torrens House Mothercraft

Hospital; Tumby Bay Hospital Inc.; Waikerie District Hospital Inc.; Wallaroo Hospital; The Whyalla and District Hospital Inc.; Royal Adelaide Hospital (Northfield Nursing Home); and Ru Rua Nursing Home,

- (a) what was the 1978-79 Budget allocation by the South Australian Health Commission;
- (b) what is the 1979-80 allocation and will it result in cuts in services to patients, retrenchment of nursing staff or retrenchment of ancillary staff and, if so, what are the details of cuts or retrenchments in each case;
- (c) what amount was requested for 1979-80;
- (d) has a submission been received by the Minister for a re-assessment of the hospital's allocation on grounds of genuine difficulties; and
- (e) has the board of management expressed any opinion to the commission or the Minister on how the 1979-80 allocation will affect the local community and if so, what was that opinion?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:

GROSS PAYMENTS ALLOCATIONS TO RECOGNISED HOSPITALS AND GOVERNMENT NURSING HOMES

Hospital	1978-79	1979-80	Requested
	Budget Allocation (a) \$'000	Budget Allocation (b) \$'000	1979-80 (c) \$'000
Adelaide Children's	21 520.2	20 075.3xy	22 411.9
Andamooka Outback	84.0	61.1	59.1
Angaston	756.2	715.7	816.2
Balaklava	509.0	530.5	530.5
Barmera	1 013.9	953.1	1 013.9
Berri	664.5	629.6	699.4
Bishop Kirkby Memorial	49.6	62.2	58.8
Blyth	327.9	313.7	304.6
Booleroo Centre	567.1	462.8	553.1
Bordertown	744.3	811.4	861.7
Burra Burra	424.1	478.4	458.6
Central Eyre Peninsula	300.0	263.9	296.0
Clare	819.0	788.3	816.6
Cleve	377.6	376.9	406.6
Cooper Pedy	377.6	384.5	462.3
Cowell	348.0	384.2	376.0
Crystal Brook	486.2	404.2	471.4
Cummins	425.5	427.4	480.9
Elliston	213.3	231.4	220.2
Eudunda	415.8	434.2	428.8
Flinders Medical Centre	32 142.3x	31 250.6xy	34 753.3x
Great Northern	391.7	302.8	616.4
Gumeracha	455.2	467.0	489.3
Hutchinson	1 343.7	1 379.6	1 524.7
Jamestown	503.5	424.3	454.5
Kalyra	1 479.6	1 432.3	1 550.2
Kangaroo Island	396.9	348.2	361.0
Kapunda	408.9	415.4	432.4
Karoonda	337.5	305.0	351.7
Kimba	424.1	366.8	420.0
Kingston	399.6	364.5	401.4
Lameroo	374.8	371.9	395.3
Laura	461.5	440.7	474.3
Leigh Creek	259.0	268.3	286.8
Lower Murray	442.4	456.2	464.5
Loxton	610.8	660.9	640.0
Lyell McEwin	7 149.0	6 688.4xy	7 465.9
Maitland	572.5	541.9	627.2
Mannum	556.7	512.7	578.4

Hospital	1978-79	1979-80	Requested
	Budget Allocation (a) \$'000	Budget Allocation (b) \$'000	1979-80 (c) \$'000
Marree	42.0	40.2	37.9
Meningie	614.0	595.7	698.9
Millicent	850.0	935.4	927.0
Minlaton	608.3	574.3	584.9
Modbury	12 394.3	12 075.5xy	13 033.0x
Mt. Barker	794.4	799.8	798.6
Mt. Gambier	6 054.3	5 832.5xy	6 404.5x
Mt. Pleasant	493.0	499.0	520.0
Murat Bay	538.6	512.8	584.6
Murray Bridge	1 248.6	1 213.0	1 350.8
Naracoorte	1 483.7	1 483.7	1 559.8
Onkaparinga	411.4	405.3	447.8
Oodnadatta	98.0	77.8	63.0
Orroroo	390.0	393.8	414.7
Penola	316.2	320.3	334.6
Peterborough	671.7	648.7	748.9
Pinnaroo	409.6	418.9	427.1
Pt. Augusta	3 475.0	3 278.0xy	3 589.6x
Pt. Broughton	336.3	349.6	369.0
Pt. Lincoln	1 951.8	1 908.2xy	2 075.7x
Pt. Pirie	4 255.6	3 991.9xy	4 461.5x
Queen Elizabeth	40 168.9	38 445.1xy	40 651.9x
Queen Victoria	9 045.6	8 780.0xy	9 974.4
Quorn	354.3	392.3	446.1
Renmark	729.6	711.5	763.5
Riverton	430.1	450.3	438.5
Royal Adelaide	69 298.3	67 598.0xy	72 183.2x
St. Anthonys	461.1	522.5	483.1
St. Margarets	808.6	738.4	766.7
Snowtown	368.8	368.0	402.8
South Coast District	1 191.3	1 126.3	1 154.8
Southern Districts	804.2	810.6	853.9
Southern Yorke Pen.	496.4	511.5	510.2
Strathalbyn	598.2	594.0	620.1
Streaky Bay	286.4	301.7	311.7
Tanunda	368.6	357.7	377.6
Tarcoola	44.0	48.7	53.1
Torrens House	1 271.2	1 101.6	1 223.6
Tumby Bay	491.9	504.8	517.9
Waikerie	708.6	718.0	768.1
Wallaroo	1 431.3x	1 366.3xy	1 510.8x
Whyalla	7 576.0	7 401.5xy	9 441.6x
Sub-Total	253 503.7	244 989.5	266 899.4
Northfield Wards N.H.	3 870.0	2 643.5xy	3 060.2x
Ru Rua	2 354.3	2 197.6xy	2 545.2x
Total	259 728.0	249 830.6	272 504.8

Notes

Column (b) 1979-80 Budget Allocation—
Salaries and Wages @ 30/6/79 rates.

Goods and Services @ projected prices.

Represents a standstill allocation plus allowance for carry-over commitments.

Column (c) 1979-80 Requested Allowance—

Salaries and Wages and Goods and Services @ January 1979 rates and prices for standstill only.

x Excluding hospitals' contributions to Staff Superannuation.

y Excluding Workers Compensation insurance premiums.

The 1978-79 Budget Allocations include, where applicable, Long Service Leave etc., payments to staff on termination of employment and the actual cost of these payments will be added to the 1979-80 allocations. The 1979-80 requested allowances include provision for these payments where applicable.

Question (a)

Answer supplied above.

Question (b)

In addition to the information supplied above, it is not intended that staff be retrenched and the views of hospital boards has been sought on the effect on services to patients. It is not possible to consolidate this information at this time.

Question (c)

Answer supplied above.

Question (d)

Yes.

Question (e)

Yes. It is not possible to consolidate opinions in the manner requested but the views of Boards are receiving consideration.

OUTBACK AREAS FUND

436. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Who are the members of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, when were they appointed, and what is the term of the appointment of each member?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Members of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust:

Name	Date Appointed	Term of Office (years)
Mr. Edward Connelly (Chairman)	25.5.78	3
Mr. David Rowell Amery (member) . .	25.5.78	3
Mr. Neville William Hyatt (member) . .	19.10.78	3
Ms. Lois O'Donoghue, A.M. (member)	25.5.78	2
Mr. Robert George Lewis (member) . .	25.1.79	2

REFERENDUM

438. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the Premier's policy to permit the people of South Australia to decide the question of the building of a nuclear power or like energy production station by way of a referendum and, if so, when will such a referendum be held and what will be the question put and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There are no plans to build a nuclear reactor in South Australia.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PLANT

439. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the policy of the Government that under no circumstances will a nuclear energy plant be constructed within a radius of 200 kilometres from Adelaide?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not been considered.

440. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the policy of the Government that under no circumstances will a nuclear energy plant be constructed within a radius of 200 kilometres from Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not been considered.

441. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the policy of the Government that under no circumstances will a nuclear energy plant be constructed within a radius of 200 kilometres of Port Augusta?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not been considered.

442. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the policy of the Government that under no circumstances will a nuclear energy plant be constructed within a radius of 200 kilometres of Port Lincoln?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter has not been considered.

PARA HILLS ROAD

446. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Minister acknowledge the traffic hazard existing on Bridge Road immediately south of the McIntyre Road roundabout at Para Hills throughout the distance where the road is flanked on its eastern border by the Foodland store/service station/hotel complex and on its western border by the Para Hills Police Station?

2. Will the Minister consider the member for Playford's proposal to indent the road the width of one lane on both its east and west flanks at least throughout the distance described above?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The honourable member is referred to the letter to him dated 25 September 1979 regarding the traffic situation at this location. The new road layout has only been in operation for several months and the Highways Department considers that the problems being experienced are largely due to motorists not yet having adjusted their driving habits to the prevailing conditions.

2. If the situation does not improve, consideration will be given to remedial action including that proposed by the honourable member.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME

448. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: When will details of the Government's legislative programme be given?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: When it is finalised.

TELEPHONE BOOK

449. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier aware that the 1979-80 South Australian telephone book has not yet been delivered?

2. Is the Premier aware that at least 50 000 copies have been incorrectly printed in Victoria?

3. Is the Premier aware of any commercial firms listed in the new book missing out on potential orders because of the delay?

4. Will the Premier make representations to the appropriate Commonwealth authority with a view to having the telephone directory printed and distributed through South Australian firms?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Yes.

WORK FORCE

451. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will the Government urgently initiate public discussion to end the situation where, as stated by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, "7 per cent of the work force bears the pressure of changes in the economy which benefits the other 93 per cent"?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No such approach has been made to the Government.

COMPANY EMPLOYMENT

452. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will the Minister consider requesting companies in this State who have made generous profits in the last year or two to increase their employment level as a sign of their commitment to social justice and so as to provide some alleviation of unemployment?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government has commenced several initiatives aimed at encouraging companies in this State to increase their employment, particularly of young people. A clear statement by the Government has already been made that it is now up to the private sector to respond to these initiatives.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

453. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will the Government join with the Opposition, the Australian Democrats and the National Country Party in a joint approach to the Commonwealth Government to request—

- (a) The raising of unemployment benefits to the poverty line;
- (b) the raising of permitted level of earnings for persons on benefits;
- (c) revision of the procedure for payment of unemployment benefits;
- (d) the abolition of the work test; and
- (e) planning for the introduction of technology which reduces employment,

as requested by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in its report "Beyond Unemployment, a Statement on Human Rights"?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: See answer to question 451.

QUARRY ROAD, PARA HILLS

454. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When is it proposed to upgrade, widen and reconstruct Quarry Road, Para Hills?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Quarry Road, Para Hills forms part of one of several alternative roads which the Highways Department has under investigation for serving the future needs of the North-East suburbs. The department has no present proposal for its upgrading. Quarry Road is the responsibility of the Corporation of the City of Salisbury.

HEALTH INSTITUTION ALLOCATIONS

455. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following deficit funded health institutions—Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board; Anti-Cancer Foundation; Crippled Childrens Association of S.A. Inc.; Crippled Childrens Association of S.A. Inc.—Nursing Home; Family Planning Association; Home for Incurables Inc.; Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science; Minda Home Inc.; Minda Home Inc.—Nursing Home; Mothers & Babies Health Association; Royal District Nursing Society; Royal Flying Doctor Service of Australia; Royal Society for the Blind; Royal Society for the Blind—Melrose House; St. John Council for South Australia Inc.; and South Australian Blood Transfusion Service—

- (a) what was the 1978-79 Budget allocation;
- (b) what is the 1979-80 allocation; and
- (c) will any reduction in allocation cause a lessening of services to the public?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:

Grants to Deficit Funded Institutions

	1978-79 Allocation (a)	1979-80 Budgeted (b)
Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board	490 800	396 500
Anti-Cancer Foundation	164 500	137 800
Crippled Childrens Association .	137 900	146 000
Crippled Childrens Association— Nursing Home	48 000	48 000
Family Planning Association ...	100 000	120 200
Home for Incurables.....	4 990 500	5 193 000
Institute of Medical and Veteri- nary Science	2 580 782	3 159 800
Minda Home Inc.	1 468 000	1 762 700
Minda Home Inc.—Nursing Home	64 000	64 000
Mothers and Babies Health Association	2 096 200	2 306 000
Royal District Nursing Society ..	1 237 000	1 180 500
Royal Flying Doctor Service	189 400	208 600
Royal Society for the Blind	497 800	474 000
Royal Society for the Blind— Nursing Home	31 000	31 000
St. John Council for South Australia Inc.....	911 700	853 400
South Australian Blood Trans- fusion Service	2 232 000	2 077 900

(c) No institution has indicated to the commission that a lessening of services to the public will result from the 1979-80 grant. Some requests for minor adjustments to grants are being considered.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

456. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following mental health services—Mental Health Services Division; Glenside Hospital; Hillcrest Hospital; and Intellectually Retarded Services—

- (a) what was the 1978-79 Budget allocation;
- (b) what is the 1979-80 allocation and will it result in any reduction of services to the community or retrenchment of staff and in either case, what are the details; and
- (c) what amount was requested for 1979-80?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:

Service	1978-79	1979-80	1979-80
	Budget	Budget	Budget
	Allocation	Allocation	Request
	(a)	(b)	(c)
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Mental Health Services Division	2 296	1 964.5	2 286.9
Glenside	11 337	10 991.3	11 840.0
Hillcrest	11 390	10 514.0	12 215.5
Intellectually Retarded Services	10 096	10 354.5	10 537.5
Total	35 119	33 824.3	36 879.9

Notes—

Column (b) 1979-80 Budget Allocation:
Salaries and Wages @ 30/6/79 rates
Goods and Services @ projected prices represents a standstill allocation plus allowance for carry-over commitments.

Column (c) 1979-80 Budget Request:

Salaries and Wages and Goods and Services @ January 1979 rates and prices for standstill only.

Health Services' contribution to staff superannuation and workers' compensation insurance premiums have been excluded from both columns (b) and (c) but are included in column (a). The 1978-79 Budget allocations include, where applicable, long service leave, etc. payments to staff on termination of employment and the actual cost of these payments in 1979-80 will be added to the 1979-80 allocations. The 1979-80 requested budgets include provision for these payments where applicable.

(a) Answer supplied above.

(b) In addition to the information supplied above, it is not intended that staff be retrenched and the views of hospital boards has been sought on the effect on services to patients. It is not possible to consolidate this information at this time.

(c) Answer supplied above.

INSTITUTIONS

457. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other bodies—Ashfield Community Hospital; Blackwood Hospital; Calvary Hospital; Glenelg Hospital; Hamley Bridge Hospital; Henley and Grange Hospital; Hindmarsh Community Hospital; Keith Hospital; Le Fevre and Port Adelaide Community Hospital; Mallala Hospital; Memorial Hospital; North-Eastern Community Hospital; Northern Community Hospital; Stirling Hospital; Thebarton Community Hospital; Western Community Hospital; Aged Citizens Clubs and for Home Care; Aged Persons' Homes; Archway Rehabilitation Centre; Autistic Children's Association; Australian Association for Better Hearing; Australian Council for Rehabilitation of Disabled; Australian Foundation for Prevention of Blindness; Australian Kidney Foundation; Australian Neurological Foundation; Bedford Industries; "Bethesda", Mount Gambier; Catholic Family Planning Centre; Central Districts Mentally Handicapped Children's Association—Maintenance and Transport Costs for Kindergartens; Central Methodist Mission (Kuitpo Colony and Koster House); College of Nursing, Australia; Coober Pedy Rescue Squad; Diabetic Association of South Australia; Flinders Industries—Whyalla Sheltered Workshop; Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee; Heritage Industries; Medical Board of South Australia; Medical Cadetships—Living allowances and fees, etc.; Mentally Retarded Children's Society Workshops at Loxton, Port Pirie, Meningie Area School, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte and Port Augusta; National Heart Foundation of Australia; Phoenix Society; South Australian Deaf Society; South Australian Association for Mental Health Inc.; South Australian Council for the Ageing; South Australian Foundation on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence; South Australian Post-graduate Medical Education Association; Speld South Australia Incorporated; Flinders Medical Centre—Volunteer Service; and Transport Concessions to Pensioner and Indigent Patients—

(a) what was the 1978-79 Budget allocation;

(b) what is the 1979-80 allocation and will it result in any cuts in services for patients retrenchment of nursing staff or retrenchment of ancillary staff and, if so, what are the details of cuts or retrenchments in each case;

(c) what was the amount requested for 1979-80; and

(d) has the hospital, institution or other body expressed any opinion to the South Australian Health Commission or the Minister on how the 1979-80 allocation will affect the local community and, if so, what was that opinion?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other minor health bodies do not submit budgets. Grants to these bodies are made by the Minister of Health based on *ad hoc* submissions for assistance.

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

458. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following community health and associated programmes and domiciliary services—Ceduna Community Health Centre; Central Pool—Community Health Nurses; Christies Beach Community Health Centre; Cleve Community Health Centre; Clovelly Park Community Health Centre; Community Health Nurse Training; Community Immunization Programme; Community Practice Nurses—Whyalla; Community Services Implementation Team; Coober Pedy Community Health Centre; Coonalpyn Community Health Centre; Drop-in Centre (Central Mission); Eastern Geriatric and Rehabilitation Centre; Eastern Region Rehabilitation Service; Family Training Unit; Feasibility Study—Computer Processing of Data; Gladstone Community Health Centre; Headquarters—Psychiatric Rehabilitation Hostels; Industrial Therapy Centre; Ingle Farm Community Health Centre; Keith Community Health Centre; Kingoonya Medical Centre; Lock Community Health Centre; Lucindale Community Health Centre; Medical Students Rural Placements; Mount Gambier Extended Care Service; Mental Health Rehabilitation Service; Metropolitan Community Psychiatric Service; Occupational Health Centre Development Officer; Paramedical Aide Training Course; Para Region Health Services Advisory Committee; Para Region Rehabilitation Service; Pilot Community Health Programme (Schools)—Ingle Farm; Planning and Research Unit; Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service; Port Lincoln Community Health Centre; Psychologist St. Corantyn Clinic; Grow; Regional Referral Clinic, Osmond Terrace; Riverland Health Services Advisory Committee; Royal Flying Doctor (Port Augusta); Rural Requirements—Port Pirie; St. Agnes Community Health Centre; Southern Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service; The Parks Community Health Centre; Tumbay Bay Community Health Centre; Western Region Rehabilitation Service; Whyalla Community Health Centre; Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula Community Psychiatric Service; Women's Community Health Centre; Women's Community Health Centre—Crisis Centre; Young Peoples Hostel for Ex-Psychiatric Patients; Barossa; Bordertown; Eastern Metropolitan; Loxton; Mannum; Millicent; Murray Bridge; Para Region (including Gawler); Port Augusta; Port Lincoln; Port Pirie (Mid-North); Waikerie; Wallaroo; Western Metropolitan; and Whyalla—

(a) what was the 1978-79 Budget allocation;

(b) what is the 1979-80 allocation and will it result in any reduction of services to the community, retrenchment of staff or deferment of any planned expansion of community programmes and, if so, what are the details in each case; and

(c) what amount was requested for 1979-80?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON:

GROSS PAYMENTS ALLOCATIONS TO COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ASSOCIATED PROGRAMMES AND DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICES

Programme:	1978-79	1979-80	1979-80
	Budget Allocation (a) \$'000	Budget Allocation (b) \$'000	Budget Request (c) \$'000
Ceduna Community Health Centre	46.0	48.2	47.8
Central Pool—Community Health Nurses	13.0	13.0	13.2
Christies Beach Community Health Centre	160.0	171.4	194.4
Cleve Community Health Centre	9.0	7.0	8.4
Clovelly Park Community Health Centre	176.0	208.8	191.5
Community Health Nurse Training	258.0	232.1	183.0
Community Immunization Programme	23.0	27.8	29.2
Community Practice Nurses—Whyalla	30.0	27.1	30.0
Community Services Implementation Team	60.0	44.3	44.8
Cooper Pedy Community Health Centre	20.0	55.3	48.8
Coonalpyn Community Health Centre	16.0	17.6	17.2
Drop-In Centre (Central Mission)	59.0	60.9	80.1
Eastern Geriatric and Rehabilitation Centre	213.0	242.2	269.3
Eastern Region Rehabilitation Service	104.0	125.7	122.7
Family Training Unit	108.0	133.1	126.3
Feasibility Study—Computer Processing of Data	15.0	19.4	19.4
Gladstone Community Health Centre	16.0	17.5	17.5
H.Q.—Psychiatric Rehabilitation Hostels	113.0	173.1	156.5
Industrial Therapy Centre	65.0	95.0	95.9
Ingle Farm Community Health Centre	282.0	297.5	303.6
Keith Community Health Centre	17.0	16.0	17.7
Kingoonya Medical Centre	1.0	—	—
Lock Community Health Centre	37.0	40.2	39.9
Lucindale Community Health Centre	4.0	7.7	5.6
Medical Students Rural Placements	3.0	3.0	3.0
Mount Gambier Extended Care Service	210.0	229.5	278.7
Mental Health Rehabilitation Service	—	—	—
Metropolitan Community Psychiatric Service	67.0	72.8	93.4
Occupational Health Centre Development Officer	52.0	32.7	56.8
Paramedical Aide Training Course	50.0	50.4	61.3
Para Region Health Services Advisory Committee	154.0	179.4	162.6
Para Region Rehabilitation Service	23.0	49.0	37.6
Pilot Community Health Programme (Schools)—Ingle Farm	47.0	49.6	50.5
*Planning and Research Unit			
Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service	43.0	134.0	123.7
Port Lincoln Community Health Centre	111.0	119.4	132.3
Psychologist—St. Corantyn Clinic	15.0	20.4	17.3
Grow	63.0	80.8	82.1
Regional Referral Clinic—Osmond Terrace	503.0	519.6	540.9
Riverland Health Services Advisory Committee	50.0	23.3	40.2
Royal Flying Doctor (Port Augusta)	62.0	64.1	70.4
Rural Requirements—Port Pirie	25.0	31.4	31.4
St. Agnes Community Health Centre	158.0	168.6	171.9
Southern Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service	849.0	822.4	820.4
The Parks Community Health Centre	238.0	299.1	292.3
Tumby Bay Community Health Centre	17.0	14.1	18.1
Western Region Rehabilitation Service	265.0	328.8	325.9
Whyalla Community Health Centre	27.0	18.7	22.0
Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula Community Psychiatric Service	16.0	22.6	22.4
Women's Community Health Centre	168.0	178.2	181.1
Women's Community Health Centre—Crisis Centre	31.0	35.2	39.4
Young People's Hostel for Ex-Psychiatric Patients	—	—	—
Sub-Total	5 092.0	5 628.0	5 738.5
Services:			
Barossa	34.0	50.9	52.4
Bordertown	22.0	20.3	19.8
Easten Metropolitan	683.0	739.6	855.6
Loxton	33.0	55.7	55.7
Mannum	18.0	25.0	24.6

*Funded under Health Commission—Central Office

	1978-79 Budget Allocation (a) \$'000	1979-80 Budget Allocation (b) \$'000	1979-80 Budget Request (c) \$'000
Millicent	16.0	20.3	20.9
Murray Bridge	25.0	23.5	22.9
Para Region (inc. Gawler)	272.0	336.6	328.3
Port Augusta	97.0	124.5	115.5
Port Lincoln	40.0	52.4	51.7
Port Pirie (Mid North)	202.0	214.4	218.7
Waikerie	19.0	19.1	18.5
Walleroo	124.0	106.1	122.6
Western Metropolitan	1 085.0	1 088.6	1 315.9
Whyalla	107.0	137.1	135.4
Sub-Total	2 777.0	3 014.1	3 358.5
TOTAL	7 869.0	8 642.1	9 097.0

(a) Answer supplied above.

(b) In addition to the information supplied above, it is not intended that staff be retrenched and the views of management committees have been sought on the effect on services to patients. It is not possible to consolidate this information at this time.

(c) Answer supplied above.

HONEYPOT ROAD CROSSING

460. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Road Traffic Board now approved the installation of crossing lights on Honeypot Road adjacent to the Hackham West Primary School and, if so, when will they be installed and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. A further investigation has confirmed earlier findings that the installation of a pedestrian crossing is not justified under prevailing conditions. However, the matter will be kept under review.

HACKHAM WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL

461. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What are the estimated enrolments at Hackham West Primary School for February 1980 and 1981, respectively?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is anticipated that Hackham West Primary School will have the following enrolments: February 1980, 800; February 1981, 800.

HOUSING LOAN LIMIT

466. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Government intend, in this financial year, to increase the maximum loan available to individual housing borrowers and, if so, what will be the new figure and from when will it operate?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: On 20 September 1979 an increase in the maximum State Bank housing loan from \$27 000 to \$31 000 came into effect. The need for an additional increase is constantly under review.

YOUTH ACCOMMODATION

476. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What facilities, funded in part by the Residential Care Advisory Committee, are available, on the basis of beds per 1 000 head of population, for:

(a) emergency youth accommodation; and

(b) medium term (up to six months) youth accommodation,

in each of the metropolitan regions of the Department for Community Welfare?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

(a) Central Northern Region	Nil
Central Southern Region045
Central Eastern Region023
Central Western Region	Nil
(b) Central Northern Region029
Central Southern Region004
Central Eastern Region018
Central Western Region	Nil

THEBARTON COMMUNITY CENTRE

478. **Mr. PLUNKETT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Government support the concept of the Thebarton Community Centre as outlined by the previous Government and, if so, when will tenders be let, and for which components of the centre and, if not, which components will not now be built?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The matter has yet to be considered by Cabinet.

"B" CLASS LICENCES

481. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Can the Minister clarify what he meant by "process of attrition" when he referred to the phasing out of "B" class licences, and how long does the Minister anticipate it will be before all such licences disappear?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The phasing out of "B" class licences by "attrition" means that it is the intention of the Government not to replace holders of class "B" licences when they leave the fishery for reasons of age, ill health, or lack of effort. It is not possible to give an indication of how long it will be before all such licences disappear.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

485. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the present official title of the permanent head of the Department of Fisheries?
2. What is the present acting title of this person?
3. What is the proposed official title of that office?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Acting Director of Fisheries.
2. Acting Director of Fisheries.
3. This matter is under consideration.

ROAD REPAIRS

497. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What repairs are currently being carried out on or below the surface of Winifred Street, Glandore, that have disrupted traffic on the tramline and Cross Road and when will these repairs be completed?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Corporation of the City of Marion is currently reconstructing Winifred Avenue, Glandore. It is understood that the work will be completed by Christmas.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

499. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the present stock of housing units owned by the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Ascot Park that is being rented or is available for rental, respectively?

2. How many of these units are:

- (a) two or three bedroom semi-detached;
- (b) two bedroom detached;
- (c) three bedroom detached;
- (d) villa flats; and
- (e) pensioner cottages?

3. What is the current state of the waiting list of applications in regard to each of the categories in part 2?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 246 dwellings.
2. (a) 2 or 3 bedroom detached (single units), 12.
(b) and (c) 2 or 3 bedroom detached (single units), 1043.
(d) villa flats, nil.
(e) cottage flats, 139.

3. The South Australian Housing Trust is unable to provide information on the numbers of applications for various forms of accommodation within the Ascot Park electorate without extensive manual investigation and expense. However, the following table illustrates the dates of applications the trust is presently considering for this area.

(a) 2 or 3 bedroom detached	June 1976
(b) and (c) 2 or 3 bedroom attached	June 1976
(d) villa flats	not applicable
(e) cottage flats—	
Single person	June 1974
Two person	June 1977

NORTH-SOUTH FREEWAY

500. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it intended that the North-South Freeway envisaged in the M.A.T.S. Plan will now be constructed in

either its original form or a modified form, and which?

2. What degree of consultation will take place in areas affected by any such freeway?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A decision has not yet been made on this matter.
2. Every effort will be made to ensure that full and proper consultation will take place.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

503. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Which House of Assembly Districts are serviced by Member's Electorate offices—

- (a) sited within the electorate,
- (b) sited in an adjacent electorate,
- (c) sited at Parliament House; and
- (d) sited elsewhere?

2. What plans is the Minister aware of for the transfer of any electorate office not presently in its electorate (or adjacent electorate) into its own electorate?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) With the exception of the Electorates of Brighton, Mallee, Napier and Davenport all Electorate offices are within their respective Assembly Districts.
(b) Brighton, Napier and Davenport.
(c) Mallee.
(d) Nil.

2. It is planned to transfer the Brighton office to a site within the Electorate as soon as commissioning work on newly leased premises can be completed.

WEST LAKES BOULEVARD

In reply to **Mr. HAMILTON** (1 November).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department does not anticipate that traffic conditions will require the provision of a facility such as the proposed West Lakes Boulevard extension within the next 10 years. A number of properties have already been acquired and it is considered prudent not to dispose of them until a firm decision on the transport requirements of the area can be made. Meantime, in order to obtain a return on road funds invested in acquiring properties, those properties have been made available for leasing.

POLICE DEPARTMENT FLEET REPLACEMENTS

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following information is provided in relation to the matters raised regarding Police Department fleet replacements by the honourable member during the debate on the Appropriation Bill. Replacement vehicles intended to be acquired in the current year are 254 patrol sedans, 20 pursuit vehicles, 75 coloured sedans, 40 light passenger vehicles, 23 station sedans, 15 utilities, 70 motor cycles, one cliff rescue vehicle, one furniture pantechnicon, one metropolitan class bus, one metropolitan mobile workshop vehicle, one horse float (semi-trailer), 33 prison vans (various dimensions), 15 prison van bodies, 84 sector vans, two trail motor cycles, one cab chassis with tray top, 20 unmarked vehicles, one intermediate communications van, one recruiting van, two 4-wheel drive station sedans, three metropolitan despatch vans and one maintenance van.

The term "Q cars" is one which is foreign to the South Australian Police Force. However, if the description is intended to apply to unmarked vehicles, i.e. vehicles unidentifiable as being Government-owned, used for specialised investigative functions, then the answer is that provision has been made for 20 such replacement vehicles to be acquired.

PRISONER REMISSIONS

In reply to **Mr. KENEALLY** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: No remissions for good conduct are granted to prisoners by the Parole Board.

STUDY SCHOLARSHIPS

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Officers of the Probation and Parole Branch enjoy exactly the same facilities as do other public servants. They obtain the same assistance towards part-time study and are eligible to apply for full-time study awards that lead to the attainment of appropriate qualifications within their profession.

WOMEN PRISONERS

In reply to **Mr. McRAE** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following information is provided in relation to the question regarding women prisoners asked by the honourable member during the debate on the Appropriation Bill:

Daily average of inmates: 1976-77—13; 1977-78, 19; 1978-79, 23. Strength in confinement at 31 October 1979: 24.

DOCTOR'S ROOMS

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following information is provided to the honourable member in relation to the question raised during the debate on the Appropriation Bill in respect to doctor's rooms at Adelaide Gaol. The reconstruction of the doctor's rooms at Adelaide Gaol has now been completed. The Medical Officer and his orderlies took part in the planning of the new facilities and the doctor has expressed satisfaction at the result. The facilities also include an office for the use of outside consultants.

PAROLE BOARD

In reply to **Mr. McRAE** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The constitution and structure of the Parole Board will be examined during consideration of the recommendations made in the first report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee.

PROPAGATION PROGRAMME

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Government does intend to continue with the propagation programme at Cadell Training Centre.

H.C. MEYER

In reply to **Mr. PETERSON** (6 November, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following further information is provided in relation to the question raised by the honourable member. The Department of Marine and Harbors is considering various options in relation to the replacement of the dredging capacity lost through the accident to the grab dredge *H.C. Meyer*. These options include bare boat charter, rehabilitation of the *H.C. Meyer*, purchase of a new dredge and/or a combination of those options.

The department is very much aware of the tendency to deeper draft shipping in the overseas liner trades and bulk trades and of the role that the port of Adelaide and other South Australian ports can play in meeting Australian shipping needs. The future of the port of Adelaide as an international container port and the future prospects of other South Australian ports are bright and the department has allotted the highest priority to the development of ports as a major economic function in the development of the State.

DREDGING FINANCE

In reply to **Mr. PETERSON** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following information is provided in relation to the question raised by the honourable member on the "*H.C. Meyer*" during the debate on the Appropriation Bill. Provision is made in the Estimates of Expenditure from consolidated revenue for labour and material costs to be incurred in maintenance dredging operations. Provisions is also made in the Loan works programme for wages, material and other costs associated with proposed primary dredging, that is, capital works. The Department of Marine and Harbors is currently reassessing its dredging programme in the light of the accident to the bucket dredge "*H.C. Meyer*" and it is expected that the future employment of the Department's employees will not be placed at risk because of the accident.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The vote for the Lieutenant-Governor's expense allowance was increased from \$1 000 to \$2 000 in the 1976-77 financial year. The amount of \$2 000 for 1979-80 was determined by the previous administration. In light of this question the allowance will certainly be reviewed when estimates for 1980-81 are prepared.

OFFICE MACHINES

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: When estimates for 1978-79 were prepared it was planned to purchase two new electric

typewriters at \$1 000 each. During the year, however, it was decided to overhaul the machines rather than replace them. They are now in quite good order and it is not anticipated that any replacements will be necessary before 1980-81.

COMMITTEE SECRETARIAT

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The line Administrative, committee secretariat, publicity and clerical staff actually covers salaries and wages for the Administration, Policy and Publicity and Design Divisions of the Premier's Department. The terminology in the printed estimates has been erroneously carried forward from earlier years. The Committee Secretariat as such was in fact disbanded in December 1977. Since that time committees have been funded through the Premier's Miscellaneous line—Various Committees of Inquiry, and serviced in the main by officers within the department.

AGENT-GENERAL PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The amount of \$180 000 quite clearly is the estimate of salaries and wages only. Publicity requirements as already stated are a separate vote of \$8 000 included with other contingency lines. The Agent-General is being contacted for an analysis of this amount to ascertain whether or not it is sufficient.

PRIVATE BUSINESS ORGANISATIONS

In reply to **Mr. DUNCAN** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Private business organisations receiving payment for goods and services out of line "Charges for Publicity and Design Services" during the current financial year are as follows:

Advertiser Newspapers Pty. Ltd., Artistcare, Australian Vinyl South Australia, Blue Money Photography, J. Chizmesya, Chroma Colour, Convoy International, Delmont Pty. Ltd., Design and Illustration Studio, Displaycraft, Electrosonic, Gillingham Printers Pty. Ltd., Griffin Press Ltd., Alan J. Weatherall, E. S. Wigg & Son, Group Colour (South Australia), Holiday Magazines, Kodak, Lantern Colour, Alan & Di Lloyd, John R. Miller, Opal Exporters Ltd., Pace Messenger Service, Pepper Studios Pty. Ltd., Printmint, Rodney Robertson Pty. Ltd., Brian Rohde, South Australian Typecentre Pty. Ltd., United Yellow Taxis.

PORT AUGUSTA AIR SERVICES

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This grant was instituted under the former Administration in July 1975. The grant subsidised a freight and passenger service to remote stations along the Strzelecki and Birdsville tracks.

ASIAN ASSOCIATION

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This grant is made through the Australian Institute of Management and contributes to bringing an Asian manager to South Australia to participate in the Institute's general management course. The course this year was conducted from September 21 to October 5 and the delegate assisted by the grant was Mr. Ong Teong Wa, group personnel and training manager of the Union Carbide Group of Companies in Singapore. The presence of an Asian manager at such a course, whilst it is of great benefit to that delegate, must be equally valuable for the Australian participants inasmuch as they must gain a greater understanding of the Asian management scene.

MINOR GRANTS

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Refer page 83 where the Premier in reply to a question from Dr. Hopgood confirmed that this was a sum "kept in reserve that will be drawn on".

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS UNION

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The expenditure for 1978-79 related to an application from the union for funds to acquire a motor vehicle. No application for a grant was received for 1979-80.

STATE DISASTER COMMITTEE

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was planned to publish the State Disaster Plan and relevant legislation in a similar loose-leaf vinyl cover to that used in Tasmania. Based on their cost of \$30 per set approximately, we budgeted \$30 000. The balance covers material needed when the Emergency Operations Centre, North Adelaide, is completed in March 1980.

PUBLICITY BRANCH

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The commission line operated by Publicity and Design Services is used for non-rechargeable expenses incurred by the Branch in the purchase of talent that is otherwise unavailable inhouse to engage private design artists, photographers, and to a small extent, writers. Commissions charged to this line are made only in those instances when, for various reasons, it is not possible to recharge the expenses to a client department. For instance, photographers may be commissioned to cover specific events or locations to maintain and update the PDS central photographic library when staff photographers are not available for the jobs.

PRESIDENT OF SERBIA

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The President of Serbia was scheduled to visit South Australia towards the end of the last financial year. The visit was deferred and will now take place early in 1980.

ADMINISTRATION AND RESEARCH DIVISION

In reply to **Mr. O'NEILL** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: During the Budget debate the member for Florey referred to what he thought was a reduction in the provision under the Administration and Research Division of my department, and I indicated that I would get for him the relevant information. There is no overall reduction in total staff. The reduction and estimated costs on the particular line referred to by the honourable member is occasioned by the fact that the salaries of several clerical officers have been transferred to other divisions in a reorganised costing system which will reflect in a better way the actual costs in the areas where the staff works. These rearrangements are due, in the main, to a decision taken earlier (under the previous Government's administration) to decentralise the Registry records of the department in respective district offices.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: During the Budget debate the member for Napier referred to the Industrial Relations Division allocation and asked a question concerning additional people "coming into the Industrial Relations Division under this line". I indicated that I would obtain for him details of staff members as at 30 June 1979 and as at the date that he asked his question, namely, 30 October 1979.

Details are as follows:

	30 June 1979	30 October 1979
Deputy Director	1	1
Industrial Registrar	1	1
Deputy Industrial Registrars ...	2	2
Investigation officers	25	25
Project officers	—	5
Clerical staff	35	44
	64	78

NOTE*

Clerical increase is made up of:

6 transferred to Industrial Branch (ex-Administration Division)

3 transferred to Employee Participation Branch (ex-Unit for Industrial Democracy)

MOTOR VEHICLES PURCHASE

In reply to **Mr. O'NEILL** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: During the Budget debate the member for Florey asked if I would explain the 150 per cent increase in the allocation for the purchase of motor vehicles; 50 replacement vehicles are to be purchased in conformity with the previous Government's decisions regarding the supply of motor vehicles for official Government use. Of those 50 to be purchased in this financial year, 31 will be 4-cylinder vehicles. It is of interest also to note that of the 86 vehicles anticipated to be the total fleet number of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment by 30 June 1980, 54 will be 4-cylinder units and 32 6-cylinder units. The latter vehicles are predominately based in country districts served by the department.

DEPARTMENT'S ESTIMATES

In reply to **Mr. WRIGHT** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: During the Budget debate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked why there was a reduction of \$200 000 in the administrative, clerical and general staff line of the department's Estimates, especially as there is an increase of about \$21 000 in pay-roll tax. The explanation is that expenditure estimated for the 1979-1980 financial year for pay-roll tax refers to the tax payable on the total salaries and wages bill for the whole of the department. It is not confined to the salaries costs of the Administration Division.

TRANSFERS

In reply to **Mr. WRIGHT** (30 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: During the Budget debate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked what had taken place in the department regarding transfers and also if it was possible to provide a detailed list of names, positions, previous classifications, new classifications, the department involved and the duties. I indicated that I would obtain the relevant information for the honourable member. It is in table form and I seek leave to incorporate it in *Hansard* without reading it.

Name	Position	Previous Classification	New Classification	Branch/ Division/Dept.
C. F. Connelly	Chief Project Officer	AO3	AO3	Employee Participation Branch
C. A. N. Debruyne	Project Officer	AO1	AO1	Employee Participation Branch
D. R. Hull	Senior Research Officer	AO1	AO1	Research Branch
J. C. Hunter	Project Officer	AO1	AO1	Research Branch
B. H. Sheehan	Project Officer	AO1	AO1	Employee Participation Branch
C. G. Johnson	Project Officer	AO1	AO1	Employee Participation Branch

Name	Position	Previous Classification	New Classification	Branch/ Division/Dept.
K. K. Wang	Chief Project Officer	AO3	AO3	Research Branch
R. E. M. Wood	Publicity and Promotions Officer	PP3	PP3	Temp. Press Secretary
G. A. Harbord	Project Officer	AO1	AO1	Research Branch
G. B. Kalogerakis	Clerk	CO2	CO2	Employee Participation Branch
J. A. Getinic	Office Assistant	OA-1	OA-1	Employee Participation Branch
W. J. Jaffer	Office Assistant	OA-1	OA-1	Employee Participation Branch
Vacancy (Vice Filmer)	Project Officer	AO1		1 October, 1979—Retired
M. Carmichael	Steno-Secretary Grade 3	MN-4		Transferred at own request to staff of Deputy Leader of Opposition
G. E. Leditschke	Apprentice Supervisor	CO4		Transferred at own request from Research Branch back to substantive position in Apprenticeship Commission
G. M. Anderson	Project Officer	AO1		Transferred at own request to staff of Leader of Opposition

MINOR EQUIPMENT

In reply to **Mr. PAYNE** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This line covers such items as: paper cups, hand towels, soap, detergents, uniforms, laundry contract and other miscellaneous expenses. Equipment for the kitchen and refreshment room supplied by the Public Buildings Department with some minor items supplied by Joint House Committee.

STAFF TAXIS

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The cost of providing for taxis for members and staff for 1978-79 was \$970 and it is estimated to cost \$1 009 for 1979-80. Taxis are provided after the last public transport has ceased to operate, or after 11.15 p.m.

COUNTRY SUBSIDIES

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (8 November, Appropriation Bill).

Asst. Caretaker	Hours	Asst. Caretaker	Hours	Caretaker	Hours
M. 5 p.m. to 11 p.m.	6	8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	11 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	9½
T. 5 p.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Wed.)	15½	8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	Off (from 8.30 a.m.)	
W. Off from 8.30 a.m.		8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	5 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	15½
Th. Off		8.30 a.m. to 11 p.m.	14½	11 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	9½
F. 8.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Sat.)	24	Off		Off (from 8.30 a.m.)	
S. Off (from 8.30 a.m.)		Off		8.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Sun.)	24
Su. Off		8.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Mon.)	24	Off (from 8.30 a.m.)	
	45½		64		58½
M. 8.30 a.m. to 11 p.m.	14½	Off (from 8.30 a.m.)		11 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	9½
T. 5 p.m. to 11 p.m.	6	8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	11 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	9½
W. 5 p.m. to 11 p.m.	6	8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	11 p.m. to 8.30 a.m.	9½
Th. 5 p.m. to 12 noon (Fri.)	19	8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.	8½	Off from 8.30 a.m.	
F. Off from 12 noon		12 p.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Sat.)	20½	Off	
S. 8.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Sun.)	24	Off		Off	
Su. Off (from 8.30 a.m.)		Off		8.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. (Mon.)	24
	69½		46		52½
Total Hours	115	Total Hours	110	Total Hours	111

The Caretaker receives a salary of \$10 135 and the Assistant Caretakers \$9 547 per annum. The Joint House Committee is currently reviewing the conditions of employment of the caretakers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The additional appropriation required for the line "Contribution to Electricity Trust of South Australia—For subsidies in country areas" in 1978-79 was due mainly to the increased cost of maintaining generating plant at the Coober Pedy undertaking. Other services which required higher subsidies than had been estimated include those at Ceduna, Hawker, Streaky Bay and Wudinna. At the time of preparing the 1979-80 Budget, it was considered that an amount of \$1 700 000 would be sufficient to meet all subsidy payments. As mentioned during the debate, the Electricity Trust acts as the Government's agent in these matters. It examines carefully each request for a subsidy before making an appropriate recommendation to the Treasurer in regard to payment.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (12 November, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The following table shows the three shifts that the caretakers are required to work each fortnight. Because of the hours that caretakers work, they receive an extra week's leave and leave loading at 20 per cent.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

In reply to Mr. **BANNON** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The costs of attendance by the President and Clerk of the Legislative Council at various functions during 1978-79 were as follows:

	\$
Presiding Officers Conference in Canberra and opening of Parliament in Darwin	2 087
Presiding Officers Conference in Port Moresby	3 321
Visit of President to Western Australian 150th Anniversary for Parliamentary celebrations	557
	<hr/>
	\$5 965
	<hr/>

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE

In reply to Mr. **DUNCAN** (24 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The provision for administration expenses does not include any expense allowances. The only expense allowances paid to officers of Parliament are those provided for Presiding Officers under Special Acts. These allowances, which are determined by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, are published in the *Government Gazette*. The tribunal's most recent determination appears in the *Gazette* dated 29 March 1979.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 365 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 the Hon. D. O. Tonkin and Messrs. Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Evans, Olsen, and Slater.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SALVATION JANE

A petition signed by 350 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce biological control of salvation jane was presented by the Hon. W. E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOTEL HOURS

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: URANIUM

A petition signed by 368 residents of South Australia praying that the House would call a referendum into the issue of uranium mining was presented by Mr. Millhouse.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FOOTROT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: My statement refers to a footrot incident in Keith. I wish to make a statement regarding that problem, which has recently arisen in South Australia.

On 18 October 1979, 11 500 sheep (all wethers) were offered at Keith saleyards in a complete dispersal sale, and were purchased by 21 separate buyers (four in Victoria, four in central region, and 13 in South-East region).

On 26 October 1979, a property owner at Naracoorte reported suspicion of footrot in 400 of the sheep purchased. All were inspected and four or five were found to be infected carriers of footrot. The property was quarantined.

By 8 November 1979 all sheep from the sale had been traced by the department. The infection rate varies from 1 per cent to 5 per cent. Four properties are affected, and have been quarantined. All other buyers are under restriction.

A total of 1 600 sheep purchased by an exporter are involved. These sheep are currently under quarantine, because of export requirements, on a property at Wallaroo, while the exporter decides what he will do with them.

A number of producers have bought into a problem which will take some time to resolve, since the sheep concerned must remain "suspect" until after the autumn break. They may, however, be sold for slaughter under permit before that time.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL PARKS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Owing to the confusion which arose following an interview on the A.B.C. *Country Hour* last Thursday it is necessary for me to clarify the situation regarding the land referred to, its status and its future.

Replying to a question from the A.B.C. interviewer regarding areas of land which representatives of the Lameroo council discussed with me during recent talks, I referred to all the dedicated national park lands in the area plus unallocated adjacent Crown lands. It was all the subject of our discussion.

Unfortunately, this answer was incorrectly linked with a question about which particular land I believed should be considered for future farming purposes.

In fact, when I said there was some land which could possibly be farmed, it was some areas of unallocated Crown land, the future of which is still subject to review and decision by the Government.

At no stage during the interview did I indicate that I would support farming on dedicated national park land. In fact, at the beginning of the interview, the interviewer (Mr. Stuart Bray) said:

The State Government is considering releasing some land which is being used as national parks for primary production. The immediate reply I gave was as follows:

I would like to make it quite clear that it is not our intention to reclaim national park land for rural production purposes.

That particular statement has been totally ignored by the Opposition, which created quite unnecessary concern to people in the community through its statements. There are large tracts of unallocated Crown land in South Australia. One of the sections to which I was specifically referring in the interview was an area adjacent to the Billiat Conservation Park.

Whether this unallocated land should be added to the conservation park is currently the subject of public debate. The Lameroo council representatives have some positive views on the matter and put them to me in their talks. They expressed considerable concern about the management of the area adjacent to their council district. The Chairman of the council indicated to me that they intended making a submission regarding the unallocated land, and I support their right to do so, as I support the right of every interested group or member of the community in regard to this subject.

Another area of land about which I have spoken in recent days, in the same context, is a 17 000 to 18 000 hectare piece of unallocated Crown land on Kangaroo Island. There was nothing sinister about that. I referred to it because I know the area intimately, having lived there all my life. Like the area of unallocated Crown land adjoining Billiat Conservation Park, the future of that Kangaroo Island land is also under review by my Government.

Another parcel of land which has been referred to in connection with the A.B.C. interview is an area adjacent to the Scorpion Springs Conservation Park, also in the Mallee. This particular piece of land was only recently dedicated as the Ngarkat Conservation Park, as recently as 13 September this year, just two days before the last State election. While it, too, was mentioned by the Lameroo council representatives in their discussions with me, I certainly made no commitment regarding its future for agricultural purposes.

In fact, as I said in the interview and have repeated here today, the Government does not intend to reclaim national parks for agricultural production purposes. The Ngarkat Conservation Park is dedicated land. It will remain under the protection, control and management of the Government. It will not be farmed.

While the development of land for agricultural purposes is quite clearly in my area of responsibility as Minister of Agriculture, I certainly recognise the legitimate interests and concerns of other groups in the community. As the Minister of Agriculture, I would not encourage the development of sub-economic or even marginally economic land, given the continuing cost-price pressures of agriculture today, nor would I support the clearing of land that would lead to undesirable environmental consequences. As a member of the South Australian Government, I strongly support the setting aside of adequate reserves of land for national conservation and recreation parks, and their being subject to good management.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL PARKS

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government's commitment to preserving and, where appropriate, increasing areas of dedicated national parks and reserves is unchallengeable. It was a Liberal Government which set the early conservation pace in South Australia, and this Government will ensure that those achievements are in no way compromised.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am making this statement as to where the Government stands in relation to national parks and reserves because of the confusion (already referred to by the Minister of Agriculture), which has been used by Opposition members in an attempt to cast doubts on the Government's environmental policies. They no doubt saw it as an opportunity to rubbish our plans, which were especially constructed to correct the inadequate management of our parks and reserves under the previous Government.

The Liberal policy with regard to national parks is clear and one which conservation groups and rural communities have applauded. In contrast to the past nine years we will pursue a responsible policy of managing our system of national parks and reserves for recreation, inspiration, education, scientific study, and for environmental and wildlife conservation. Where appropriate, we will acquire further areas of significance for national parks and reserves. Our commitment to management will relate specifically to the preservation of already dedicated reserves.

We will introduce voluntary support to assist the permanent ranger service, and provide adequate training for people who wish to participate. Public servants and others with specific expertise will be engaged more effectively in the development and implementation of management plans.

Mr. Payne interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has sought the leave of the House to make a statement. He should be heard in silence.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We will be examining priorities for the preparation of information relating to national parks areas and to the management of wildlife. Good management is vital: it is vital for the preservation of those lands already dedicated, and it is vital in reducing the problems which can develop when farming land adjoins reserve areas. The threat of wild dogs and vertebrate pests moving out of reserves into adjoining farming properties, for instance, is a real one, and I would like to take this opportunity of assuring the rural community that the National Parks and Wildlife Service, among other things, is very conscious of its responsibilities relating to these problems. Further funds have already been committed to help alleviate this threat.

Another problem which under-managed reserves can create involves noxious weeds. Here again, the department is aware of the situation, and steps are being taken to reduce the impact of weeds on farmland adjacent to reserves. As for the bush fire threat, the department has a workable fire policy which is effective within the parks. However, in this context it is interesting to note that, of all fires which have burnt national parks, the majority have started outside and burnt in. Fires which have started in parks and escaped to neighbouring properties have been minimal. For instance, in 1977-78, nearly 90 000 hectares of park land was burnt as a result of fires which started in neighbouring properties. In that same year, 325 hectares of private land was burnt by fires which originated in national parks.

The Government has a comprehensive, workable policy

for the State's conservation parks. As I have said, this policy will result in dedicated reserves being substantially better managed than before.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT ACT

The SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the House a proclamation in the *Government Gazette* dated 1 November 1975 notifying Her Majesty's assent to the Boating Act Amendment Act, 1978. It reads:

I, the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby proclaim and make known that a certain Act entitled Boating Act Amendment Act, 1978, passed by the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of South Australia has been laid before her Majesty in Council and that it is Her Majesty's pleasure that the said Act may come into operation, and I do hereby fix the 1st day of November, 1979, as the day on which the said Act shall come into operation.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia at Adelaide, this 1st day of November, 1979.

By command,
D. C. Wotton, for Premier

OVERSEAS STUDY TOUR REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the overseas study tour 1979 by the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, M.L.C.

NURIOOTPA OFFICE BLOCK

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliament Standing Committee on Public Works on the Nuriootpa Viticultural Research Station Office Block, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. BANNON: Has the Minister of Health seen a list which has been described by senior officers of the Health Commission as a suggested "hit list" of those commission staff deemed politically motivated, prepared by Mr. John Bailey of the South Australian Hospitals Association and a prominent Liberal Party member? If so, will she table the document in the House? What does the Minister believe is the purpose of this list, and is she aware that Mr. Bruce Guerin, the former Executive Commissioner of the commission, and Mr. Keith Wilson, Deputy Chairman of the Health Commission, are included on that list?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: In response to the Leader's question whether I have seen the list, the Leader may be interested to know that a letter from Mr. Bailey was hand delivered to my office and brought to me. I started to read that list (and I am being quite specific about answering the Leader's question), I was interrupted by someone coming into the room, I put the paper down, and I have never seen it since. I understand that it is now in the possession of a member of the Opposition, who apparently does not mind dealing in stolen documents, so I cannot, in all honesty, say that I have seen that list. I am therefore unable to

comment on anything in it or to table it. I can only say that those who deal in stolen documents and who name people who have been mentioned in those documents, are capable of very low, mean acts, and that is one of the lowest, and the meanest.

STATE GOVERNMENTS

Dr. BILLARD: Does the Premier agree with the statement by the A.C.T.U. President, Mr. Bob Hawke, that State Governments were an anachronistic lunacy and that Australia would be better served if State Governments were abolished and more power given to the Commonwealth? On Sunday last, the President of the A.C.T.U., in the first of the Boyer lectures of this year, urged the changes that form the basis of this question, and, in describing our system of State Governments, he said:

There is no justification now, in terms of the interests and the rights of 14 000 000 Australians, to perpetuate this dangerous anachronism.

He also said, in discussing the size of the continent of Australia:

The ratio between small population and huge area means that the harnessing and harmonisation of this vast dispersion of people and resources poses greater problems of economic management than in most other countries in the world.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am well aware of the comments which were made by Mr. Hawke and which were widely reported. I totally disagree with them; I think that has been made quite clear. I was also rather surprised to learn from a *Nationwide* interview on Monday night that apparently Mr. Hawke believes that this suggestion is a new one, or he was at least attempting to imply that that was some new policy and that he had broken new ground. The point is that this is one of the oldest policies in the socialist book. The aims to centralise all power in Canberra in one Government and, until just recently, in one House of Parliament, have been espoused by members opposite, by their Federal colleagues, and indeed, were the subject of the Chifley Memorial Lecture delivered by the Leader of the Opposition, at that stage, I think, Mr. Gough Whitlam. It is a matter of great interest to me because, in the course of that lecture, Mr. Whitlam was heard to say words to the effect that all Labor Party members of State Parliaments should be working for their own abolition. That is very much in line with what has been said by Mr. Hawke. I can only assume that Mr. Hawke is trying to prove that he can toe the Party line; that he does want to have a centralist Government in Australia; that he does not mind particularly what happens to State Parliaments; and that he believes we can best be represented by a central power in Canberra. In my view, this is most undesirable.

The old collectivist socialist philosophy strongly supports this move. The recently defeated Government of this State is also of that collectivist nature, and I am not surprised to hear that the proposal would be supported; I take it from members opposite that they are supporting the remarks that Mr. Hawke made. There is no way that I shall go along ever with the thought that because a Government is bigger it is better, and that because it is central and has more power it is able properly to legislate for the entire population of Australia. I do not believe that Governments necessarily always have the best programmes, and I certainly do not believe that all the power should be concentrated in one place.

There is no doubt that the Eastern States of Australia would certainly call the tune if we had one single Parliament in Canberra. There is no doubt that we would

have a very raw deal indeed, and there is no reason why people living in Sydney or in Melbourne should dictate to people living in Adelaide how much they should pay in land tax or to have their houses built, or dictate what they should do about any other of those particularly important matters to local residents.

We may have to pay some price in having a Federal system of a properly integrated Federal Parliament and State Parliaments. The price we pay is that there may be some duplication of administration, but what we gain is freedom and control over our own affairs at a point which is very close to the point of Government. We share responsibility and power. We can influence Government as it should be influenced in the decisions which most affect us.

The other matter is the one of access to Government. I believe that, with State Parliaments, people who nowadays demand more access to their Parliamentarians are able to have that access. I do not believe that we can gain anything at all by centralised control in Canberra. As far as I am concerned, any system of Government which diffuses power through State Parliaments is very responsible, most accessible, and will do the best job for South Australia and for the other States. I repeat that Mr. Hawke is obviously again toeing the Party line; he is dragging up the old collectivist socialist philosophy and, in so doing, he is hoping to make a bid for the shoes of the former leader of that Party, Mr. Whitlam.

MEMBERS' PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Mr. WRIGHT: As this is the last day of the sitting, will the Premier now make available his report on the pecuniary interests of his Ministers? On the first day of this Parliamentary session, I asked the Premier, in order to dispel public fears about pecuniary interests, to reveal whether any members of his Government, senior members of the Department of Mines and Energy or members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, own or have owned shares in Western Mining Corporation or in any other companies currently engaged in the exploration of uranium in South Australia, and indicate when they were purchased? The Premier was quoted in the *News* the following day as saying that he regarded this line of questioning as gutter-politics. However, at the time of the question in the House he said that he took the question very seriously, because it was most appropriate. One cannot win with this Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments are unnecessary.

Mr. WRIGHT: He said that it was a matter he had taken up at the first meeting of Cabinet or even earlier, and an instruction had been issued and agreed to by members of Cabinet that they would disclose any such interests they had and would take immediate steps to dispose of those interests. The Premier said he would obtain a report on this matter and said that his Government would be making the position clear so that members might reassure themselves that there was no vested interest, other than interest in doing what was right and proper for South Australia.

In answer to subsequent questions in this House, it was revealed that the Minister of Industrial Affairs had owned and had disposed of his shareholding in Western Mining, and some information was given about the pecuniary interests of at least one of the Public Service advisers to the Government on uranium matters, although it was not revealed to this House that Mr. Ben Dickinson, the Government's independent consultant on uranium matters, purchased and disposed of some 2 000 Western

Mining shares this year. We have still to await the Premier's full report on the pecuniary interest of members of his Government. Can he now give us the reassurance that he promised earlier in the session?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am bound to point out to the Deputy Leader that Mr. Dickinson's appointment as a servant of the Government was made by the previous Government. Apparently, as I pointed out once before, when the previous Government was in office it did not matter. On the general subject, I have obtained a report. I am satisfied that there is no conflict of interest. I do not intend to make that detailed report available to this House. I have adopted the same attitude as was adopted by the previous Government, in having the declarations and lists of interests registered and lodged in my department where they are open for scrutiny if any conflict of interest arises, so that I can see it. I am sure that the former Premier would agree with me that that is a proper way of going about things.

FORENSIC ODONTOLOGICAL SERVICE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Chief Secretary say what progress the Government has made in establishing a forensic odontological service as recommended by the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee in 1974?

Mr. Keneally: Why don't you explain your question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart has been interjecting constantly this afternoon. I hope I will hear no further interjections from him.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I thank the honourable member for his question and the opportunity it affords me to give details of the Government's plans in this field and to pay tribute to the work of Dr. Brown. Dr. Brown has provided this service for many years, and I point out that this has been done on a voluntary basis as a community service. However, recently Dr. Brown has had to reduce his professional workload and, for the vital forensic odontological service to continue, the Government has entered into negotiations with Dr. Brown and the University of Adelaide. Under the scheme, Dr. Brown will receive some remuneration for his service so that his income does not suffer too much because he has had to reduce his professional workload, and he will be able to pass on his expertise to other dentists.

It is proposed that a forensic odontological unit will be created in the university's Faculty of Dentistry from 1 January next year. This will offer part-time employment to Dr. Brown in the capacity of a lecturer-teacher and will also make possible improved undergraduate and post-graduate training of students and dentists in order to increase the availability of forensic odontologists in South Australia.

Under this arrangement the Government will provide \$16 000 in the current financial year to assist with the establishment and maintenance of the unit. The Government has also agreed to provide \$22 000 in the next financial year, and to continue funding at a similar level, subject to indexation. Because of the unit's importance in criminal matters, the Commissioner of Police will provide \$16 000 for the unit's establishment and initial maintenance. The unit will have available to it highly sophisticated specialist equipment and the services of the University of Adelaide, as well as consultative staff in related fields.

Overall the annual costs of the unit to the Government, bearing in mind the wide range of services that will be provided by the University of Adelaide, are very modest compared to the very considerable benefit this will provide to the South Australian community. Given the Govern-

ment's announced policy of strengthening and supporting the Police Force in the enforcement of law and order, I consider that the forensic odontological service is essential, and I am glad that the Government's negotiations with Dr. Brown and Professor D. R. Stranks, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, have been fruitful.

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. HEMMINGS: Did the Minister of Health have any discussions with any Commissioner of the South Australian Health Commission concerning the removal of Mr. Guerin from his position as Executive Commissioner prior to last Tuesday's hastily arranged meeting that removed him?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Obviously, in asking Dr. Shea to come back to chair a meeting that would consider the question of the policy of whether the position of Executive Commissioner were to be retained, I spoke to Dr. Shea on this matter. I am trying to recall whether I spoke to any of the other Commissioners in relation to that matter and, from recollection, the answer would be "No".

STATE'S SESQUI-CENTENARY

Mr. RUSSACK: As South Australia's sesqui-centenary will take place in 1986, can the Premier say whether any plans have been initiated to celebrate this important and historic occasion and, if they have not, is it the Government's intention to do so?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his question; I know of his great interest in local regional festivals and celebrations. It will be the State's sesqui-centenary in 1986, and steps are being taken by the Government to organise an appropriate celebration. Obviously, planning has not yet commenced, but it is in the early stages. I can be absolutely certain that we will upgrade the planning as is necessary so that in 1986 we will turn on a worthy celebration for South Australia. We are fortunate to the extent that we recently have had the celebration of a similar festival in Perth. I, with other State Premiers, will be attending the final functions of that celebration later this month, and I look forward then to learning some of the organisation that was put into the Western Australian celebrations.

I point out that another celebration will have to be taken into account, namely, the bicentennial of Australia in 1988. As those two festivals will be close together, considerable thought will have to be given to a way in which we can celebrate our own South Australian occasion without cutting across or competing with the latter celebration of Australia's bicentennial.

URANIUM

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy give the exact date on which he intends to make the Government's policy statement on uranium, and say whether it will contain details sufficient to be of use to South Australians with respect to projects already approved for uranium mining in South Australia? On 21 September, in an interview with an *Advertiser* journalist, the Minister said that he had given approval for the mining of uranium to proceed at the Honeymoon site in the North of the State.

Elsewhere in the same article he said, "It's all go here,

I'm afraid." One can only conjecture that the "I'm afraid" was an afterthought on his part.

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

Mr. PAYNE: I am certainly aware that you, Sir, would not allow me to continue in that vein, and I do not intend to do so, but I believe that it is reasonable to point out that it was germane to the question I now raise with the Minister. Last Saturday, an advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading "A.A.R. Limited"; it was an advertisement for the services of a groundwater hydrologist, a project/mine geologist and a uranium metallurgist. These persons are, according to the advertisement, required for the Honeymoon project. The advertisement states:

The uranium ore occurs in a confined tertiary aquifer. The advertisement goes on to say that the project mine geologist will be responsible for the geological assessment of the deposit for the purposes of solution mining. Honourable members opposite will understand the process involved: the introduction of liquids into the area where the uranium is held in the ore body. If the process is successful—

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

Mr. PAYNE: I am sorry, Sir; it is a very technical matter. I am attempting not to debate the matter but simply to provide sufficient information so that the Minister may be less confused than he has been in the past and so that he can answer my question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Not only is the honourable member debating the issue but he is now commenting, a matter to which I have previously drawn his attention. I ask the honourable member to continue with his explanation, and his explanation only.

Mr. PAYNE: I am attempting to quote information contained in the advertisement so that members of the House and the Minister will fully understand the import of my question. I have asked the Minister when he will make the statement that he has already promised to this House and whether it will be of such detail that it will have relativity to a uranium project in South Australia, which is already under way in that applications have been called for personnel to work in the area. I thought it fair to attempt to show that the kind of process is such that the people of South Australia and members of this House would be glad to have a reassurance from the Minister, if it is possible to obtain that reassurance from him, on this matter. Because of your ruling, Sir, I will not attempt to go any further. I believe that with your help I have been able to outline to the Minister the import of the question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the House is well aware of who is confused on this issue, if one has a look at the Labor Party's track record in this House. Part of the question is easily answered. Let me assure the honourable member that a comprehensive statement will be made in due course.

MEDIA MONITORING UNIT

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether the media monitoring equipment in the Premier's Department is being used to monitor the performance of Opposition members, as was done by the previous Government? If it is not, what is the unit's present function?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The media monitoring unit is no longer in existence, and has not been in existence for some time. Indeed, so successfully has it been wound down that I find that a number of items of expensive

equipment are missing from that department. I have only today had to initiate an investigation into the whereabouts of a three-head cassette deck, Sony telephone recording equipment, one Sony cassette player radio, and one Sony recorder. This equipment seems to have been mislaid and no-one seems to know where it is. Quite apart from that, it is not the Government's intention to set up the media monitoring service again, but I would like to know, in passing, what has happened to the equipment that was in the unit.

SAMCOR

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether he will honour the undertaking given by the Minister of Agriculture that Samcor staff made redundant through changes in manpower structure will be given Public Service positions in other Government departments? The Minister of Agriculture explained, in an interview given to the *A.B.C. Country Hour* on Friday last, that the reconstruction of Samcor management structure begun some eight months ago would continue. He also explained in the interview that the staff made redundant by the restructuring would not be retrenched, but would become the responsibility of the Public Service Board, which would find jobs for them in other Government departments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member has just answered his own question. That was the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, and it is what has been said not only by me but also by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. There is no question why it should not be honoured.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health say what is the policy in relation to rehabilitation services in South Australia, and particularly in relation to job opportunities for new occupational therapy graduates coming out next year? Each year, a quota of about 25 students is accepted by the South Australian Institute of Technology to study occupational therapy. At present, the institute has some 71 full-time and part-time students studying occupational therapy, and there will be approximately 11 graduates this year and a further 18 to 20 next year. I have been approached by a group of concerned students in my district as to future appointments in their field. Because occupational therapy is an important development in the health services of this State, some clarification and statement are needed.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: As the honourable member and other honourable members would know, it is the policy of the Government to support rehabilitation services and, where possible, to expand them. With the present difficulty of the restraints of the State Budget, it is not possible to expand them as quickly as we would like, but in relation to each of the 11 new graduates in occupational therapy for 1979 who has sought a position in South Australia, a position has been found, and employment is secure for those graduates. I am informed that there will be 23 new graduates in occupational therapy in the middle of 1980, but the employment position for those graduates is not precisely known at present. However, I am able to say that, in addition to the money already allocated in the State Budget for rehabilitation

services, an additional \$107 000 has been expended on developments for existing community health activities, and the Government is offering to provide the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre with additional funds for the geriatric assessment units at those hospitals. I hope that, by the time the allocations are made for the next State Budget, there will have been further developments in the rehabilitation services, and employment opportunities for occupational therapists will look correspondingly brighter.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Environment ascertain from the Minister of Housing what information is available in relation to a recommendation by the South Australian Housing Trust regarding the annual review of Housing Trust rentals? Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the State is required to make an annual rental review. It is now some time since the review should have been announced and, in view of the concern within the community, especially that of trust tenants, that there may be a significant increase in rent, can the Minister provide any information as to the Government's intention in relation to the review?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I shall be pleased to consult with my colleague and bring down a report.

PRAWN FISHERIES

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Fisheries explain to the House what action has been taken to investigate the alleged depletion of prawn stocks in St. Vincent Gulf and Investigator Strait? Last week a report appeared in the *Advertiser* indicating that there was a severe depletion of prawn stocks in the St. Vincent Gulf and other prawning areas. Since then, I have been contacted by fishermen from both Investigator Strait and St. Vincent Gulf. I have since been informed that the Government has taken some action to investigate these allegations further.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Following the report to which the honourable member refers, I had discussions with the President of AFIC (Mr. Michael Thomas), the Executive Director (Mr. Gallary), the Acting Director of Fisheries, and representatives of the Prawn Management Committee. Arising from those discussions, it was decided, in conjunction with the industry, that the *Joseph Verco* would make an examination of runs in St. Vincent Gulf, portion of Investigator Strait, and an area on the eastern side of St. Vincent Gulf. Those runs, or examinations, I understand, will start late this week and it is expected that they will take about five nights. The *Joseph Verco* has been engaged in an examination of the scale fishery, and in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, in water sampling in St. Vincent Gulf. That work is important and is not being left. Arrangements are being made for the sampling to be done by another vessel. It is hoped that this first examination will reveal to the department the size and location of prawns in the areas mentioned. It may well be that we will be looking for a voluntary closure of prawn fishing for some 30 days, after which a similar examination will be made to assess the growth factor and what prawns are present in those areas. The matter is under examination, using the *Joseph Verco*, the research vessel belonging to the Department of Fisheries.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, who I hope has recovered from the festivities he attended on the weekend.

Mr. Gunn: That's if you were lucky enough to get an invitation.

Mr. KENEALLY: Weren't you invited, Graham?

Mr. Gunn: No, I wasn't.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart will ask his question.

Mr. KENEALLY: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. Does the joint statement issued by the South Australian Minister, and the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, Peter Nixon, about the sealing of the Stuart Highway, mean that the Commonwealth Government is making additional funds available to seal the national highway, or does it mean that the South Australian Government is being required to redetermine its road building priorities so that the Stuart Highway will be sealed at the expense of construction projects for which the State has responsibility?

The question of responsibility for sealing the Stuart Highway has been raised in this House many times. The previous Government believed that that responsibility rested with the Federal Government. This view was supported by such diverse groups as the South Australian Chamber of Commerce, Spencer Gulf Cities Association, R.A.A., both Liberal and Labor Senators for South Australia, Mr. Ian Sinclair in an election commitment to the Northern Territory, and many others. Those who believed that the financial responsibility rested with South Australia are fewer in number, but they include Mr. Peter Nixon and the present State Government when it was in Opposition. During the weekend Mr. Nixon, when speaking to a meeting at Coober Pedy, said that there was to be no additional Commonwealth funding for this project.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope, from the tone of the honourable member's question, that he is as keen about the sealing of the Stuart Highway as we on this side of the House are.

Mr. Keneally: Certainly.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am glad to hear that. It was an important plank in the present Government's election policy that it would make immediate approaches to the Commonwealth Government to have the sealing of the Stuart Highway completed within five years.

As the member for Stuart realises, three weeks ago I went to Canberra to see Mr. Nixon on that subject and, indeed, on a couple of other subjects concerning the Government at the time. I negotiated with Mr. Nixon that, in fact, the Stuart Highway would be sealed within seven years. That was the text of the joint statement that was made over the weekend.

I am unaware of a statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport that there would be no additional Commonwealth funding, because, as the honourable member realises, this Government has said that to seal the Stuart Highway in six years would require \$18 000 000 of extra Commonwealth funding and that to seal it in seven years would require something less than that—approximately \$14 000 000. Let me make it quite plain to the honourable member and to this House that other road projects in this State will not suffer as a result of the sealing of the Stuart Highway. The sealing of the Stuart Highway will become a top priority as far as the allocation of this State's funds are concerned. Next year the allocation for the sealing of the Stuart Highway will probably be of the order of \$4 300 000, virtually the same as it was this year. Perhaps the member for Stuart will rest

easy to know that the Government does not intend to make other major projects, such as the Tailem Bend bypass and various other projects of that nature, suffer because of the Stuart Highway.

HOME SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Health say what action her department has taken to overcome any health risks associated with home swimming pools? My question arises from an article entitled "Pool neglect is risk to health" which appeared in the local newspaper. The article states:

People who fail to maintain their swimming pools properly are open to health risks, according to Henley and Grange Deputy Town Clerk Rodney Donne. Correct management of swimming pool water will ensure it is safe for swimmers, he said this week.

Mr. Donne is also quoted as saying:

Although many chemical companies gave advice on pool maintenance, it was often too technical for people to understand. It is difficult to set a standard for pool advice and chemical labelling because there is no uniform standard for pool sanitation.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I am aware that health risks can be attached to private swimming pools that are not properly attended to. The honourable member would no doubt know that the regulations covering the public swimming pools are under the Health Act and that they are administered by the central board of health and local boards of health. I know that local boards of health would be very willing to provide advice on pool maintenance to the owners of private swimming pools. It seems to be rather a matter of promoting the fact that this information is available.

With the onset of summer, I will certainly consider doing that, because I feel sure that responsible pool owners do want to have access to the best advice, and certainly this is available through the boards of health. I will ask the central board of health to look at the matter and see whether there are ways in which the availability of advice on the addition of pool chemicals can be promoted, and I will get a report for the honourable member.

OUTER HARBOR TERMINAL

Mr. PETERSON: Is the Minister of Transport aware of any proposal to link the Outer Harbor container terminal to the national standard gauge rail system? If he is, when will this work be carried out, and, as there are two possible routes, which route will the rail link take on the peninsula?

An article which was headed "\$58 000 000 Railways Plan for South Australian Lines" and which appeared in the *Advertiser* on November 8 states:

The Australian National Railways has planned a \$58 000 000 project to link South Australia with the national standard gauge and to upgrade the State's freight services. . . . It wants about \$22 000 000 to build a new passenger terminal near the Keswick station and to construct new standard gauge freight-handling terminals in Adelaide.

On the same subject, the publication of the Marine and Harbors Department entitled *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal* has said:

Adelaide as national ship-rail hub by 1983: Reports that the Federal Government will make funds available next financial year for a start of work in July 1981 on the standard gauge link between Adelaide and Crystal Brook bring the Port of Adelaide national ship/rail import-export receival and

distribution centre concept much closer . . . Shipping and rail are recognised as the two most energy-efficient means of moving large quantities of freight and the Port of Adelaide, as a "one stop shop" for inwards and outwards international cargo, should help cut costs and save time for State and national importers and exporters. The prospect should also be attractive to the Australian National Railways Commission and to both conference and non-conference shipping lines on the Australian coast.

We have a terminal that is in a precarious situation, and the provision of this line will, I think, help further to establish it as a national terminal.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I appreciate the interest of the honourable member in this question. As I told the member for Stuart a short while ago in relation to another matter, I also took up this matter with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport when I went to see him two or three weeks ago.

Once again it was an election pledge of this Government that we would press the Commonwealth into starting the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line as soon as possible. Our submission to the Commonwealth Minister was received kindly. I cannot tell the honourable member any more than that about when an announcement will be made, but I am hopeful that the Commonwealth will make an announcement soon as to an early beginning of the standard gauge link. The honourable member's question follows on from that, because the question of the Outer Harbor terminal is intimately connected with the construction of the whole standard gauge line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook. If that occurs, and occurs soon, it will be necessary to renegotiate the standardisation agreement, in many respects at any rate, that presently exists between the State and the Commonwealth.

During those negotiations I will certainly be pushing very hard for the Outer Harbor terminal connection to be added to the standard gauge link. That is extremely important for South Australia because not only do we have the advantages that the honourable member mentioned in the explanation to his question but we also have the proposed development of this State at Redcliff and Roxby Downs, and it could well be that the products from those developments could be brought down and shipped from Outer Harbor, which would be a great asset to the State.

CHILD CARE CENTRES

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Education state the Government's policy in relation to early childhood education? I have received a deputation who presented a detailed submission on behalf of a number of persons who operate independent child care centres. They are extremely concerned about what they consider to be unfair competition from family day care centres, Government-run child care centres and play groups.

First, independent child care centres are required to provide professional mothercraft and/or child care staff in attendance if there are small babies catered for, and this is not required in family day care centres. They are subject to a much more detailed examination and inspection; for example, a community welfare officer, an educationist and local health officers must call at least annually. They are subject to much more stringent regulations. The previous Government would not subsidise the cost of child care for families in severe financial difficulties in contrast to such children in family day care centres. Additionally, the operators of the independent child care centres are

extremely concerned in that district welfare officers require 150 families operating family day care centres in their area of control to justify the employment of a family day care co-ordinator, and therefore it is only human for the officers of the Department of Community Welfare to push these centres in preference to any other. Also—

The SPEAKER: Order! Could the member please indicate from what he is quoting?

Mr. ASHENDEN: I was not quoting, Sir. These are facts given to me by the group of early childhood care people who came to see me. These are the facts given to me by them, and I was bringing them forward.

The SPEAKER: I wanted to be quite certain, because the honourable member is getting very close to commenting. I note that he is using someone else's words. I ask him to watch the matter closely.

Mr. ASHENDEN: All the points I am making have been put to me by a group of eight of my own constituents who came to me on this matter, but I thank you for your advice, Sir. They also advised me that it is a Department of Community Welfare officer who alone determines the suitability or otherwise of the premises for and operators of a family day care centre, which is in contrast to the inspection of independent child care centres. The private operators of the independent child care centres also expressed their concern at the growth of such groups in competition in relation to the children who would normally come under their care.

The persons who made their representations to me stressed that they do not fear equal competition. However, the situation at present, as I have already outlined, requires that they are subject to far more critical staffing requirements, inspection requirements and regulations, and they are not eligible to enrol children receiving Government assistance in the payment of their fees if from disadvantaged families. They have pointed out to me their concern in these areas.

They have therefore asked me on their behalf to ask that the entire situation be reviewed so that in fact the regulations to which they are subject, which they do not believe to be unreasonable, should apply to all areas of children in early childhood day care centres. Could the Minister please advise on these matters?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is some division of responsibility for the care and education of children between birth and five years, and I believe the content of the question comes essentially within the confines of the Minister of Community Welfare rather than of the Minister of Education. The Minister of Community Welfare has the responsibility for the control, operation and licensing of child care centres, irrespective of whether those child care centres are Government funded or independent private commercially operated, or in fact whether they are the family day care centres, which incidentally also need licensing if three or more children attend them even though they are conducted in a private home.

There may be some implication that the Government is largely responsible, but the Federal Child Care Act does in fact cover the funding of all these institutions, and I believe there are four separate categories of children who are catered for under the Federal Government's allocation of funds for needy children. One of the categories mentioned by the honourable member is not currently funded by the Federal Government in so far as there is no provision for children in need attending privately operated child care centres to obtain a Federal Government subsidy, and that is a matter to which this Government will be addressing itself.

However, as the overall answer is probably likely to be

far more lengthy than even the question, I will undertake to obtain a comprehensive report from the Minister of Community Welfare for the honourable member.

UNDER SECRETARIES

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Premier state whether he intends to appoint Parliamentary Under Secretaries to assist some Ministers in his Government? There is a precedent for this kind of appointment: the Hon. R. S. Hall, when Premier of this State from 1968 to 1970, appointed Under Secretaries. The present Chief Secretary and Minister of Water Resources are two I can recall. I take it that the reason for the House getting up either today or tomorrow, as I understand it, was given by the Deputy Premier—that the Government and Ministers of the Government need to acquaint themselves with the intricacies of their various departments, and I can understand that. I believe it would be of great assistance to Ministers to deal with the more mundane tasks of a Ministry if they had such people as the members for Fisher, Eyre, Hanson, Glenelg, and Goyder to help them, and if a couple of bright and up-and-coming young stars such as the members for Mallee and Rocky River were to assist the Minister of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is going far beyond a simple explanation.

Mr. CORCORAN: No, Sir; I am serious. I think that all these people have adequate qualities to perform the task, and I am sure that Ministers would be only too anxious to have the type of assistance they could offer to them in the control and conduct of their Ministries.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the honourable member for the excellent suggestion he has put forward. Obviously, he has given a great deal of thought to this matter. No consideration has been given to the appointment of Parliamentary Under Secretaries. We are fortunate in having a very powerful back bench indeed, with men of great talent. Their activities are already directed at totally supporting the Government in helping in every way with policy matters and in implementing policies. In view of the honourable member's explanation, I place on record my appreciation of the tremendous work that has been done by the various Government departments during the past eight weeks since this Government was sworn in and took office. Their task has been enormous. When one looks at the number of questions that have been placed on notice in this period, and compares it with a comparable period of the previous Government, one sees that, at the end of last week, 506 questions had been placed on the Notice Paper over 13 sitting days, of which 380 or more have already been answered, including those printed in today's *Hansard*. This compares with the last session of the previous Parliament, which met on 11 sitting days, during which 318 questions were placed on the Notice Paper. When Parliament was dissolved unexpectedly on 22 August 1979, only 219 of those 318 questions had been answered. In other words, it is a measure of the success which the Ministers and the departments have had that, over an almost identical number of sitting days, the present Government has been presented with nearly double the number of questions and is answering them at nearly twice the rate established by the previous Government.

FLINDERS RANGE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Environment visit the

northern Flinders Range and discuss with the local residents and members of the communities in that part of my district the Flinders Range planning area landscape zoning regulations that were placed on exhibition in March 1979? Also, will he have extra copies of the report printed? The Minister will be aware that there has been considerable discussion in the Flinders Range area in relation to the effects of these regulations. Will he have this matter examined by his department before visiting that part of my district? On this occasion, I shall be pleased to assist him in organising any visit, and I will not need the assistance of the member for Stuart in representing my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Order! In calling on the honourable Minister, I draw his attention to the proximity of the close of Question Time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the honourable member for asking this question. I shall be pleased to come up and speak to his constituents as soon as possible. That is something I had planned to do. I shall be pleased to come up and talk about some of the difficulties landholders are experiencing in that area.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As Minister of Public Works it is my duty to place before the House details of financial mismanagement within the Public Buildings Department. This mismanagement involves money spent in excess of Ministerial approval and projects undertaken without approval by the appropriate Minister. Although most of the matters to which I refer occurred prior to 1976, accountability for the moneys involved remains a matter of serious concern.

First, I will outline the history of this matter and indicate what measures have been taken to correct the problem. I will then outline the policy which the Government proposes to adopt in respect of the management of the Loan works programme, given the facts which this report and previous reports of the Auditor-General have highlighted.

This matter was first brought to the attention of Parliament in the annual report of the Auditor-General for the financial year ended 30 June 1977. The Auditor-General has raised the question of expenditure in excess of approval in each subsequent report. In view of the serious implications revealed by the Auditor-General, I requested the Public Buildings Department to provide me with an up-to-date report as soon as possible. Expenditure incurred by a Government department without the approval of the responsible Minister threatens the very basis of Ministerial accountability to Parliament. In the circumstances, I believe it proper to inform Parliament of the extent of over-expenditure or expenditure without Ministerial approval, and to indicate what procedures will be adopted to overcome past deficiencies and institute safeguards for the future.

First, I place on record my confidence in the integrity

and competence of the present management of the Public Buildings Department. I am satisfied that, since his appointment, the Director-General has sought to contain and overcome the failings of the system as it existed when he commenced duties in March 1978. I cannot overstress my complete confidence in the Director-General. He has done a superb job so far in trying to correct the mismanagement that occurred within that department prior to his appointment.

I turn now to an examination of the facts first brought to the attention of this Parliament by the Auditor-General in 1977. The report emphasised two aspects: expenditure in excess of approval, and expenditure undertaken in respect of projects for which no formal approval existed at all. The Auditor-General's Report was based on information brought to light by the transfer from manual records to computer-based accounting during 1975-76. There were over 20 000 project account records at that time. Whereas a meaningful examination of each record was impossible under the manual ledger system, the introduction of computer-based accounting procedures rapidly exposed those accounts where either expenditure had been incurred without any authority or where the amount authorised had been exceeded. As an example, the situation at the end of April 1977 for projects almost exclusively completed prior to 1976 is dealt with in a table. I seek leave to include that statistical table in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is the material purely statistical?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, Sir.
Leave granted.

Loan Works Programme	Total Value of Projects without Approval	Total Value of Expendi- ture in Excess of Approval
	\$	\$
Education.....	944 023	8 565 272
Hospitals	3 222 566	4 280 466
Other Government buildings	666 642	2 566 141
Further Education	1 551 322	2 554 566
Reimbursement.....	63 387	89 475
Total	\$6 447 950	\$18 055 920

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The implementation of the computerised management information system was thus strikingly successful. It permitted the instant reconciliation of many thousands of physical records containing details of expenditure and approval for expenditure. In this way a total overview of the department's financial records extending back many years emerged for the first time.

At this stage, it would probably assist honourable members if I were to give some examples of projects where expenditure in excess of approval was identified, and where Ministerial approval for that expenditure is now being sought by me as Minister of Public Works. One example is departmental housing at Clare. On 13 October 1972, the then Minister of Works gave approval for the erection of two residences at Clare for the Education Department at an estimated cost of \$37 000. However, the residences were not completed until late in 1975 at a final cost of \$71 600—that is, \$34 600 more than was originally approved. No explanation for the delay in construction is available. Taken in the most favourable light, this represents cost increases of over 24 per cent per year compound—approximately double the prevailing inflation rate. The residences are of standard construction and design.

The relevant file was referred to me as Minister of Public Works for my retrospective approval of the excess expenditure (representing in total an increase of 93.5 per cent over the estimate) on 2 October 1979. I ordered an immediate investigation.

A second example is Loxton Primary School. On 13 September 1971, Cabinet approval was given for the expenditure of \$545 000 to provide for the replacement of Loxton Primary School. Additional funds of \$40 000 were approved in October 1972 following completion of documents, and a revised estimate of \$584 000 was prepared. On 28 May 1973 a contract was awarded by public tender in the sum of \$541 223. As a result of the contractor's inability to complete the work in time, Ministerial approval was given for the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department to undertake the work in order to achieve availability of the school by a date satisfactory to the Education Department.

The Construction Division commenced work on site in April 1974, and the project was completed in May 1975. Total expenditure approved was \$619 925. However, the total expenditure incurred was \$862 623, leaving an over-expenditure of \$242 698. Again, the over-expenditure was identified at the time of the changeover to computerised accounting records, and was referred to departmental management for action on 11 January 1977. The file was presented to the previous Minister of Public Works on 10 August 1979 for his approval. The then Minister requested further details from the department in an attempt to identify the reason for the inordinate time lapse involved. Again, it was subsequently presented to me for approval without adequate justification for the price escalation. Following discussions with senior officers of the department, I have reached the conclusion that, in all the circumstances, such explanations would no longer be relevant, even if they were available.

One further example may be instructive: Kingscote Area School. On 20 January 1978, a contract was awarded to the District Council of Kingscote to carry out earthworks and filling in conjunction with the redevelopment of Kingscote Area School by the Construction Division. The district council was unable to offer a firm price for the work as requested, but submitted an estimated price of \$54 100. This offer was accepted by the Construction Division, even though it was lower than the divisional estimate (\$82 000) and subsequently lower than the indicative prices obtained from mainland private contractors.

During the course of the project, one of the wettest winters in recent times was experienced, and extensive re-work was required over a large percentage of the excavated works. These works consisted of the formation of a suitable base to accept the filling and compaction of the hard core material and top soil. The ultimate expenditure incurred in respect of this contract with the district council was \$164 471. This amount was paid in full prior to the seeking of Ministerial approval for the excess expenditure, which amounted to \$110 371. This project was of particular concern to me as Minister of Public Works.

As indicated earlier, action was taken within the department to rectify the financial and legal deficiencies highlighted by the computer accounting system. A substantial, continuing, clerical effort was mounted to prepare the relevant details for Ministerial approval in respect of each project. The effect of this may be measured by the following extracts from subsequent reports of the Auditor-General. I seek leave to insert a purely statistical table in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

	1976-77 Report (as at 30/6/77) \$M	1977-78 Report (as at 30/6/78) \$M	1978-79 Report (as at 30/6/79) \$M
Expenditure in excess of approval	18.0	10.93	4.997
Expenditure without approval	6.0	1.865	0.245
Total	24.0	12.795	5.242

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A further illustration of the type of effort required is the fact that, during the first six months of 1979 alone, some 1 440 projects were processed for additional approval.

I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a detailed financial statement relating to the 39 projects remaining to be dealt with currently where over-expenditure exceeds \$20 000. I have two purely statistical tables, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

PROJECTS IN EXCESS BY \$100 000

All Construction Division projects

Project	Approval \$	Expenditure \$	Excess \$	Completed
Port Augusta Community Welfare Centre	386 500	513 557	127 057	October 1975
Munno Para P/S Timber Classrooms	205 000	350 840	145 840	March 1979
Marryatville High School Conversion	2 072 500	2 592 883	520 383	May 1978
Holden Hill North P/S Erection	895 000	1 023 469	128 469	January 1976
Modbury South Special School	938 363	1 090 156	151 793	February 1976
Arbury Park Outdoor School	572 793	714 236	141 443	March 1976
Yorke town A/S—Erection	1 676 500	1 902 556	226 056	March 1976
Loxton P/S—Completion by C.D.	619 925	862 622	242 697	March 1975
Augusta Park H/D Erection	1 000 620	1 269 588	268 968	November 1974
	\$8 367 201	\$10 319 907	\$1 952 706	

CONSTRUCTION DIVISION: MAJOR WORKS IN EXCESS BY \$20 000-\$100 000

Project	Approval \$	Expenditure \$	Excess \$	Completed
Various Schools—Transportable C/R	73 386	107 220	33 834	October 1976
Wattle Park—Training Centre	161 324	203 115	41 791	August 1976
Stradbroke Primary School—Open Unit	440 000	472 231	32 231	October 1978
Magill Home—Glen Stuart Ward	87 500	133 610	46 110	April 1978
Marryatville Primary School—Consol.	461 000	496 210	35 210	June 1978
Salisbury East High School—Art/Craft	214 000	270 393	56 393	December 1977
Victor Harbor Primary School—8 T. Unit	588 000	611 948	23 948	November 1978
Croydon Park T/C Child Care/Mind	78 320	112 629	34 309	February 1977
Dental Clinics—Plant/Furn. 1978-79	132 000	162 825	30 825	February 1979
Nailsworth Primary School—Redevelop.	495 000	577 924	82 924	February 1979
Cathedral Plaza—Landscaping	84 425	115 107	30 682	December 1978
Northfield Laboratories—Staffrooms	75 000	98 741	23 741	October 1978
P.B.D. District and Depot	457 000	489 226	32 226	April 1977
Netley—Construction Division Office	173 000	216 604	43 604	August 1977
Elizabeth T/C Child Minding Centre	78 000	110 190	32 190	February 1977
Woodville High School—Extensions	1 048 596	1 118 978	70 382	November 1975
Para Hills High School—Additional Accom.	295 000	363 479	68 479	May 1975
Brinkworth Primary School—Construction	213 552	272 021	58 469	November 1974
Port Noarlunga South Primary School— Stage 2	396 000	453 304	57 304	April 1978
	\$5 551 103	\$6 385 755	\$834 652	

OTHERS

School Deaf and Blind	137 895	195 344	57 449	June 1975
Motor Vehicle Registration Centre	5 818 560	5 849 021	30 461	July 1977
Mt. Barker South Primary School Land	21 661	50 290	28 629	December 1978
Clare Regional Education Office—2 Res.	37 000	71 600	34 600	October 1972
Adelaide Gaol—Maintenance 1976-77	84 600	117 135	32 535	June 1977
Adelaide Gaol—Maintenance 1975-76	64 500	100 490	35 990	June 1976
Supreme Court—Accommodation Judges and Staff	79 600	107 321	27 721	May 1977
Whyalla Hospital—Add. Rolls Ironer	44 600	64 293	19 693	August 1978
Grenfell Centre—Accomm. D.T.R.S.	34 100	54 100	20 014	January 1979
Forensic Science—Scientific Equip.	128 000	149 464	21 464	August 1978
Grenfell Centre—Accomm. D.T.R.S.	90 000	119 778	29 778	July 1976
	\$6 540 516	\$6 878 850	\$338 334	

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: An analysis of the financial statements shows that all previous projects, where expenditure is more than \$100 000 in excess of approval, have been projects handled by the departmental Construction Division (one of which is Loxton Primary School). All these projects were completed before the implementation of the computer system in 1976.

The retrospective endorsement of such expenditure without approval, which by now amounts to approximately \$19 000 000 since 1977, has been nothing more than an exercise in accounting formalities. Without the proper justification and explanation—something which appears to be unavailable in most cases—retrospective approval of individual projects in isolation obviates any attempt to maintain the integrity of Ministerial responsibility and accountability to this Parliament. Uninformed approval is no approval at all. Special procedures are required to deal with such unusual situations.

It is desirable that the remaining backlog of approvals be resolved as quickly as possible. However, for the reasons I have outlined above, I do not believe that the outstanding items can be treated as a normal request for the Minister to approve over-expenditure on a current project—a situation in which the Minister would expect to be provided with a full explanation in order that his approval would be an informed one. It is my intention that the balance of projects requiring approval should be identified and dealt with as a special group for which the present Government would not accept responsibility. However, before giving my approval to the differences between actual expenditures and earlier Ministerial approvals so that the outstanding matters of the past may be cleared up, I propose to ask for such explanations of the differences as are available, to ask the Director-General of the Public Buildings Department to report to me on those cases where it would no longer be productive or justified for further efforts to be made to obtain explanations, and to give the Auditor-General the opportunity to consider and, if he thinks appropriate, comment upon the papers submitted for my approval.

I now turn to the critical point—what steps are being taken to ensure that history is not repeated? By its very nature, the computer-based information system that first brought to light the need for action will, to a significant degree, prevent similar situations arising in the future. A continuous overview is now available to departmental management of the projects currently under way, and especially with those where expenditure exceeds approval as highlighted by the computer. This will help timely action by the department to secure Ministerial approval for those projects where such over-expenditure is justified by special circumstances.

It is most important that such anomalies are detected early. While a given undertaking may be acceptable to the Government and the community at a certain cost, additional expenditure may render the project uneconomic and impractical. Design changes may be required to bring the project back to reality.

It is worth noting that projects undertaken through the public tender system are not so susceptible to the massive cost increases which have been identified in this report. If proper allowance is made, in advance, for inflation, and if variations to the contract are kept in hand, the great majority of projects can be, and are, completed in a professional manner to the ultimate benefit of the community. Over 75 per cent of the Loan works programme is handled in this way to the complete satisfaction of the Government. It is my intention over the next three years to increase this proportion further.

However, the basis for the approval of funds is a current

estimate of anticipated future costs. In many cases, the exact calculation of rise and fall payments and the value of contract variations cannot be undertaken until some period after the practical completion of a contract or of multiple contracts where they form part of a total project. Until all the variables associated with a contract are finally completed, evaluation of the additional funds approval required cannot be a precise exercise. For these reasons, no guarantee can be given—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister's time has expired. He must seek leave for an extension.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I seek leave for an extension of time to complete this statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: For these reasons, no guarantee can be given that approved expenditure limits will never be exceeded. However, control systems must be implemented and developed to ensure that the incidence is reduced to an absolute minimum and that timely action is taken to ensure that additional approvals are sought when necessary. The action already taken includes the following:

1. The department is improving estimating procedures, and is monitoring expenditure in order to contain expenditure within approval, or to provide early recognition of the requirement for additional funds.

2. Procedures have been implemented to ensure that approval is obtained for each discrete design phase of a project, replacing a prior system whereby approval was not sought during the design period, but only at the stage of the submission for funds for a construction project.

3. The implementation of a "fixed price" system for projects undertaken by the Construction Division, and the extension of the system into other cost producing sections of the department, including professional design costs.

4. Improved control procedures have been implemented, which include a computer analysis each month comparing expenditure against approval, with reports forwarded to relevant project team leaders and to appropriate control areas within the department.

5. Project team leaders and others having responsibility for expenditure control have had their responsibilities clearly enunciated. Also, training will be provided where necessary, to enable defined job-cost-control objectives to be achieved.

While the subject matter of this statement is largely historical, it will continue to impact on the current management of the department until the outstanding projects have been dealt with. In this regard, it is my intention that the next report of the Auditor-General will see the conclusion of the outstanding matters to which I have referred.

This statement will clarify the problems that the new Government has had to confront, and particularly the problems that I have had to confront, as Minister of Public Works, and the action taken to uphold the principles of Ministerial accountability.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY CONTRACT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I want to reveal to the House the circumstances concerning the letting of a contract by the State Transport Authority for 100 buses under the former Labor Government. It is a sad and sorry story of maladministration and irrational decision-making

by the Labor Cabinet and, in particular, by the former Minister of Transport, Mr. Virgo. It is a matter of continuing public interest, since the travelling public is failing to get the benefit of new buses as quickly as it might have.

The history of the matter goes back to 1977, when, in October of that year, the General Manager of the State Transport Authority recommended to the S.T.A. Board that 100 new buses be acquired by the authority, which was agreed to by the authority. The Minister duly sought and obtained Cabinet approval for the new buses on 9 January 1978.

On 17 March 1978, the S.T.A. called tenders for the supply and delivery of 100 new buses, and they were to comprise 20 "small" buses for use on narrow, winding Hills routes, and 80 express-type buses for use on long distance routes (of which 35 could be articulated). Tenders closed on 28 July 1978, and tenders were received for seven makes: M.A.N., Volvo, Hino, Mercedes-Benz, Mogurt-Ikarus, Scania, and Leyland. These tenders were referred to an evaluation committee of officers from the authority's Engineering, Traffic, Administration and Development Branches for recommendation. The final choice turned out to be between Volvo and M.A.N.

In due course, that committee recommended the purchase of M.A.N. buses, mainly because the overall operating features provided by M.A.N., with its low floor height, were superior to Volvo, the ability of M.A.N. to provide a developed bus body design was of major importance, and the M.A.N. buses were cheaper. Volvo are bus chassis manufacturers only. They are not bus manufacturers, as are firms such as M.A.N. This means that the design of a bus body for the Volvo chassis had to start from scratch, while in the case of M.A.N. the bus is engineered as a complete unit and all of the major engineering design, calculations and stress tests had already been carried out.

M.A.N. guaranteed the bus bodies for 18 years. Volvo did not offer a complete bus design, but accepted design responsibility for the complete bus with a reduced body warranty of five years. The M.A.N. buses would use engines which complied with the the 1977 California emission regulations, while the Volvo buses would not.

The recommendation in favour of M.A.N. was supported by the General Manager and by the authority, and, in October 1978, a recommendation was sent to the Labor Cabinet to accept the M.A.N. tender. However, following Cabinet consideration of this, a meeting was called two days later, on 18 October, between the then Premier (Mr. Dunstan), Mr. Virgo, Mr. Hudson (the Minister of Planning), Mr. Simmons (the Chief Secretary), and some public servants. The Minister at that meeting decided that the Volvo tenders should be accepted, and the Cabinet accepted that advice on 23 October. The reasons for such a decision are not particularly convincing. For example, the agent for Volvo was a local South Australian company, while M.A.N. did not have substantial representation in South Australia.

Since M.A.N. had plans for upgrading its Adelaide representation, this is hardly a logical basis for refusing M.A.N. the contract. Likewise, it was claimed that Volvo should be favoured because the S.T.A.'s present Volvo buses had parts which are substantially interchangeable with the new model and that M.A.N. had no adequate servicing arrangements in South Australia. The S.T.A. had in fact made it clear to the Labor Government that it was quite satisfied with the servicing arrangements proposed by M.A.N.

On 20 October, the authority had written to Mr. Virgo

recommending acceptance of the M.A.N. tender. The authority sought that the matter be referred back to it if the Government decided not to accept the tender from M.A.N. The Volvo agent had revised the original tender on 19 October and did so further on 26 October. The changes included reductions in prices, a 10-year warranty on the bus body frame, and a firm schedule of deliveries promised. On 30 October, the S.T.A. advised Mr. Virgo that the Volvo tender was still inferior to that of M.A.N.

Despite that, on 31 October Mr. Virgo peremptorily directed the S.T.A. to send a letter of intent to the agents for Volvo for the purchase of 100 buses and to begin contract negotiations. The Government of the day failed to refer the matter back to the S.T.A. for further review. No approach was made to M.A.N. to determine whether that company was prepared to reduce its price after tenders closed. Extensive and time-consuming negotiations followed between the parties involved, and the Volvo price was varied more than once. Finally, a contract was signed on 3 May 1979 for the supply and delivery of 100 Volvo buses.

The problems which S.T.A. anticipated in this contract have become a reality. There have been long delays in the supply of chassis and in design of the bus bodies. Mr. Virgo, in his announcement of the Volvo decision on 2 November 1978, said that the order would be complete by mid-1980. The delays which have now arisen mean that the first prototype bus will be available in March 1980 and the remainder of the buses will take approximately 12 months from then to be delivered.

I should make it clear that there does not now seem to be any practical option but to continue with the arrangements with Volvo. Any attempt to alter that now would simply cause further delay. However, I believe that the public is entitled to know of the costs of Labor's style of decision-making.

There has been unnecessary disruption to Pressed Metal Corporation at Royal Park, where all the body work is being done, in its attempt to maintain its skilled workforce, and to provide that with adequate work. There has been a drop of 30 to 220 in the numbers employed at Pressed Metal Corporation, and some who have left will be lost to the industry for good. There have been costs to S.T.A., due to such things as rises in the cost of the buses and the cost of maintaining the old unsatisfactory buses.

In total, the estimate of additional cost incurred by the authority due to the delay will be \$1 165 000, or \$11 650 per bus. That, in harsh statistical terms, is the cost of the peculiar way the Labor Government went about making unjustified and, indeed, improper Executive decisions. The previous Government failed to consult adequately with the S.T.A. about its views and refused to discuss further the firm views of the S.T.A. officials. It allowed Volvo to vary its prices after tenders closed, while giving no such opportunity to M.A.N. or any other tenderer.

The travelling public will now have to make do with the new buses, which have under-floor engines requiring high saloon floors and high steps. This contrasts with the S.T.A.'s approach that since 1968 all buses it has purchased have been rear-engined buses, which allow for low floors and low steps. While the services will be operated with new buses, these will, regrettably, be of obsolete design compared with present day standards. The public will not enjoy the high quality equipment to which it is entitled and which could have been provided at less cost.

It is the concern of this Government that the buses should arrive on what is now the schedule, so that the benefits of having new buses will, at least, be available to S.T.A.'s passengers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL AND HEALTH UNITS

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: On Thursday last a series of questions seeking Budget information about hospitals and health units were placed on notice by the member for Napier. There was a consolidation of more than 500 questions dealing with the 1978-79 allocations, 1979-80 allocation and the submitted requests by the health institutions. I regret there was a need for the honourable member to seek information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections across the floor of the House.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: That information should be available to Parliament in the Budget papers. However, it should be clearly understood that the manner in which the Health Commission budget is presented to Parliament was formulated under the previous Government and in the short time available between taking office and presenting the health budget it was not possible to devise a presentation which would have enabled meaningful Parliamentary examination of the Government's administration of the health sector. When presenting the Budget, the Premier announced that the Government's intention was that any future policies and programmes be made self-evident from the Budget papers.

The answers to questions on the health budget clearly demonstrate the vast diversity and complexity of our health services and emphasise the magnitude of the task of providing State-wide health care efficiently and effectively. There are many non-recognised hospitals and other minor health bodies which receive occasional special grants from the Government. These voluntary bodies are not required to submit budgets, but seek Government assistance on the basis of need to enable their activities to continue. Consequently, there is no obligation on the Health Commission to present this information to Parliament.

The House will note that most budgets have been marginally increased as a result of provision for inflation, but they could, nevertheless, be described as standstill budgets, as members will see when *Hansard* is published and the answers to the honourable member's questions appear in print.

A number of hospitals have had reductions in funding, in keeping with the Government's policy, a policy clearly endorsed by the people and the Parliament to eliminate waste and rationalise services for greater efficiency and more effective health delivery.

The effectiveness of health services cannot, and should not, be measured by ever-increasing budget allocations, but by constant re-evaluation of the cost effectiveness and appropriateness of the services being provided. It is unfortunate that the Opposition tactic of dwelling unnecessarily long on minor points in other Budget lines meant that the Health Commission budget was not scrutinised by Parliament in the longer than normal time allowed by the Government for this purpose. Had the Health Commission budget been subject to proper scrutiny, I would have made these points at that time, and would have also undertaken to provide the kind of information which the member for Napier has sought in Questions on Notice.

I feel sure that the honourable member will acknowledge the considerable time and effort required to prepare this information for Parliament. I draw to the

attention of the House the notes which accompany the figures provided. These notes fully clarify the total budgetary situation, which may not be initially evident. I intend ensuring that the presentation of the Health Commission budget to Parliament is improved over the next three years. The Health Commission and Treasury will be asked for a presentation which emphasises each individual health unit's responsibility and accountability, and shows how the health dollar is being spent and what value South Australians are getting for health expenditure.

PYAP IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That the report be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): In speaking to this Bill as it comes from a Select Committee, and having examined the Bill, I seek to make a few remarks. First, I remind the House that this Bill is in the third reading stage at this time only because of the co-operation extended by the Opposition in this matter.

This co-operation was extended at a time when the Opposition was under the impression (I would go so far as to say it had the word of the Government) that the session would continue beyond today. I believe this is very pertinent to this matter of the third reading now being possible at this time. I make no complaint against the Minister concerned. I have every reason to have some regard for the way in which he approached the matter. He gave me advance notice so that the Bill could be studied at least for a brief time.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will link his remarks back to the third reading.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe that I have linked them very effectively by pointing out that we could not be continuing the third reading at this stage if the co-operation of the Opposition had not been given to allowing this important measure to get to this stage. I do not intend to debate this matter for very long. I believe that it does need to be said that, when the request from the Minister came to me as the member representing the Opposition in this area, I had no hesitation in agreeing, bearing in mind that I believe I had every right to think that a certain time table was to apply with respect to this matter and other matters on the agenda for the House. Unfortunately, that has proved not to be the case.

The Bill as we now view it is one that is satisfactory for the purposes for which it is intended to provide for the funding for the Pyap Irrigation Trust. Members can be assured that the Select Committee of members on both sides of the House had before it sufficient information to allow them to be quite certain to recommend to the House the course that has led to the Bill's being at its third reading stage. The members of the trust, those people concerned, are satisfied that the legislation as it now stands, with the clauses which have been added, will be adequate for the task of providing for assistance in the rehabilitation and the upgrading of the headworks of the Pyap irrigation system.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): At the time of the second reading explanation, I expressed my appreciation to the House and to the Opposition for facilitating this measure in the interests of the Pyap irrigators and also in the interests of the State, inasmuch as that it would create a little additional employment through the letting of this contract to rehabilitate the Pyap Irrigation Trust headworks. Again, I express my appreciation to the Opposition for enabling this Bill to proceed at this time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 November. Page 873.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The Opposition supports this measure, and I want to speak to it only briefly. It should not be imagined that it is a simple matter; it has had quite a long and complex history. In the excellent second reading explanation given by the Minister of Health that history is quite adequately set out for those who are familiar with the area. On the contrary, for those who have not followed the history of the legislation through, basically, it is as follows: before the Consumer Transactions Act was introduced by the then Attorney-General, Mr. King, a situation existed whereby, when goods were the subject to some form of consumer lease, an innocent purchaser could be placed very much at risk in obtaining money. The innocent purchaser could be placed in the situation of having those goods repossessed from him by the credit provider, notwithstanding that he had paid money and that he had done so in good faith.

When the Consumer Transactions Bill was first introduced it was intended by section 35 to overcome that unfortunate situation and to provide that, in legal terms, a purchaser for value without notice from a person who had been provided with credit under the arrangements of the Bill would not be caught with the loss. It was well known that such a strong but necessary change in the law, should have a safeguard, and the safeguard provided was a heavy penalty on the fraudulent person provided with credit, who sold the goods intending to defraud the innocent third party. The difficulty that confronted the Crown was proof of fraud because of course it was necessary to demonstrate that at the relevant time (the relevant time being at the commission of the act which constitutes the act of fraud), there was an intent, and in many cases the person acting in such a way would claim (and who was to disprove him) that really he meant to keep up the obligations that he had under the consumer lease or other document.

What is now proposed is that there be a reversal of the onus of proof. It is not a matter which I lightly support. In criminal matters and, in particular, serious criminal matters there should never lightly be removed from the citizen protection of forcing the Crown to prove every element of its case beyond reasonable doubt. Under the scheme now proposed to the House the person who might find himself in that situation would, by proving things on the balance of probabilities, demonstrate that he did act in good faith, and be acquitted. Such things could not be proved beyond reasonable doubt. Because of that situation, the Opposition finds on balance that the measure can be supported.

I think we have to carefully monitor the way in which this revised provision operates and to make sure that there are not other hidden difficulties created, because we all

know that throughout the field of consumer and commercial law many difficulties are hidden at the time that one agrees with what might obviously be, and in this case is, a well-intentioned proposition. With those reservations, I support the measure.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): The member for Playford has indicated that the Opposition supports this Bill, and we do say that with some qualification. We have some reservations about the matter, and have some concern, as has generally been expressed by the member for Playford. In particular, I have some reservations about this matter, since it may be that, by removing the requirement of *mens rea*, we will place some people in a position where, on being charged with what is in effect a criminal charge, they will be in some difficulty in defending themselves, notwithstanding the fact that a defence has been provided in this Bill. That defence is for the accused to prove that he did not know and could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have ascertained that the goods in question were subject to a consumer mortgage or a consumer lease.

That will place him in a position in which in a criminal case he bears the onus of responsibility to prove his innocence, and that is a dangerous principle to introduce into the criminal law. I am not suggesting that this is the first time it has happened; I am talking more of generalities. Nonetheless, it is a principle which one should introduce into the criminal law only with the greatest of reluctance. I think on balance that in this instance the circumstances justify the introduction of what is, in effect, a reversal of the onus of proof, but nevertheless I have some reservations.

The other comment I would like to make about the Bill at large is that it is noteworthy that this Bill does not in fact provide what might be described as greater consumer protection. It is significant that the first Bill from the Minister of Consumer Affairs does not in fact seek to provide greater protection for consumers. I am a little at a loss to know why this Bill has come up at this time. I can only assume that the Hon. J. C. Burdett, the Minister, has had a particular experience with the old section 35, and that this has caused him to have a bee in his bonnet. As a result, he has decided to press this matter with great urgency. I would not have thought it was a matter which could not wait until the business session which we are promised will eventuate early next year. However, he has chosen to introduce it at this time and I do not want to delay the House any longer than is necessary.

I would simply like to conclude by saying that I do hope that in future we will see from the Minister of Consumer Affairs indications of a more aggressive approach in protecting consumers than is indicated by this measure, which does not further the interests of consumers to any extent, and as such can hardly be claimed by the Government to be a consumer protection measure.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I am pleased that the Opposition supports this Bill. In fact, as I understand it, there has been a bi-partisan approach and, had the former Government continued in office, a Bill along similar lines would have been introduced. In response to the remarks of the member for Elizabeth about consumer protection, I think it important to note that the provision is ensuring that the criminal law is effective in preventing deliberate attempts to defraud; that is the purpose of this amending Bill. I believe it will go a considerable way towards achieving that aim, an aim that is supported by both the Government and the Opposition. The sooner it is put into effect the better.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Fraudulent sale or disposal of goods subject to mortgage or lease."

Mr. DUNCAN: Whilst the point of the Minister of Health was correct, that the previous Government did intend to introduce a measure of this type (it might well have been that our provision would have been the same), I make the point that we would have introduced such a provision as part of a more wide-ranging revision of the Consumer Transactions Act and the Consumer Credit Act, both of which Acts we believed were in need of revision at this time. I am still mystified why this provision was introduced in a Bill on its own, rather than along with the various other provisions which it was intended to introduce in a consolidating Bill.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: At the risk of sounding repetitious, I think that the answer to that is that we need to ensure that the criminal law is effective and, once that decision has been taken, it is obviously in the interests of everyone if the Legislature acts promptly to enable that to take place.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS (COASTAL WATERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 November. Page 884.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Again, the Opposition supports this measure. However, if the last measure was relatively simple, it would be difficult to imagine one more complex than this. As explained in the second reading speech, the Bill stems originally from a decision of the High Court in which all the States of the Commonwealth challenged an Act of the Federal Parliament known as the Commonwealth Seas and Submerged Lands Act. That Act received the Royal assent on 4 December 1973 and all the States commenced actions against the Commonwealth seeking declarations in effect that the Act was wholly or partially invalid, and eventually it was referred for argument before the Full Court. The decision of the Full Bench of the High Court was handed down on 17 December 1975, and, if I might say so, with respect, not unpredictably was in favour of the Commonwealth.

In the course of that case there were some remarkable events. I think it could be said that that was the most important case decided by the High Court since the Engineers' case 55 years before. Certainly there was no more momentous case in the area of Commonwealth-State relationships than that. In the course of the hearing all the States relied, at least to a large degree, on an opinion which had been obtained by the State of South Australia on behalf of all the other States from the late Professor D. P. O'Connell. Professor O'Connell, who recently died tragically at the early age of 54, was at that time Challis Professor of International Law at Cambridge University and, prior to that, had been Professor of International Law at Adelaide University. He prepared a mammoth 500-page opinion for the State of South Australia on behalf of the rest of the States of the Commonwealth in which he had no doubt that, at the time of federation, the right to the territorial sea to the then traditional three-mile limit was unquestionably vested in the then colonies.

The High Court, however, at the time of its deliberations, had decisions of the United States Supreme

Court and the Supreme Court of Canada which had canvassed the very same issues and which had come down in favour of the national Government. In the course of a long and erudite debate, which was reflected in the judgments of the majority of the High Court, there is an astonishing amount of knowledge of constitutional law, legal history, national history, and other fields set forth. The view taken by the majority of the High Court substantially was, in relation to the vesting of the territorial waters, that, since colonial Governments were, under the respective Westminster Acts in their very nature incapable of international relations except with the mother country of the colonies, it was simply not right to affirm that there was a capability of those colonies, as distinct from the motherland, holding territorial rights over the waters, submerged lands, and so on.

The High Court dealt with this problem not only from the technical legal point of view but, for one of the first times, got into the complex and difficult area of policy. There was little doubt from many comments made in the long and extremely complex judgments that that policy was, indeed, being considered as distinct from matters of law. While I have no doubt that this has often been the case in the past with decisions of the High Court and, no doubt, other courts of this nation, to my knowledge it was the first time that it was spelled out quite so clearly. There were three policy approaches in support of Commonwealth ownership theory, and these were variously adduced by members of the bench. First, was the notion of international responsibility, the argument briefly being that the obligations imposed on nation States by the conventions are obligations which only the nation State could and should shoulder and perform.

Reference was made to the obligation to afford innocent passage in the territorial sea and the obligation, not unjustifiably, to interfere with navigation, fishing, and the conservation of living resources. Secondly, what might be termed the security theory was put forward. Briefly stated, it goes along the line that it is the nation and not the parts of the Federation which must have the power to protect and control, as a national function, the area of the marginal seas, the sea bed, the air space, the continental shelf, and incline. Various comments were made on this. Next, reference was made to the possibility of diverse and discordant rules in the area of the territorial sea, when a uniform (Commonwealth) regime was desirable.

Of those three policy approaches, it is my view, with respect to the High Court, that only the first, that is, the notion of the responsibility of the nation State, can be seriously held forward as having a strong basis in reality. I accept the first part. The part I criticise relates to the consequences of defence, protection of revenue, and so on, which I say is of little consequence. In particular, I criticise the third theory adverted to, namely, the possibility of diverse and discordant rules in the area of the territorial sea, as against the notion of a uniform Commonwealth regime. Apart from the question of uniform and understandable procedures and law and order, the main interests the States have in these areas are economic. It was because of those economic interests that all States followed South Australia's lead and took action.

However, in the course of the case, larger matters were referred to. Not only was the situation of the territorial sea referred to, but the effect of the decision was also to deal with gulf waters and, indeed, even inland waters. That posed to the States difficult problems indeed. In legal and constitutional terms, the High Court again held that, if some of the powers it had claimed were vested in the Commonwealth were not to be found in the traditional heads of power on which the Commonwealth was relying,

they could be found in the external affairs power.

The external affairs power at that time had been seen very much as a foreign affairs power—in the terms of strict diplomatic relations with other nations. The High Court gave the external affairs power such a broad connotation that it now appears obvious that, in the view of the High Court, if the Commonwealth Government enters into a valid convention on any number of matters (not just this kind of matter where, depending on the view you have, it might be rightly said that the Commonwealth, as a nation, has the right to interfere), it could be said that that convention, by dint of the external affairs power, comes into effect as a law of the Commonwealth. If that is the case, then, by interaction of section 109 of the Constitution, which, simply put, states that, if a law of a State conflicts with a law of the Commonwealth, then, to the extent of the conflict, the law of the Commonwealth shall prevail, these conventions shall prevail.

To give an example, the High Court, putting it bluntly, was saying that, if the Commonwealth entered into a convention with some other authority, such as the United Nations or another country, that would have an effect internally in relation to State-controlled areas, that would override State laws. That has very wide connotations indeed. As a result, the State that has at that time, ironically, been enthusiastically taking part in the Constitutional Convention (which had been proposed originally by Mr. Jack Galbally, of the Victorian Parliament, and supported by the Whitlam Government) took the opportunity of the Constitutional Convention to point out vigorously to the Commonwealth that, what the High Court had done, was create an intolerable situation that even the Commonwealth did not want.

To the Commonwealth, the Act was very much of a declaratory nature; it was the sort of statement which said, "The sea is ours, and those things we claim are ours, but we do not particularly intend to do anything about their regulation." What the States pointed out was that, if what the High Court said was correct (and the States being in no position, because the matter was under the Constitution, to take the matter any further on appeal), a huge number of proper State regulatory powers and laws were null and void. So, you had a lawless three-mile area, a lawless inland sea, lawless inland waters and, what was even worse, a vague grey area at the edge of all this, where it was quite indeterminate whether a State, Commonwealth or any law at all applied.

Furthermore, the way in which the High Court put its notion was that, in all doubtful matters, there would be a case-by-case resolution of the difficulties. That being so, one could imagine a veritable plethora of litigation going on for decades to sort the whole thing out. The end result, I am pleased to say, through negotiations between the States and the Commonwealth since 1977, is that it has been possible to put together the complementary legislation which the Minister introduced in the House the other day, thus enabling the solution of a number of these problems. I could take up a great deal more of the time of the House, because this topic has intrigued me, as a member of the Constitutional Convention, and there is an enormous amount of legal and constitutional theoretical comment on this matter, but I do not intend to do that.

I merely indicate that the Opposition has carefully considered the proposal, notes that it is extremely complex, has checked and rechecked the history of the case law that led up to this and Dr. O'Connell's opinion, which is available, and notes that the proposal put forward seems to provide a realistic basis on which to deal with most of the problems that the State has brought forward. Furthermore, it is put forward in such a way that probably

challenge against it will not succeed. It is interesting to note that the draftsman has taken into account, obviously, many of the comments made by the diverse members of the High Court in their judgment. Another problem is that, while it is true that there was a large majority, the way in which that majority expressed its views was by no means at one; people reached the same results by vastly different routes, philosophies and legal notions. As far as I can see, most of the problems have been ironed out. On that basis, I support the Bill.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support the second reading. The complexities of this matter were first drawn to my attention by a previous Premier, Mr. Dunstan, when he showed me the opinion that the State had received from Professor O'Connell, including a map which had been drawn up and which demonstrated the various sorts of definition that might be given to the internal waters of South Australia. This matter is so important for this State because of the indented nature of our coastline and because so much of the territorial waters can also be regarded as internal waters. One thinks of the two gulfs and of the broad embayments around the Bight. Professor O'Connell was able to show in his opinion that various interpretations could be given as to the boundary of internal waters in this State.

In any event, the broad outline of the history is reasonably well known to the House. The States, following the passing of legislation in the Commonwealth Parliament, which was subject to one major amendment in the Senate in relation to mining tenements (the Senate knocked out a further piece of legislation in relation to mining royalties), sought an appeal to the Privy Council, which was refused. In turn, there was an appeal to the High Court. The High Court decision was handed down in December 1975 by a five to two majority. It is interesting to examine a few of the words of the Chief Justice at that time. He stated, in part:

I have concluded that in 1900 none of the colonies had proprietary rights in the territorial sea, its subjacent soil or superjacent airspace or in the continental shelf and incline; and that none of them had legislative power over any of those items.

Later in the judgment he went on to say that, even if it could be demonstrated that the legislative power existed, the power with relation to external affairs, which has been conferred on the Commonwealth by the Commonwealth Constitution, would have been sufficient to transfer that legislative authority. He stated further (page 373 of the Commonwealth Law Report, volume 135):

... power with respect to external affairs was assigned to the Commonwealth. That power at the very least included all matters of international concern. As I have already said, "once low-water mark is passed the international domain is reached" . . . A consequence of creation of the Commonwealth under the Constitution and the grant of the power with respect to external affairs was, in my opinion, to vest in the Commonwealth any proprietary rights and legislative power which the colonies might have had in or in relation to the territorial sea, seabed and air-space and continental shelf and incline. Proprietary rights and legislative powers in these matters of international concern would then coalesce and unite in the nation. That, in my opinion, was the intentment of the Constitution.

Barwick C. J. went on to dismiss all actions. That was the position at that time. As the member for Playford has said, that left the possibility of all sorts of litigation occurring.

It is interesting to note that the *Australian* suggested that the States, in putting pressure in 1977 on the Fraser Government to enter into some legislative scheme to allow

for a return of the powers, were, in fact, suggesting that we should step backwards. I refer to an editorial of Tuesday 1 February which, under the heading "Offshore rights a step backwards", detailed the reasons why the legislation that had been upheld by the High Court should not be further tampered with, and concluded:

But to attempt to win back any measure of control or the right of independent activity in the name of the States in the offshore area is simply not on in 1977. This battle has already been won for modern, national-looking, centrally co-ordinated planning.

There is some element of that feeling still around, as I will detail shortly. However, before doing so, I indicate that one High Court decision suggested that, despite what had been legislated for and despite the earlier High Court decision, the States still held some legislative rights. An article in the *Advertiser* of 20 January 1976 (page 7) stated:

The South Australian Government might have lost its legal power to control fishermen, skiers or surfers along the South Australian coast.

The article detailed that there had been a court case in Western Australia in which a magistrate ruled that Western Australia had no jurisdiction over a fisherman who had caught and processed undersized crayfish. The magistrate had upheld a submission that the State Fisheries Act was limited geographically to the low water mark except in ports, harbors and other specified places. The magistrate based his ruling on Commonwealth sovereignty over the territorial sea which was upheld by the High Court in the decision to which I have referred and which was a month before the Western Australia case came on. The article continued:

If the Western Australian ruling applied equally in South Australian waters, the Government might lose control over such things as speeding power boats, fishermen with undersized catches and surfers who used their boards within areas restricted to swimmers.

That case went on appeal and it was stated in the *Advertiser* on 15 May that year that the Full High Court ruled unanimously that State Governments have power to make laws governing the sea adjacent to their shores. The report stated that the six judges had been asked to review a case in which a Western Australian magistrate dismissed charges against a Fremantle fisherman, and it detailed matters to which I have referred. It then stated:

... the Western Australian Fisheries Act did not apply. He said this was because the Commonwealth Seas and Submerged Lands Act... In their reserved judgment handed down yesterday, the High Court judges said a section of the Seas and Submerged Lands Act expressly preserved the operation of State laws which were not in conflict with Commonwealth sovereignty.

At that point, there seemed to be some feeling that perhaps the legislation would remain untouched. However, in 1977, the States and the Commonwealth agreed to introduce a legislative scheme on this matter, and a portion of that is before us now. I assume that this is not the last that this place will see of the matter.

When we turn to the statement made by the Commonwealth, we see that the legislative scheme, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, is bound up with the matter of the extension of the territorial waters to 200 nautical miles in relation to fishing rights. This matter was agreed upon by the South Pacific nations at a conference held in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, a couple of years ago. It is one which has created some problems for the Commonwealth, because there has been a good deal of speculation on whether the Royal Australian Navy has the capacity to patrol the enormously expanded area of waters which would fall within the Commonwealth's control. Be

that as it may, the Commonwealth has proceeded with its intention in this matter, and, as I understand it, the legislation to be introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament once all States have passed legislation similar to that which we have before us will effectively proclaim the 200 nautical mile zone.

It is interesting, when we read the statement on this matter, that it not only says that the Federal Government has agreed to give the States control of the seabed from the low-water mark to three nautical miles out, but goes on to say that it will also set up a joint Federal-State authority to control the remaining 197 nautical miles when the 200-mile economic zone is proclaimed. The report states that the legislation for the 200-mile zone was before the Senate and was expected to be passed into law early in the Budget session, which began in August.

The question arises whether we, as a Parliament, will be asked eventually to pass complementary legislation in relation to the joint Federal-State authority. It seems clear that some such authority will be required in order to ensure the proper development, as well as the preservation, of the reserves within the area, so any indication that the Government can give the House as to discussions it has entered into with the Commonwealth on that matter would be most useful.

The Government of which I was a part was party to the agreement which was negotiated with the Commonwealth at the Premiers' Conference in 1977. At that time, we committed ourselves to the scheme which is before us. Consequently, I support the legislation.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 November. Page 882).

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was quoting from a paper on petrol sniffing at the Yalata Aboriginal Reserve, and I quoted that part recommending certain activities designed to develop a healthful lifestyle. It was felt that increased pride, independence, and responsibility would follow the development of such programmes. I turn now to the remainder of the paper, as follows:

Some resources could profitably be allocated to the preparation of educational media such as pamphlets, films, and audio-visual teaching aids. Teachers at Yalata have prepared an experiential reader in conjunction with the community nurse and Aboriginal health workers on the ills of petrol sniffing. No recognisable reduction in the incidence of sniffing occurred as a result of this book. This approach should be considered only as a small supplement to an overall programme.

Scare tactics have very narrow applicability in discouraging petrol inhalation. Deaths seem to have only a transitory effect on the sniffing habits of peers (as shown at Amata, where two children have died). Sniffing persists at Yalata, where it is common knowledge that the practice is ruining the psychological and physical health of at least 10 children. In Canada, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police sometimes apprehend a child who is "sniffed up". Their authority for this action rests in a section of the Act which makes it an offence for a juvenile to engage in an activity which can cause himself bodily harm. The writer believes this approach, if tried here, would only provide another game for the juveniles, that of "avoiding the candy car" (the Eyre Highway Range-Rover patrol with stripes along its side).

It is hoped that this paper will stimulate discussion and practical planning, and that solutions will be found more rapidly as a result. If a solution is not found there will be deaths, more criminal acts by juveniles, increasing frustration amongst the parents, less learning taking place at the school, decreasing respect for tribal ways by the children, and the various bodily damage caused by tetraethyl lead poisoning.

This is a serious matter, and I can appreciate the concern expressed by the teaching staff at the reserve. Judge Newman, the Chief Judge of the Juvenile Court, is also aware of the problem; he was so concerned that, when I visited the area, he sent with me a special magistrate to gather as much information as possible. It is clear that we all have a responsibility to assist in overcoming this problem, and I hope that the new Minister of Education will be able shortly to visit the Yalata community. Whilst he is there, he might hear the community's attitude to land rights—and that would be a good thing, too.

I turn now to the matter of unemployment and family life, and I refer to the study of a sample of emergency assistance clients conducted for the social planning and research branch of the Department for Community Welfare. Two research officers were employed by the department on a contractual basis for a three-month period to undertake a research investigation into the effects of unemployment on families.

The report on this study was released in February of this year. I want to deal briefly with three aspects of the report: a summary of the report, a summary of its findings, and its eight recommendations. Under the heading "Summary of the Report", it states:

The number of unemployed people in Australia is increasing and, despite predictions to the contrary, there appear to be few indications that it will diminish quickly over the next few years. South Australia has one of the highest levels of unemployment of the Australian States, and the percentage of families in this number is increasing markedly.

At the end of December 1978, a total of 46 900 people were unemployed in South Australia, 7.6 per cent of the workforce. The rate for the total Australian workforce was 6.7 per cent. Considering that the average size of the family in Australia is about four people, the total number of people directly affected by unemployment is far greater than the statistics suggest.

To be unemployed is to be subject to a dramatic drop in income, but the trauma goes much further. Unemployment, both directly and indirectly, places stress and strain on all aspects of a family's functioning. Unemployment also influences an individual's or family's position in the community. The "dole bludger" image, which is so readily promoted within certain sections of the community, suggests that the unemployed do not really want to work. Other inferences are that the individual is responsible for his or her own unemployment.

Unemployment is a community responsibility, and the responsibility of Government as the politically organised community. This study has attempted to identify the social and financial consequences of unemployment for the family. The purpose of the study is to investigate the problems being experienced by unemployed families who have approached the Department for Community Welfare for financial or other assistance.

The study was conducted using a combination of questionnaires, case studies and group interviews. As a result of the study, recommendations are presented which, if implemented, will relieve some of the critical effects of unemployment on family life.

Under the heading "Summary of Findings", the report states:

Patterns of employment: Two basic changes to unemploy-

ment in South Australia are evident. Not only are the number of people unemployed increasing, but the length of time that people are unemployed is increasing.

A total of 32 880 people were receiving unemployment benefits in South Australia at the end of August 1978. This represents an increase of 10 350 from the previous year. Twenty three point five per cent of this total were receiving the married rate, approximately 7 730 families, which increased from 19.4 per cent the previous year. Of those receiving the married rate 40 per cent (approximately 3 060 families) had been receiving the benefits for six months or more at the end of August 1978.

Almost half the families were experiencing unemployment for the first time. The large majority of people surveyed were involuntarily unemployed.

Patterns of income: The impact of a greatly reduced income brought about by unemployment was, for most families, a crippling blow to their financial wellbeing. A critical factor that caused financial hardship for families was the cost of housing. Financial commitments established prior to becoming unemployed was another major cause of financial hardship.

Patterns of family stress and the consequences: Financial hardship imposed stress upon families and is reflected in marital tension, family disruption and unnecessary conflict between family members. The reduced purchasing power faced by many families meant that important expenditures were deferred. The deferred purchase of items frequently related to children. Other difficulties associated with the greatly reduced income of unemployed families included threatened and actual eviction, disconnection of essential services and utilities, and repossession of goods.

Many respondents reported decreased activity, social withdrawal, feelings of despondency and lack of self worth, and decreased ability to pursue recreation and community activities. These tended to compound marital and family problems. Family members frequently reported that their health had deteriorated as a result of the financial and emotional stress caused by unemployment.

I turn now to the eight recommendations of the report, the first of which states:

That monetary and fiscal policies that lead to the creation of jobs be pursued, or that specific employment creation programmes be developed and implemented.

Some of the reasons given for supporting that recommendation are as follows:

The vast majority of people who took part in this study were involuntarily unemployed. For these people, support services and assistance can only help make a difficult and traumatic situation less intolerable. Such services cannot answer the basic need for stable and productive employment.

If unemployment becomes a permanent aspect of the Australian economy, the alternative lifestyle movement may gather momentum with increasing numbers of people opting out of the system and developing a way of life that may not involve regular employment. This may be a satisfactory solution for some young people in the future; however, for families with a presently unemployed breadwinner, it is unacceptable. For these families, the only acceptable solution is finding a job.

If the Commonwealth Government considers that it is not possible to stimulate the economy to create employment, or to develop specific employment creation programmes, it becomes imperative that it funds an adequate range of support and assistance programmes to minimise the trauma of people who are unemployed because of economic conditions.

The second recommendation states:

That the allowance made for the children of unemployment benefit recipients be increased from \$7.50 to \$10 to

bring them into line with the cost of living increases over the last three to four years, and that they be indexed at the same time as the basic benefit rate.

The third recommendation states:

That, in job retraining programmes, places be made available specifically for people who have been unemployed for long periods of time, particularly for those people with families.

The following reasons were given in support of that recommendation:

In August, 1978, 23.5 per cent (i.e. approximately 7 650 families) of unemployment benefit recipients were receiving the married rate benefit. This represents an increase from 19.4 per cent in the previous year. In 1978, 40 per cent of those receiving unemployment benefits at the married rate had been unemployed for six months or more (i.e. approximately 3 060 families).

The inference that can be drawn from these figures is that unemployment is having an increasing impact on families and that the impact is long term. It is of concern that the children in these families are growing up without a model of a working parent in the family. Professor Sarri has emphasised that his experience in the U.S.A. is having profound consequences with children who have never known a working parent and who now find it difficult to adopt a lifestyle which involved working for a living. (Paper presented at SACOSS annual general meeting 1977).

It is important that such a cycle of unemployment does not develop in Australia, and consequently, special attention should be given to those families where the breadwinner has been unemployed for long periods of time. The retraining of people in this category, therefore, should be accorded priority so that they may obtain the employment that has eluded them.

The fourth recommendation states:

That the Welfare Rights Officer Programme funded by the Department of Social Security be extended to South Australia for the employment of two welfare rights officers by organisations working with unemployed persons or by self help groups of unemployed persons.

The following reasons were given in support of that recommendation:

During the course of this study it was noted that many people experienced unnecessary hardship because they lacked information about available services and did not know their rights under existing programmes and legislation. People's ignorance of their rights was particularly evident in relation to housing issues and the threat of eviction. The provision of welfare rights officers to work directly with unemployed groups of people would enable the establishment of a body of information about available services and how people can exercise their rights. No such body of information currently exists in any one place. Welfare rights officers would therefore help people to go directly to the services they need without spending considerable amounts of time finding their way through the service system. This would also save many agencies a considerable amount of time in answering misdirected inquiries.

The fifth recommendation states:

That the Commonwealth Government provide the State Government with funds for programmes to support and assist families experiencing the effects of unemployment, particularly long-term unemployment.

The following reasons were given in support of that recommendation:

The continuing high level of unemployment is placing significant strains on the resources and services of both the State Government and voluntary agencies. This is most evident in the area of emergency financial assistance. The Department for Community Welfare, for example, has found

it necessary in some district offices to ration the amount of financial assistance that can be paid out during each week because of the high demand for assistance.

Other services such as the Budget Advice Service are receiving an increasing number of clients who are in financial difficulty as a result of unemployment. The stresses and strains on family relationships which primarily arise because of the financial hardship of unemployment are placing growing demands on counselling services.

Apart from the need for funds to supplement existing services, additional specific programmes for unemployed people are needed. At least two additional programmes are necessary.

The first for the establishment of self-help and activity groups to involve individuals and families to prevent their social isolation and withdrawal. The second for educational programmes to show families how they can manage on a reduced income.

The sixth recommendation states:

That the Commonwealth Government extend the concessions available to other benefit and pension recipients to the long-term recipients of unemployment benefits.

The seventh recommendation states:

That the possibility of a housing subsidy for families where the breadwinner is unemployed be investigated.

The following reasons were given in support of that recommendation:

This study has found that one of the greatest causes of financial difficulty confronting unemployed people is the cost of housing. Families in the process of purchasing their own home or renting a private sector house are at financial risk if they become unemployed. Families renting through the public housing sector seem to receive more sympathetic consideration in the form of reduced rents. It would be inappropriate to suggest that the public sector should provide housing for all unemployed people.

A means-tested housing subsidy, available to families where the breadwinner has been unemployed for three months or more and where the families are paying off their own home or privately renting a home, would go a long way to reducing the trauma that unemployment has for many families.

The eighth and final recommendation states:

That the staff of the Department of Social Security and the Commonwealth Employment Service change their practices which inhibit unemployed people. Encouragement should be given to unemployed people to become involved in community and recreational activities.

The following reasons were given in support of that recommendation:

During this study, it was found that many people, particularly those who had been unemployed for a long time and for whom employment prospects were bleak, were spending much of their time at home watching television. Individuals seemed to become socially isolated and withdrawn. The continuing presence of the breadwinner in the home contributed to his/her lack of self-confidence. This, associated with the social isolation, tended to exacerbate family tensions that had arisen as a result of unemployment.

Many respondents reported that they believed that if they were involved in community and recreational activities, then they could lose their unemployment benefit because they were not at home or out looking for a job. If the responsible authorities informed people, especially those people whose job prospects were poor, that their benefit would not be affected if they participated in community activities, some of the social isolation experienced by unemployed people could be reduced.

Some of the detailed test cases throughout this report make very interesting reading. They show quite clearly the

very real problems that exist for a family when any member of that particular family becomes unemployed. I would recommend that all members take their time to read this full report.

I would like to conclude my remarks on the matter of the adjournment of the House as reported in the press. This move comes after only 14 sitting days and, if we take the opening day when very little business was discussed, we have only really had 13 days in which to carry out the business of this session. That business is probably some of the most important business to come before State Parliament. I refer to the Budget, on which the Government saw fit to introduce the guillotine, thus depriving many members of the opportunity of raising questions of major importance. Now, we find that the debate on the Address in Reply is also to be adjourned until next year. I think this is an insult to the Governor of South Australia and also an insult to the community. It is unprecedented. The Opposition, when in Government, never to my knowledge ever adjourned the Address in Reply debate. It should be finalised now before any adjournment is considered by this House. The Government seems to be frightened to face up to the Opposition. What is the matter? Is the Government scared of the questioning by the Opposition members? Is there too much pressure being applied, or are the questions too hot or too complicated for Ministers? There is no doubt that the Government has been forced to change its intention.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ABBOTT: There is no doubt in my mind that the Government has been forced to change its intention on the Public Service transfers. An issue, which is more serious than the matter of transfers and which is likely to raise its head in the very near future, has been drawn to my attention; that is, that certain departmental heads are asking their staff in a very nice and very roundabout kind of way as to how they voted at the last State election. I have been made aware that this has happened or is happening in at least two Government departments.

Mr. Randall: Which departments?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not prepared to name the departments at this stage. I am waiting for additional information. The honourable member will hear as soon as information is provided to me.

This is probably the worst form of intimidation possible. The staff are so scared of losing their jobs that they naturally say that they voted for the Liberal Party. The persons involved are most reluctant to give their names. However, I am hopeful of obtaining further information on this matter, and, when I do, I can assure the Government that all hell will break loose if this is going on as a result of a change in Government.

One would have thought that with the Government so fresh and with very little legislation passed to date it could sit at least until the Address in Reply debate was completed. The Opposition has co-operated with the Government in every way possible, and at least the Government could have agreed to sit for the remainder of this week to give all members the opportunity of speaking in the Address in Reply debate. It is a sorry day for the community to see a Government that will not front up to normal questioning. It is avoiding Question Time and we are going backwards, back to the Playford days with a Government too nervous to want to sit for a reasonable time. Perhaps the worst aspect of this move is that it prevents private members' time and private members' Bills. Members on both sides of the House will be unable to raise matters of great importance, some matters

affecting their own districts and of vital importance to their constituents, whom they are elected to represent. I support the motion.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I support the motion. I add my congratulations, Mr. Speaker, to those you have already received from members on your election to the high office of Speaker in this House. Like all members who voted for you, and without wishing to detract from the ability of the defeated candidate, I am sure because of your long experience in this place and because of your well known sense of integrity and fair play you were the best man for the job. I am sure you will honour the undertakings given in your initial address to this House.

I would also like to place on record my appreciation for the service given to the Parliament and to the electors of the District of Florey by my predecessor Mr. C. J. Wells. Mr. Wells was the first member for Florey, following its creation in the 1969 redistribution, and he retained it successfully until his retirement this year. Besides representing his constituents very ably during his term of office, the former member also served on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation from 1970 to 1976 and as the Chairman of that committee from 1975 to 1976. Mr. Wells was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee from 1976 to 1979, and he carried out his duties on behalf of the people of South Australia without fear or favour and without a big white Ford LTD. The former member was most assiduous in the prosecution of his duties despite a severe physical handicap caused by failing health towards the latter stages of his career. I am sure that all members will join me in wishing the former member for Florey a long and happy retirement.

For my part, I look forward to serving the people of the District of Florey in particular and the people of South Australia in general for many years to come. When one changes from one position to another it is often the case that before one can settle into the new position there are matters relating to the previous job which need to be tidied up, and such is the case with me.

As a former officer of the Australian Labor Party (South Australian Branch), I feel a responsibility to comment on at least some aspects of the recent election campaign. I do not propose to go into the role of the Murdoch press in the campaign, as this has been well canvassed already by other members. Although members on the other side might reject the allegations of extreme political bias, respected journalists in Adelaide have quite clearly indicated that such was the case. Rather, Sir, do I wish to direct my attention to the misleading advertising campaign carried out by a group of Adelaide business leaders whose claim to be concerned only with business and not politics is quite clearly not true. It is a well-known political fact that in democratic systems so-called lobby groups representing various business interests pay a lot of attention to what goes on in the political arena. It is also a basic historical fact that the ruling classes use conservative Governments to maintain the *status quo* to the greatest extent possible so far as the distribution of wealth is concerned. Ideally, big business prefers to exercise its political power in the background, working through Parliamentary puppets to avoid being seen as overtly manipulating Governments. However, if its position of privilege is threatened, then such measures as are necessary to protect its interests will be invoked, regardless of laws or accepted conventions. The 1979 Canberra coup is a classic example of this.

In the election campaign just conducted it was somewhat unusual to see four prominent business leaders quite blatantly campaigning for the Liberal Party.

However, they were only doing in public what they had been doing for years under cover. I believe that businessmen not involved in politics should have their privacy respected by Parliamentarians. However, when businessmen such as these referred to so openly place themselves in the political arena, to my mind they are fair political game. There were reasons for this intrusion, and I will give them soon. However, I would like to say in reference to the gratuitous advice given by some of the members opposite as to why the A.L.P. lost the election, that in part what they said might have had some validity. However, they have omitted at least two very important factors. One was that the former Government and the A.L.P. failed to anticipate the virulence and the magnitude of the media campaign which would be launched against them and, secondly, the A.L.P. failed to appreciate the extent to which anti-working class elements have penetrated the trade union movement. Even so, despite the election result there is still a solid A.L.P. base in the electorate from which the Party will be able to mount a strong counter-attack in its campaign to regain Government. The truth of this is borne out in the latest *Bulletin* poll which shows that the A.L.P. is already back to the level of support it had before the election.

One of the reasons referred to previously for the open entry of business leaders into the campaign was, I believe, a fear at the beginning of the campaign by the Liberal Party that the Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party was a liability who would have to be kept out of sight if the Liberals were to have any chance of winning. This opinion was certainly given some validity by a story which was reported in the *National Times* of 8 September. The story goes that Mr. Rupert Murdoch rang the *News* and said that the Liberals had to get the front page on 23 August. *The News* rang the Liberal Leader's office to tell the Liberals of their good fortune and to ask for a story line. The Leader's office replied, "We haven't got one." To avoid upsetting the master, the ingenuity of the Murdoch machine went into operation. The headline screamed "Tonkin's secret plan." What happened next? I have it on good authority that the Liberal Leader's office rang the *News* and asked what was the secret plan it was talking about.

Whilst we are on that subject, the author of that brilliant piece of objective (in inverted commas) journalism was a one-time political reporter, now press secretary to the Premier. Could this appointment be in recognition of services rendered during the campaign? The word in journalistic circles is that the same press secretary is well in the running for the Murdoch medal for journalistic integrity for his efforts during the campaign. Of course, if the Prime Minister decides to hold an early election and requires a media campaign of lies, innuendo and smearing to justify it, the local contender might be eclipsed by one of his more innovative colleagues.

The SPEAKER: Order! I indicate that the use of the word "lies" in that instance is not directed at a particular member. It has been a word used in debates earlier in this session in a similar way, but I do indicate to honourable members that the very use of the word is likely to incite the flinging around of the word amongst members on a more regular basis, and that would be against Parliamentary debating procedures. I ask all honourable members to please consider the use of the word as unparliamentary on all occasions.

Mr. O'NEILL: I withdraw the word "lies" and say that, if the Prime Minister decides to hold an early election and requires a media campaign of untruths, innuendo and smearing to justify it, the local contender may be eclipsed by one of his more innovative colleagues.

Before referring in detail to our brave protectors of interests of big business in South Australia, let me refer briefly to the contents of the advertising campaign that they endorsed. A feature of the advertisements, commented on by numerous observers, was the way in which outdated, selective and, in some cases, quite erroneous figures were used to develop statistical justification for the case that these defenders of the faith (that is, maximisation of profit) were putting.

I assure you, Sir, that I do not presume to judge Messrs. Mill, Gregg, Black, and Rundle. They do not have to answer to me for their actions, principles or ethics, or lack of them. It may be that in their business activities they see nothing wrong with using incorrect figures and false statistical arguments to convince shareholders in the companies with which they are involved on the merits of a particular course of action. It is the prerogative of the shareholders either meekly to accept or to seek the assistance of the law if they have suspicions as to the legality or validity of the actions of the company directors concerned. However, I consider that the electors of South Australia should be accorded legal protection against that type of irresponsible misuse of facts and figures in election advertising material. It is high time that legislation was enacted to require truth in advertising by political Parties, preferably at all times but certainly during election campaigns.

I proceed now to deal with the interesting bevy of politically oriented business men referred to earlier, in ascending order of priority. Lowest on the list in terms of experience (and not, I hasten to add, character) is Mr. G. Mill, Executive Director of the Master Builders Association since 1979. Before that, he was Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Automotive Chamber of Commerce and, before that, Secretary of the South Australian Automotive Chamber of Commerce. I well remember Mr. Mill in the last role, soliciting support from the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party when some of his members were being mercilessly hounded by major oil companies in what was known as the discount war. He had no compunction then about enlisting the aid of those whom he would later vilify. However, Mr. Mill is now a responsible Director of the Master Builders Association, undoubtedly right up to the minute (at least one should be able to conclude so) on the state of the building industry in South Australia.

On the front page of the 4 September issue of the *News*, Mr. Mill is quoted as saying "Somebody has to tell the people of South Australia that jobs and employment are on the line," the implication being that under a Labor Government his industry was in trouble. However, on page 12 of the same edition of the *News*, tucked inconspicuously in a corner, under the heading "Building rates still soaring", was the following enlightening information:

Private building approvals in South Australia rose during July, the fourth month in a row.

The question I want answered is: was this responsible officer of the M.B.A. ignorant of the state of his industry, or was he deliberately misleading the people of South Australia?

Next, we have Mr. T. M. Gregg, Industrial Director of the South Australian Employers Federation. Before his elevation to this position, Mr. Gregg was the Industrial Officer of that organisation. Mr. Gregg's organisation is one of the less significant bodies on the Adelaide industrial scene, a sort of commerce and industry jackal snatching at the scraps left by the big boys. Mr. Gregg's most useful function as far as the trade union movement is concerned is that he serves as a constant reminder that the seeds of

McCarthyism are right here in our community, just waiting for the right climate to flourish. Mr. Gregg is reported in the *News* as saying, on behalf of his organisation, "We are not a political body." That is obviously not true, and there is ample evidence to show that he and his colleagues are very political. Mr. Gregg has distinguished himself on numerous occasions with his paranoid ramblings about trade unionists and their leaders. He even went to the trouble of circulating to his members a rather poorly produced circular the contents of which were considerably lacking in veracity. I do not intend to waste any more time on him.

I now come to Mr. G. Black, President of the Retail Traders Association, Chairman of Directors of Blacks Shoes, and, I believe, a councillor for Hindmarsh Ward in that non-political and most democratically-elected body, the Adelaide City Council. Mr. Black, if we can believe the *News*, was the founding father of this brave little band of champions of free enterprise. Mr. Black claimed in the *News* of 4 September, "No Government has bashed business as hard as this one." Strong words, but untrue. It was just a part of the plan to destabilise the electorate.

Rather than being apolitical, I think a cursory look at Mr. Black's activities and associations with the Liberal Party will show that he is very political. I do not propose to scrutinise the political side of Mr. Black on this occasion; that can be done at some other time. Today, I want to look at certain industrial aspects of Mr. Black's operations.

In the *News* of 3 September, Mr. Black drew attention to some of the (in his opinion) "unsavoury aspects of the Labor Government's industrial policies". I would like to report to the Parliament some facts which, I believe, draw attention to some (to borrow a phrase) "unsavoury aspects" of Mr. Black's policies, which give a clue to Mr. Black's vested interest in opposing the Labor Government.

I am advised that on 17 October a trade union officer visited Black's warehouse, at Brompton, on a routine visit. He found two storemen there, neither of whom was a member of a union. Inquiries revealed that one of these workers was being underpaid to the extent of \$27 a week by Mr. Black's company. From April to the then present, with adjustments for overtime, etc., the company owed the employee about \$700. This company was avoiding its legal responsibility to the extent of at least \$27 a week, or almost \$1 500 a year.

I do not know how many employees Mr. Black's company has, but, supposing there were 10 employees being underpaid to the same extent, that would mean \$15 000 a year could be misappropriated by Mr. Black's company in a 12-month period. No wonder Mr. Black is opposed to the Labor Government and the trade union movement.

The member for Playford drew attention to the intrusion of a Mr. Adrian Brien into the political arena, on 17 October last, and suggested a boycott on his business. Incidentally, Mr. Adrian Brien has been involved in politics before. The House may recall the article in the *National Times* on 2 December 1978 that names Mr. Adrian Brien as one of those involved in the "Steele Hall coup", which aimed at deposing the current Premier because "52 per cent of Liberal followers said they favoured Hall as the best chance to lead them to Government . . ."

I mention Mr. Brien only to make the point that I would not advocate people boycotting Black's shoe stores. However, I do say that anyone buying a pair of shoes or anything else from a Black's shoe store could possibly, in a roundabout way, be contributing to the electoral campaign of the Liberal Party. Those customers are also patronising

stores which, possibly, could be underpaying the people working there. Perhaps this champion of the South Australian community, Mr. Black, may not be the knight in shining armour he would have the people of South Australia believe he is.

Mr. Lewis: At least, he hasn't got two left feet.

Mr. O'NEILL: Like a Mallee hen. It has two left feet. Last, but certainly not least, in this interesting lineup of apolitical Samaritans, we have Mr. John Louis Rundle, Chairman of Chambers of Commerce extraordinaire. As one can see by consulting the pages of *Who's who in Australia* he has apparently made a profession of being a Chairman of Chambers of Commerce. In addition, Mr. Rundle was the endorsed L.C.L. candidate for the Federal seat of Adelaide in 1961. In 1966 he contested the preselection for the Federal seat of Sturt and was beaten by the present incumbent Mr. Ian Wilson and his electoral machine.

It would appear that Mr. Rundle was, and almost certainly still is, a very political person in his outlook. Mr. Rundle's business activities include being principal of J. C. Rundle and Co., leading hotel brokers and consultant; Chairman of Directors of the Pier Hotel, Port Lincoln; Governing Director of the Railway Hotel, Salisbury; Director of the Woodville Hotel Ltd; and director of 18 other companies. It would be interesting to ascertain from the Liquor Trades Union how many problems it has encountered in dealing with employee's rights at the above establishments. As with Blacks Shoe Stores, I would not advocate a boycott of Mr. Rundle's hotels. However, I would suggest to the patrons of those hotels that, if they are Liberal supporters, they can rest happy that quite possibly a percentage of the cost of every drink they buy in those hotels will go towards the election campaign of the Liberal Party. If the patrons do not support the Liberal Party, they should be aware that they are probably making a covert donation to the Liberal Party by way of the excess profits ripped off them.

This does not apply only to the A.L.P. supporters. Country Party supporters in Port Lincoln should be aware that, by drinking at the Pier Hotel, they could be contributing to Liberal Party funds to assist in campaigning against their lone representative in this place, the member for Flinders. What these concerned business men do politically is their own business, but they cannot have it both ways. If they are going to get engaged in Machiavellian intrigue against those forces in the State whose aim is the protection of the underprivileged in society and the promotion of a democratic way of life, they cannot expect to avoid the political spotlight. Nor should they be allowed to create the impression in the community that they speak for the whole of their membership, because they do not.

Following the launching of their "Stop the job rot" campaign, I had, at the A.L.P. office, numerous calls from people claiming to be members of one or other of the organisations concerned who wished to disassociate themselves from the campaign. I also received from trade unions advice that they had received similar reports. My rejoinder to both the individuals and the trade unions was that the complaint should be made public to draw attention to the fact that those four business men did not have the unanimous support of their organisation. The response to that suggestion in every case was that the individuals concerned were frightened to state their position publicly for fear of reprisals against them by the organisations concerned. So much for the rights of the individual.

Mr. Rundle quite clearly engaged in a type of fear mongering in the community, which he knew to be based

on false premises. In the *Advertiser* on 13 September last, at page 12, Mr. Rundle is reported as having said, "Socialism has scared off investment and expansion in this State." That was before the election. In the *Advertiser* on 28 September, at page 39 (well back), this same business leader, this man of integrity, is reported to have told a business conference in Adelaide, "Complacency, rather than the socialist left, was the greatest threat to the future of free enterprise in Australia." Having given the lie to his earlier statements, he is then reported to have gone on to insult the majority of people in Australia by implying that they are lazy, greedy, cheating thieves.

In a way I feel sorry for Mr. Rundle. His acquisitive nature and his desire to accumulate more and more money has given him a very jaundiced view of his country. The Mills, the Greggs, the Blacks and the Rundles of our community have a major responsibility to bear in the economic future of this State. If the Premier does not deliver on his promise to revitalise industry and commerce and provide at least 17 000 extra jobs in the next three years, those political entrepreneurs must accept their share of the blame.

The matters I have covered are, in my opinion, not just random events; they are a manifestation of a new political movement which is developing in Australia and which has started in the last five to 10 years. This movement is insidious in its effect, and it is undermining everything that is decent in our society. It is a coalition of the forces that control the media and finance. The latest manifestation of that is that after weeks of bucketing this State and saying what a terrible place it was, the media in South Australia, especially the electronic media, is now saying overnight that South Australia is a wonderful place in which to live.

The aim of this force is the replacement of the democratic system with what might be called Murdoch-racy. I suggest that it follows that the exponents of this system should be called Murdochrats. I sincerely hope that the people of Australia realise the extent to which their lives are being manipulated by the Murdochrats and will take such action as is necessary to control these unsavoury forces which, if not contained, will destroy all that is good in the Australian way of life.

I now raise a matter that I frankly thought would not attract so much attention, but it seems to be important to some members opposite. In *Hansard* on 23 October last (page 312) the member for Glenelg is reported as having said, in reference to me:

He was the only member opposite who refused the hands of members on this side of the House in friendship and congratulations.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is possible for a member to refer to any previous debate from *Hansard* in this session.

The SPEAKER: That is a matter on which I have already given a ruling on a previous occasion when the member for Fisher raised this question in respect to the member for Salisbury. On that occasion I indicated that I had noted the use of the reference to *Hansard*, but, as that member was a new member, I said I would quietly take up the matter with him. It is my intention to do the same in relation to the member for Florey. I take this opportunity, as many honourable members are present, to ensure that new members particularly recognise that direct reference to any debate in this session appearing in current *Hansard* may not be referred to in debate.

Mr. O'NEILL: I thank you, Sir, for your guidance and forbearance. I withdraw the reference. I have heard within the confines of this building that the matter caused some concern. Consequently, I feel that there is a need to set the record straight. The matter is certainly not as simple as

some people may believe it to be. What I have said to those three or four honourable members who have approached me is that, if they are prepared to disassociate themselves from the defamatory advertisements commissioned by the Liberal Party supporters during the campaign, I would be perfectly happy to shake their hands. It may be significant that not one was prepared to repudiate the advertisements in question. Consequently, I can only assume that they endorse the sentiments expressed in those advertisements.

This raises an interesting situation. An advertisement in the first edition of the *News* of 6 September referred to "A group of dangerous left-wing socialist union leaders." Subsequent advertisements clearly indicated that the "dangerous group" referred to included friends and colleagues of mine, as well as me. If members opposite believe these assertions, I am surprised that they should want to shake hands with me. If they do not believe these assertions, I wonder why they did not have the courage to say so. I make clear that I do not hate anyone on the other side of the House. I fail to understand their attitudes in regard to many matters; however, in fairness, I say that from their point of view the reverse could also apply.

I have not deliberately insulted any members opposite, nor do I intend to do so. I will observe the normal business courtesies in the execution of my duties as the member for Florey, but, if members opposite wish to participate in a defamation of my colleagues and me, I am afraid that I cannot be so hypocritical as to ignore that attitude, especially in view of the damage done to the careers of men who would have made fine representatives for their districts in this House. In my opinion, it is a great pity that Mr Don Ferguson, an A.L.P. activist in the Henley Beach area for 20 years, is not a representative of that area. He was the victim of a most despicable and carefully orchestrated defamation. Likewise, Mr. Apap was, to an even greater extent, defamed and slandered by local people apart from the general slander in the *News*. The people who opposed him used every filthy political trick in the book.

On the Thursday prior to the election, I received a phone call at my office from an old A.L.P. supporter, who asked:

What can we do? There are people going around Taperoo saying, "Don't vote for Apap. He's only a bloody wog."

This was one of the tactics which resulted in Mr. Apap's being defeated and another candidate's being elected for Semaphore. Legal advisers have informed me that the series of advertisements authorised by one N. Buick, of Kangaroo Island, were *in toto* a defamation of the members for Elizabeth and Albert Park and of Messrs. Ferguson, Apap and me. I was also advised that the series gave every evidence of having been put together under extremely good legal guidance so that, even though the total effect would be defamatory, it would be impossible to prove defamation under the existing law.

I am here because I won the election for the District of Florey, so I guess I could adopt the attitude that winners can laugh and the losers can please themselves. However, in my Party, there is a strong mutual respect for one's fellows and, even if one disagrees with other members' opinions, nevertheless one has respect for them and the service they have given to the community, the union movement, and the Party. Therefore, I must make the point that I despise the authors and the purveyors of the slanders and defamations committed during the campaign, and I am resolved to redress the matter wherever I can.

I want it clearly understood, Sir, that, in the execution of my duties, I do not propose to be rude to anyone in this House. However, in social matters I have no desire to

associate with anyone who endorses a slander or a defamation against my friends. Just to set the record straight, in view of some of the incorrect statements that have been made in the press, when some members opposite have approached me (and there were no more than four) I have not refused outright to shake their hand but have put the proposition to them that, if they would dissociate themselves from the defamatory advertisements, I would be happy to do so. None so far has been prepared to do so. Therefore, I think that, as a point of honour, if people endorse the slander, I have no desire to mix socially with them.

I wish to make quite clear, in view of the article in the *News* of 1 November 1979 by S. Middleton, that I am not the member who refused to shake the Premier's hand, because he has not offered it to me up to this time. I hope that my explanation has at least clarified the situation, and I look forward to a relaxation of the polarisation that has so often been referred to by members opposite since this Parliament began.

I must now answer some of the points that have been raised by some new members opposite during their speeches in this debate. It is indeed unfortunate that I must spend some of my time in this manner, as there are many matters of importance to my electors and to the State in general to which I wish to refer. However, to let some of the statements made by members opposite go unchallenged may be taken in some quarters as concurring in those views. The members for Henley Beach, Rocky River, Morphett and Newland all made some reference to the trade union movement, radical leaders, and a number of other matters relating to the industrial scene generally. One thing I have noticed about their speeches is the common thread which runs through them (one may say a common story line, and we all know which Story). Big daddy is out there in the Premier's office calling the shots for the young hustlers who do not know the ropes yet, and he is scratching his head and wondering what to do with some of the old ones who have never learnt.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Speaker—I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I did not see the change.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not casting any reflections on the Chair.

Mr. O'NEILL: I am not, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is good. I will allow the honourable member to continue.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Henley Beach gets up in this place (I am sorry that he is not here, but then he was sorry I was not here when he spoke) and bleats about having his union membership revoked by nasty trade union leaders, and he is supported in his grief by the member for Todd.

Either the honourable member was trying to mislead this House, or he does not know the rules of the union to which he belonged. His membership, along with that of all other members of the union, was subject to rules decided on, not by members of the Australian Labor Party, or any other political Party, but by members of the union. After the decision was reached, those rules were registered with the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. To qualify for membership, he must be working at a job involving electrical technology associated with the posts and telegraphs communications industry. He wanted to know whether I and other members on this side have retained our union membership. I can assure him, whilst I cannot speak for other members, that I have done so, because my union sees political activity on behalf of the working class

of Australia as a legitimate qualification for the retention of membership. The honourable member made much of the fact that he was jeered at and persecuted by his fellow members at union meetings, because he was a Liberal. It is nice to see him back.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber. The honourable member for Florey cannot be heard.

Mr. O'NEILL: The thought might not have occurred to the honourable member, but it could be that his fellow members disagreed with him because he was promoting ideas which they saw as being arrant nonsense from an industrial point of view. My inquiries have led me to believe that that was precisely the case. I am also informed that the rank-and-file members of his former union were not at all impressed with the way in which the honourable member, in collusion with the now Minister of Industrial Affairs, tried to assist a non-unionist to circumvent an Arbitration Commission decision that only union members were entitled to be on a nine-day fortnight, by purporting to be a conscientious objector. The Industrial Court subsequently found the claim to be spurious.

The honourable member also ran into trouble with some rank-and-file members when, after he supported a resolution that strike action be taken in the technology dispute of 1978, he subsequently reneged on the decision. It is not uncommon for people to try to blame their own shortcomings on others, but I wish the honourable member would research his claims more accurately.

Likewise, the inaccuracy of the statement of the member for Rocky River must be pointed out. He must not be allowed to rewrite history in such a cavalier manner as he attempted to do the other night. He said, in relation to the late Sir Robert Gordon Menzies, the creator of the Liberal Party in Australia (and I do not argue with that), that his Party was a Liberal Party, and not a conservative Party. One could be forgiven for thinking that a person who comes to this place with a reputation for brilliance in the fields of political administration and organisation, such as the honourable member has, a reputation for being the type to take over the Parliamentary Leadership of the Party, would know more about the history and the ideology of the Liberal Party than is apparent from that statement. Anyone who has done any research on the formation of the Liberal Party by Menzies knows that he was rejected as Leader by the old United Australia Party in 1941 because of his total inability to govern in a war-time crisis. However, Menzies took advice on how to make a political come-back. Although a rank conservative royalist of the old British Empire school, he was astute enough to see a way to hoodwink the Australian people. Even though he had been an admirer of the way in which Hitler reorganised Germany, he adopted the name "Liberal", as he knew that on the British political scene the Liberals were seen as being middle of the road.

Mr. Mathwin: Rubbish!

Mr. O'NEILL: The honourable member was not here, so he would not know. Menzies then set about creating an impression that he was a great cricketing enthusiast, although prior to the war he had not shown much interest in the game. Last, but not least, he most effectively implemented and exploited the campaign that is still used today by the Liberal Party, the red smear technique, in election campaigns. It may be of interest to the member for Rocky River to know that, during the 1974 election campaign, a prominent British radio commentator, Richard Butler, reporting on the Australian political scene, stated:

For the benefit of the British listening audience, I must

point out that the Australian Liberal Party stands well to the right of the British Conservative Party.

The main lesson—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation in this Chamber.

Mr. O'NEILL: The main lesson that present-day Liberals should learn from the Menzies era is that, when the trade union movement tried to make Menzies see the danger of exporting raw materials to the Japanese war machine, they were attacked by Menzies.

Government members might know that Sir Robert Menzies carried the name "Pig-iron Bob" to the grave with him, and probably in the future we will see "Uranium Mal" and "Yellow-cake Doug" carry their nicknames also.

The honourable member also had something to say about the trade union movement, and makes an extremely ill-informed observation about the shortage of tradesmen in industry. For many years this hoary old argument has been trotted out by the employers. The fact is that employers and conservative Governments in this country have created this situation. Except in some minor areas there is no shortage of metal tradesmen and other tradesmen. The fact is that the wages policies of the conservative Governments have reduced the income of tradesmen to such a level that many of them have left the industry for which they were trained to work in other areas requiring less skill and less physical discomfort but paying much better wages.

The honourable member borrowed a phrase from Lord Acton: "The ship exists for the sake of the passengers, not vice versa". I suggest the honourable member gives back that phrase, although it may be difficult because Lord Acton has been dead for a long time, but the phrase is not relevant, because the Australian ship has been taken over by pirates.

I could have much more to say about the honourable member's statement but time is getting on and, because of the way that these sittings have been reduced, I want to make one or two more statements and then make way for my colleagues. The member for Newland made it obvious that he is a mathematician of considerable ability, and I imagine that he will be able to make the transition from weapons research to electoral matters with ease. As the honourable member took only a cursory swipe at my colleagues in the trade union movement, I do not intend to take much time responding. I merely note with interest that the honourable member served notice on his Party colleagues that he is a loner, when he said, "My first and over-riding commitment, I believe, is to serve the electorate". He sees that commitment as transcending all Party barriers. I look forward to his support when my Party puts forward proposals for the good of his electorate with which his Party does not agree.

The member for Morphett sprayed all over the place like a garden sprinkler. However, I gather that he disagrees with the businessmen's champion, Mr. John Louis Rundle, who thinks that everyone in Australia is greedy and avaricious. The member for Morphett only thinks of nasty radical trade union leaders as being greedy and avaricious. The honourable member may not appreciate it, but he and his colleagues are continually insulting the intelligence of the ordinary (as they call them) trade unionists. Those trade unionists have a great respect for their leaders in the main, and they elect their leaders and can remove them if they are dissatisfied with the job they are doing. In all unions registered in the commissions, Federal and State, they do it by secret ballot.

The honourable member pleads on behalf of the South Australian business and industrial community that it should be allowed to operate in an atmosphere relatively free from Government interference and control, but he also advocates a centralised system of wage fixing. The honourable member wants a system that allows the owners of the means of production to do what they like, whilst the unions are constrained by Government laws and regulations.

Next, but by no means least, when it comes to speaking on the trade union movement, with an absolute authority born of abysmal ignorance, we have the member for Todd. I find his sanctimonious concern for the former member for Todd rather hard to take, given that he circulated a facsimile of a hand-written letter in the recent election campaign which, to put it as gently as possible, was misleading as to the political policies of my good friend the former member for Todd. The honourable member engaged in the time-honoured Liberal tradition of kicking the red can. He even tried to adduce the troubles of Indo-China as justification for the holy writ of free enterprise. In my opinion, the most audacious thing he did, this proponent of free enterprise, who sees socialism as anathema to democracy, was to say that his previous place of employment was a car-manufacturing company. Indeed, it was: Chrysler (Australia) Limited.

If one wanted to prove the effectiveness of the capitalist system, I would think that Chrysler would be the last firm one would want to mention to demonstrate the success of private enterprise. The *News*, on 2 November, reported that the Carter Administration in the United States had agreed to provide the Chrysler Corporation with \$US1 500 000 000 or \$A1 365 000 000 in loan guarantees to stave off bankruptcy. The President of the corporation, Mr. Iacocca (I hope I got his name right), who, incidentally, Chrysler pinched from Ford, said:

The company faces losses of \$U.S.3 000 million over the next two or three years, with or without Government assistance.

I cannot figure out that piece of gobbledegook, but who is kidding whom about all commercial and industrial wisdom resting with private enterprise? The fact is that if the little people were not exploited ruthlessly to foot the bill most large corporations would be in the same boat as Chrysler. Harking back to my earlier report on business lobbyists—

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: A house painter made a severe impact on the world this century, but I think that the member for Glenelg has left his run a bit late—he will never make it. Harking back to my comments about business lobbyists, we were further enlightened by a report in the *Advertiser* of 3 November 1979, as follows:

The offer was double the maximum amount the Treasury had said it would consider, double what Chrysler had asked for, and six times the record for such Federal aid to any private United States firm . . .

In announcing the offer, Treasury Secretary Mr. W. Miller denied the decision had been influenced by the intense political pressures mounted by Chrysler and its congressional allies.

I would not dispute Mr. Miller's word, but there is no doubt from the report that private enterprise in the democratic system has "congressional allies", and is prepared to use "intense political pressures". If the member for Todd wishes to delude himself about the efficiency of the private enterprise system, that is fair enough, but he should not be allowed to go about misleading the people as to the realities of the system.

The electorate I represent is one well known to me. I have lived in the City of Enfield for the past 20 years and

have seen many changes occur as the area has expanded. One sight that has given me much pleasure in latter years has been the way the residents of Clearview have transformed what were once within my memory, bare wheatfields into a veritable forest by the planting of tall trees; it is indeed a credit to them.

Many of my constituents live in South Australian Housing Trust rental homes, which they have developed with care and affection over the years. It concerns me to hear members opposite talk in heartless economic terms about evicting those people and forcing them into the hands of the real estate sharks. Many of my constituents are struggling to pay off homes but, in their attempts to achieve the so-called great Australian dream of a home of one's own, are continually being frustrated by increases in interest rates.

Unfortunately, because of the ruthless demands of the system, these poor people live in constant fear and financial insecurity. Many would-be homeowners are falling by the wayside, struck down by the Fraser Government's policy of a redistribution of more and more wealth away from the workers. This fact is clearly evidenced by the number of "for sale" signs appearing on relatively new homes, not only in my electorate but in many other electorates that include new areas.

My district contains a number of constant reminders of the plight of those poor souls who cannot cope with the vicious competitiveness of the system: for instance, Her Majesty's Yatala Labour Prison, wherein are incarcerated many unfortunates whose real failing was that they could not stand the pressures of the system; the Strathmont Centre, which tries to assist those who have suffered nervous and mental disorders; and the Hillcrest and Enfield Hospitals, which cater for other disadvantaged people, including those caught up in the drug trade, and which are not run by members of the Labor Party. It is of particular concern for me therefore to note how the Government has swung the axe in the area of health services.

The members opposite who were so voluble in pressing the rights of the individual should consider for a little while what the system that they support really does to people. Believe me, I have seen it from very close quarters, and I am afraid that conservative Governments really mean it when they say that life was not meant to be easy—that is, for people of the lower levels of society who must work and must have a job to obtain the wherewithal to exist in society. That situation certainly does not apply to those who skim the cream in the form of profits from invested capital, because life has never been easier for those people.

Although I would like to take all the time I could, I am now forced to curtail my remarks because there are other speakers waiting to speak. As a new member, I will undoubtedly err at times, and I made a couple of errors this afternoon. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I look to you for guidance in procedural matters, and I assure you that any transgressions on my part will not be deliberate. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and other honourable members for the courtesy afforded to me in the past hour.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to open my speech with a few comments about someone I consider to be one of the most outstanding political personalities in this State over the last 15 years. I am referring to my predecessor as the member for Ascot Park, Geoff Virgo. I value Geoff Virgo very much as a personal friend, and on many policy and tactical issues he has been a very valuable guide. In the past, I have had the pleasurable task of being the campaign director alongside Geoff Virgo for every

election in the district since he became the member for Ascot Park in 1970, as well as being associated with him in the Party structure within Ascot Park and on the State Executive.

Geoff began his career with the South Australian Railways as an electrician in 1941 and continued that employment until 1959. He became actively involved in the affairs of the Electrical Trades Union, and for 12 years he was honorary President of that union in South Australia. In 1959, Geoff was elected State Organiser of the A.L.P. in South Australia, and from 1963 to 1968 he served as State Secretary during the grip of the Playmander (the gerrymander instituted by Thomas Playford). This was eventually overcome, although it was not finally eliminated until 1977. The process of elimination was one in which Geoff Virgo played a key role. During that period he applied 101 per cent of his energy to the service of the cause he believed was right.

In relation to his retirement, it has been said that his contribution to the success of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia was second to none. Of all Geoff's many achievements, the strategy he implemented to break the Playford gerrymander in the late 1950's and early 1960's is of extraordinary significance to the well-being of the people of South Australia. It has been said that Geoff should now retire and work only 20 hours a day for the Labor movement rather than the 25 hours a day he has worked for the last 30 years.

Geoff has played an extremely prominent role within the A.L.P. as well as within the Government during the period 1970-79. He has been the epitome of a dedicated Labor man. When Geoff decided that a particular principle should be followed, he put his case most forcefully at all times. Most of us had disagreements with him at one time or another but, whatever eventuated, there was one thing of which you could be absolutely sure—

Mr. Whitten: And he was nearly always right.

Mr. TRAINER: Apart from the fact that he was nearly always right, as the member for Price has pointed out, the national Secretary of the Labor Party, David Combe, who preceded me as campaign director for Geoff Virgo in 1967-68, pointed out that "one would always know in these disagreements that Geoff's opinions and actions were motivated solely by what he genuinely believed to be in the best interest of the Party". Disagreements with Geoff were based not on personality conflicts or on settling old scores but purely on whatever difference of opinion there was between you and Geoff Virgo—a difference of opinion as to what was the best line to follow for the best interests of the Party and for the community.

In Geoff's mind, in my mind and in the minds of so many other people, the interests of the Party and the interests of the community are synonymous, because the Labor Party represents the aspirations of the majority of the population at any one time. Whether or not we can always mobilise that support at election time is another matter, but nevertheless we do aspire to represent their interests.

In 1968 Geoff stood down as State Secretary to become the member for the old seat of Edwardstown as successor to former Labor Premier, Frank Walsh. In 1970, as a result of the Hall redistribution of 1969, Geoff became the member for the seat of Ascot Park. I now have the honour to represent that seat, which was carved out of the old seat of Edwardstown.

As also applied to Geoff Virgo, my first election as a member for this area has been accompanied by the Labor Government's being dislodged from office, as it was in 1968. As with Geoff in 1970, I expect our Party to be back

for Government in my second election as member for Ascot Park, even though my majority on 15 September was not as great as I would have liked. The overall result of the election reminds me of the story that I heard the other day concerning a pilot and his 727 jet coming in towards the airport. He told the control tower, "I have got some good news and I have got some bad news," and the people in the tower said, "Well, tell us the bad news first." He said, "Well, one of the wings is cracking off; the undercarriage won't come down; I am losing fuel; I am rapidly losing altitude; the co-pilot has food poisoning; and I am starting to pass out." They said, "Well, what on earth is the good news?" and he said, "The lights are green on Burbridge Road."

With the election result, it is difficult for us to find the good news on this side, but, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, the polls have indicated that there is some good news. The polls tend to suggest that it was an aberration from normal voting trends, that it was caused by short-term anger at the Government for one reason or another, fuelled by various interest groups and that the overwhelming urge of those who voted against us was to give the then Government a kick in the pants. Unfortunately, the kick in the pants achieved a lot more than that. I think on the Monday after the election a lot of people regretted the way they voted on election day.

I return to the subject of my predecessor, Geoff Virgo. During his period of office from 1970 to 1979 he was an extremely active and competent Minister of Transport, handling a very difficult and controversial portfolio. During that period he served also as Minister of Local Government and as Minister of Marine. In the Transport Ministry, he had problems, and I think his successor as Minister of Transport will find that he, too, is going to have a lot of problems. Problems such as the truckies' blockade, and the strike by employees of the State Transport Authority which took place during the election campaign. The new Minister of Transport may well find that the election gimmick of the O'Bahn scheme will be an albatross around his neck in the future.

During Geoff Virgo's period as Minister, he completed many projects that will be very worth while to the State. He was one of the chief architects behind the Rundle Mall, an institution which, incidentally, was bitterly resisted by the Rundle Street retailers, who later on were to achieve record profits after it was installed. He was behind the installation of the South-Eastern Freeway, the Bee-line bus, the Christie Downs rail line, and the sealing of the Eyre Highway, and he started the North-East Light Rapid Transit Scheme, NEAPTR (which unfortunately the present Government is prevaricating about) and the sealing of the Stuart Highway. He was also involved in the Noarlunga Centre interchange (for which somebody else is getting the credit), and also the S.T.A. workshop, which has been opened recently.

In a final circular to members in the district, Geoff said this:

To me it has always been one of the best features of the job of a politician that he gets to meet many, many people. That is the way it should be. It is what the job is really all about. Even though a politician spends most of his time in and around his office and Government departments, the electorate still remains home base, and in many ways more important than all of the other duties he is called upon to perform. The politician is elected by the people of his electorate as their representative, and that is a privilege he must never take lightly. To me it has been a high honour that the people of the Ascot Park electorate judged me fit to act on their behalf.

I, too, am honoured to carry this responsibility on behalf

of the people of Ascot Park in terms that demonstrate that their faith in me has not been misplaced.

I would like to refer, as did the member for Florey just now, to some of the comments made by the member for Todd. I was listening in my room the other night when he spoke, and a couple of his comments attracted my attention. One was when he referred to the cost advantages that so many other countries are supposed to have in relation to Australia. At that moment, I just happened to have in front of me an article which seemed to say something different. Very often when our Liberal leaders and captains of commerce urge the working men of this country to work harder, it is implied that the traditional primary and secondary sectors in the economy are not being productive enough and that the extortionate labour costs for the workers' efforts are crippling the economy.

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

Mr. TRAINER: The member for Todd referred to cheap labour in other countries, a fact that may not necessarily be so. For some years, our business leaders have insisted that Australian labour costs are outrageously high compared to those of the industrious Japanese, Germans, Swiss and Dutch. A recent report I uncovered from the Dresden Bank (the Dresdener Bank A.G.) tells a different story in its comparison of labour costs around the globe, including hourly rates and fringe benefits. Compared to a \$1 labour unit in the United States, Australia runs at \$1.17, one or two cents ahead of Britain at \$1.15, and France at \$1.16. However, our hourly rate of \$1.17 is well behind that of Holland at \$1.21, Japan at \$1.26, Germany (which is often held up as a model) at \$1.39, and Switzerland at \$1.47. These figures suggest that our labour costs are not as high as some people have suggested.

Another topic on which the member for Todd touched was technological change. He agreed with the member for Baudin that we cannot stop it. I do not recall any Opposition member saying that we should act like latter-day Luddites and try to hold back technological change. Our argument is that the unrestricted introduction of technological change, without any consideration for monitoring its effects, will be socially and economically harmful. Whilst in my room just now I came across a booklet printed by the Printing and Kindred Industries Union that states:

The trade unions are not trying to stop the introduction of automation. They know they are powerless to stop it anyhow. What they are trying to achieve is the safeguarding of the interests of their members and a share in the fruits of the profits that will flow from increased productivity. They have adopted a totally different attitude to the Luddites of the nineteenth century industrial revolution who smashed the machines in a futile attempt to stem the oncoming flood of mechanisation.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the word "Luddites", it refers to a group of eighteenth century workers, particularly in the textile industry, who had a mythical figure called Ned Ludd, who was their hero, with his giant hammer, smashing the machinery they saw as taking away their livelihood. They followed suit. The booklet continues:

One of the industrial/social problems being faced by the work force today is the fact that the new technology of automation is being introduced in Australia, and indeed throughout the world, in an uncontrolled manner. Each industry is becoming aware of the manna from heaven in the form of computer-based techniques, and is rushing headlong

into the abyss, regardless of the consequences to the work force.

That is the point we are trying to make—that the work force must be considered with the introduction of this new technology. Workers are not just units of labour appearing on a ledger, to be cast aside because it happens to suit the interests of the employer. The booklet continues:

As a result of the indecent haste to computerise, each trade union is attempting to salvage what it can on a piecemeal basis, which is reminiscent of a bucket brigade at a bushfire and equally as ineffectual.

The booklet goes on to give several examples of the effect on employment that the introduction of computer technology has had and will have. It states:

The installation of computerised telephone exchanges within Telecom Australia will result in the reduction of the maintenance work force by 20 per cent in the next six years, even though there will be an increase in lines of 60 per cent in the same period . . . In the banking industry the personalised work of bank tellers, of ledger keepers and typists will be eliminated as a result of the installation of 24 hours a day, seven days a week automatic cash dispensers. An electronic funds transfer system will allow for electronic payment . . . This will result in a reduction in cashiers, record clerks and other support staff in the offices of manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers.

Then appears a telling point:

The transfer of computer tapes to banks from electricity authorities, Telecom Australia, insurance offices and other large undertakings will enable customers' accounts to be charged automatically.

As a result, few or no invoices will be needed, less paper and printing will be required, and fewer envelopes and stamps for postage and mail deliveries will be required. Although that reduction in consumption of materials such as paper is ecologically sound, we can see from this type of analysis that computerisation in one undertaking can cause a domino effect in others.

Another topic on which the member for Todd touched was something we have heard much about from Government members, namely, the trade union movement. He criticised the member for Salisbury indirectly, that honourable member having referred to his wish that compulsory voting should apply not only at the Federal and State levels, but in local government elections as well. The member for Todd asked why we did not have compulsory voting in union elections, too. As the member for Albert Park pointed out, the matter of logistics must be considered. In the case of the union of which he was a member, namely, the Australian Railways Union, members are scattered over a wide area. The same position applies to many other unions, whose members are scattered over a wide area and are not territorially concentrated as in local government districts.

The member for Todd also referred to secret voting. This can already take place, if requested by a certain specified number of members of the union. The costs can be borne by the Electoral Office, but the request rarely comes. Many drawbacks exist, as has been pointed out, as regards compulsory ballots in unions. The system slows down the process of negotiations. If you have to vote to start a strike, you also have to vote to lift it. An arrangement could be coming to fruition, but the men cannot go back to work, because the vote cannot be held because of the complicated logistics of a postal vote spread across the State.

Much is made about the degree of participation in unions, but we hear little about the lack of participation in companies. Months of publicity was given to the difficulties which the Bank of Adelaide was having. There

was an absolute crescendo of publicity, yet only 25 per cent of the shareholders in the bank, after all that publicity, attended the meeting at which the decision was made to accept the recommendation put to the meeting.

When Government members want secret ballots in unions, their secret wish is that those ballots will somehow produce a different result from those conducted in the open. They seem to infer that members will stick up for their rights less if there are secret ballots.

They seem to suspect that members are intimidated. When a union member is approached while out shopping with his wife and says, "I was going to vote against it; I am not really keen on it," particularly if it is an industrial dispute that has brought down some flack on the union, he will say, "I didn't want to, but I had to go along with it." He is really ducking for cover. In a secret ballot, he is just as likely to support that industrial dispute. The most outstanding example I can think of was the 1974 coalminers' strike in the United Kingdom that was conducted on a nation-wide referendum basis, resulting, if my memory is correct, in a vote of 85 per cent in support of the dispute, a dispute which finally brought down the Heath Government.

I turn now to the theme of technological change, but first I will make some remarks dealing with the growth of the service sector in our economy and the growth of what is sometimes called the post-industrial society. It has been said by some economists that we have been moving, since the industrial revolution, to a post-industrial society, in which the Government is a greater generator of employment than is the private sector; in which we have technological change involving automation and miniaturisation to a massive extent; in which there is a knowledge explosion where computerisation produces a massive quantum leap in the amount of information accessible to people; in which there is an economic shift from the stress on goods and services to instead services and the provision of information and in which information processing is the greatest growth area for employment, although there are complications in that particular area.

Some unemployment is now being generated within this growth sector, for example, in retailing where there are automated supermarkets, and in the banking and insurance industries, which I mentioned when I was quoting from that pamphlet, with respect to computer data processing. This post-industrial society is one that is developing towards a leisure society in which people will have more time on their hands as a result of either unemployment or rationalisation of working hours for automation. Whatever one calls it, it is still spare time, time that is available for boredom and alienation. We have an economy which is capable of massive production of goods and services. Our problem is really not one of production but of how to distribute the goods that our economy is producing.

It is traditional to divide the economy into three sectors. In about 1940, Colin Clark introduced the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors as a manner of dividing the economy. Primary industry was connected with farming, fishing mining and forestry; secondary industry involved manufacturing; and tertiary industry was associated with services, including such aspects as education, transport, government, retailing and construction. There was some argument about whether construction should be included in the secondary sector with manufacturing. The growth area has been, and will be for some time, the traditional service sector.

A pamphlet printed by that well-known Marxist organisation, the Australian Chamber of Commerce, refers to three out of four people being employed in the

service sector. The chamber refers to accountants, air-line operators, architects, bankers, builders, bus drivers, carriers, dentists, doctors, electricians, engineers, entertainers, financial advisers, gardeners, hotel keepers, insurers, lawyers, painters (I see there is some reference to the member for Glenelg), plumbers, railwaymen, real estate agents, researchers, restaurateurs, retailers, stock brokers, taxi-drivers, teachers, television, radio and press people and, for the benefit of the member for Brighton, travel agents. This pamphlet is entitled "Serving Australia" and it is published by the Assembly of Business Organisations, which is associated with the Chamber of Commerce. It follows the traditional pattern of dividing the economy into primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors. On page 2 of the pamphlet there is a reference to the farming sector, in which there has been greater and greater productivity over the years with fewer workers, and reference to manufacturing and mining. The pamphlet states:

Farmers have been able to satisfy local needs for their products and develop their export potential with only 7 per cent of Australia's total work force. [The manufacturing] sector's proportion of the work force now stands at 21 per cent.

Mining Sector: Because of the capital intensive nature of mineral extraction, a substantial export industry has been developed using only about 1 per of the work force.

If the mineral boom promised for Roxby Downs follows the traditional pattern of being capital-intensive and not labour intensive, it cannot do that much for the alleged job rot.

The authors of this pamphlet seem to be rather dissatisfied with Government policies that concentrate attention on the farming sector (which occupies only 7 per cent), the mining sector (which occupies 1 per cent) and the manufacturing sector (which occupies 21 per cent), as that is a total of only 29 per cent of the work force. It is claimed that the glamour area of mining is rather unproductive employment, and it is felt that the service industry deserves more attention. It is stated:

Economic policies affecting the service sector are often imposed by default of any direct analysis; they are merely a residual that spills over from policy initiative in agriculture, mining or manufacturing . . . For an understanding of the economy as a whole it is vital to be able to recognise the end products of this tertiary sector of industry. It is easy to see the preparing and harvesting of agricultural crops in primary industry, or the factory processes producing goods in secondary industry. We are concerned now, however, with the activities of the great bulk of Australians in the work force who make our market economy work. The end products of their labour consist of services, and these services contribute to the creation of national wealth. They transport people or cargoes by air, land or sea. They may be the distributors of goods or the providers of finance with which goods may be purchased. They build, paint, sell or insure the houses we live in.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There being a quorum present, I call the honourable member for Ascot Park.

Mr. TRAINER: They slip in quickly sometimes, don't they? It was further stated:

They provide for our health, education and entertainment. It is scarcely possible to live through a day in our society without using the services of these people. Roughly, two-thirds of all the money we spend is spent on the services they provide. It is no wonder then that almost three out of every four people in the work force are employed in service industries.

That is one sector of the economy that really does have the greatest potential for growth rather than the glamorous mining industry or the traditional manufacturing and farming industries.

According to some material I read recently, rather than that traditional three-sector division of the economy into primary, secondary and tertiary, there is a possibility of considering an economy that is actually closer to reality, one in which everyone who does something to contribute to our society is considered a worker. This new definition of the economy would include all those women, for example, who are not normally thought of as being in the work force, and who are normally put in the category of housewife. We could possibly divide the economy into five sectors that have some similarity to the three traditional sectors, with some overlap.

The primary sector would deal with extractive industries; the secondary industry would deal with the manufacturing and construction industries; the tertiary sector would deal with general economic services involving the processing of material or the processing of energy; a quaternary sector would deal with the processing of ideas and information; and an quinary sector would involve *quasi* domestic services.

Under the new definition, the primary sector would involve 6 per cent of our redefined work force, working in extractive industries, extracting raw resources, in farming, fishing, forestry, mining or quarrying. The secondary sector would be similar to the previous secondary sector, involving 21 per cent of the redefined work force involved in manufacturing and construction, and processing raw materials from the primary sector and converting them into finished products. The tertiary sector would involve 23 per cent of the redefined work force in general economic services involving the processing of matter and energy, including wholesale and retail trade, which assist in distributing the products from the secondary sector; transport and storage industries dealing with products from the secondary sector and the transport of people; repair and maintenance of products from the secondary sector; public utilities; and some personal services including people like tattooists and hairdressers, who have to be classified somewhere.

The quaternary sector, which would involve 22 per cent of the redefined work force, is that dealing with information and idea processing. Unlike the first three sectors, this deals not so much with concrete objects such as fish out of the sea, food or oil out of the ground, or products made, but with abstracts—the handling of ideas or symbolic objects, such as money, cheques, bank statements, title deeds, wills and so on. This covers the field of knowledge, data, symbols or general paper shuffling. People to be included would be teachers, research workers, clerks, typists, postal workers, the press, *Hansard* reporters, media staff, telecommunications workers, computer programmers, photographers, printers, lawyers, advertising agents, insurance officials, bank officials, people involved in the arts, the clergy, and even politicians. Some of them deal with things much more abstract than others do.

A rapidly expanding proportion of our society becoming more educated is involved: a more literate society, a more leisured society, one more involved with communication and paper records, a population less concerned with a crust of bread, one would hope, and more concerned with ideas.

Finally, the quinary sector would be 29 per cent of our newly defined work force, redefined to include anyone who is contributing something to society, and including housewives. An economic article I have read recently

describes this as *quasi* domestic services, services provided in the home or in a situation analogous to home service. In this sector, we would include care of the aged or care of children, and anyone who is involved in providing food as a housewife does, or as a restaurant does. We would have restaurateurs in this sector. Many of the people connected with the tourist industry would be in this sector, because they are providing shelter; the hotel industry, for instance. To take the analogy further, we could incorporate massage parlours and private clubs in this sector, and all of those people—a small number at the moment, but it is growing—who are involved in domestic service. In the concluding stages of what was traditionally referred to as the industrial revolution, domestic service formed a large proportion of the work force in Victorian and Edwardian England.

This quinary sector, the *quasi* domestic service sector, is quite large, because it contains a vast unpaid group engaged in work of this nature, people we refer to as housewives. Consideration must be given in some way to recognising homemaking work as being real work.

Every so often, a member of the privileged class complains of lack of productivity on the part of working people, and says they should work harder. These exhortations seem to be directed mainly to the primary and secondary sectors of the economy, especially to the workers in manufacturing industry. It is implied that somehow our sluggish economy will lift itself if these workers can be more productive.

First, we must remember that the primary and secondary sectors employ only a relatively small section of the real economy, or about 27 per cent of the real work force. There is something strange if our economy rests on the productivity of such a small group. Secondly, most of our industrial and mining plant is capable of efficient production but is not working at anywhere near its peak because of lack of demand. The problem really lies with the equitable distribution of the products of our industry.

Consider the cost structure of a loaf of bread. Within the primary sector a farmer is involved; in the secondary sector, the miller and the baker; in the tertiary sector, there is packaging, transport, the wholesaler and the retailer; and in the quaternary sector, there is the advertiser who advertises the product, office staff, clerical staff, and so on. Out of 14 people involved in the chain from wheat until it finally appears in the home, only five involved actually produce the loaf; the other nine (should we call them "loafers"?) are non-productive; they do not deal with raw materials at all. They market the material or make the material accessible, adding huge overheads, and the farmer receives only a small return on his fraction of the final price.

Not much can be done about the productivity of the people who do the physical work associated with the physical product in milling and baking, or in the motor industry, which is operating far below its productive capacity. There is something wrong when a nation with a market that can cope with only one or at the most two engine plants has to make do with four or five. The problem is not one of production, but of finding markets for the cars produced. The survival of the industry depends on built-in obsolescence to create a false demand, on political intervention in the form of protection from imports, and an unlimited supply of cheap fuel. The problem of that supply will not be solved by any emphasis on uranium.

We face a problem with the impact of the traditional primary and secondary sectors on the ecology, if our lives are to continue to be based on processing and consuming material goods. This will eventually result in a subsequent

collapse of an overloaded environment as our waste products expand and our demands for raw material continue. We cannot go on forever consuming material goods without massive recycling. It has been estimated that, if the current demand for material goods continues to grow at an annual rate of 3 per cent, in 1 000 years time we would annually consume a mass of metal greater than the size of the globe. Obviously, something would have to give long before then. I hope it does not have to happen in our lifetime.

Provided we can overcome the tremendous social shock, the shift to service industries, particularly the knowledge industry, may be a blessing in disguise. A population more interested in abstraction, such as ideas and data, could consume less in the way of material things, and postpone that ecological disaster.

Technological change cannot and should not be held back if it can assist, but we must monitor its social effect carefully, and do all we can to minimise unemployment occurring as a result. We must also have a positive social attitude to unemployment, for unemployment and leisure are just opposite sides of the same coin.

The two major aspects of a person's life, especially for the traditional male worker, have been his family and his work. The family, to some extent, has been in decline as the nuclear family has replaced the extended one of days gone by—the extended family not just of father, mother and young children, but of grandchildren, grandparents, uncles, aunts, and so on. As a man matures, his family in some ways has to take a second place in his life to his work. As his children grow up he tends to concentrate more attention on his employment, and his work becomes so much of his life that he often identifies himself with it, as many of us do. After all, when we meet someone, after names are out of the way, one of the first questions, if not the very first, is, "What do you do?" or "What are you?" and the reply is that the person is a draughtsman, a welder, or whatever. People identify themselves with the work they do. Unemployment creates a particularly tragic vacuum. When you are unemployed you are not a welder, or a draughtsman—you are a nothing. It is essential that more positive attitudes towards this problem should develop.

Another aspect I could mention in passing that relates to technological change is the knowledge explosion, where, in modern society, a flood of information makes life continually more complex. There are countless forms to be filled out—insurances, health cover, registrations, a deluge of news and information in the press, on radio, and on television, advertisements urging people to buy this and that, parking signs, traffic signs, bureaucrats behind desks to be faced, police with summonses at the door, and so on—so much information and so much paper to be dealt with, and so much electronic information to be dealt with, too.

All of these aspects of modern living, this flood of information, can induce a feeling of inability to cope with it all. To the unemployed, this problem adds further to the sense of personal failure and inadequacy. We must give more attention to quite radical solutions to the long-term problems of unemployment. The concept of the 35-hour week, without reduced wages, should be seriously considered. Provided wage levels are maintained so that community purchasing power is not lost, it is preferable to have 40 people working 35 hours rather than 35 people working 40 hours. Similarly, four-day or three-day weeks must be considered.

Other flexible options need to be considered, such as optional late entry into the work force or optional early retirement. Similarly, a sabbatical system similar to long

service leave arrangements could possibly be devised to allow a person to work eight months on and four months off in each year. If technology is to displace people, we must consider options such as these to cater for those who will be unemployed. Another avenue to consider is that of engaging people longer in education. With a higher unemployment rate, what is needed is more educational expenditure, not less.

Indeed, if we consider that a student is someone who is engaged in work (and ask a school student whether he is working, and he will assure you that he works pretty hard), education is potentially the largest single employer in the country, although 95 per cent of those involved in this work are not paid wages for their time.

Among O.E.C.D. countries, a recent survey showed that Australia has a particularly low percentage of her population below 25 years of age occupied in full-time education. As a result of this low proportion being still in the education system, 62 per cent of all Australians under the age of 25 years are competing with each other for jobs in the work force, whereas in the Japanese work force only 45 per cent of people under the age of 25 were competing with each other for jobs. If our country had a similar education profile to that of Japan, the business of education would absorb 150 000 young people, a number approximately equal to the number of under-25-year-old unemployed in this country.

To a certain extent, this is already happening in secondary schools, with more students staying on, say, to Matriculation, or internal year 12, or even repeating Matriculation or year 12 (not out of a burning ambition, unfortunately, to matriculate, but rather to avoid going out to join a work force where jobs are not available for them).

Our education system must provide for the less gifted as well as the elite. Year 12 courses will have to be continually redesigned and redesigned again for these people. In the past, too much of our secondary education system has been structured around the one-tenth of students who are going on to university, not the nine-tenths of students who will not be, because of the Matriculation examination having also to serve as an entry examination for university. Those members of this House who attended the meeting with the young people from Community Involvement Through Youth (CITY) the other day should be aware, from some of the moving comments that came from some of the young people, just how little, unfortunately, our education system has done to prepare them for unemployment and how shattering an experience it can be.

Our education system must not be looked on as just an extension of the enrolment procedures of the university, nor should it be looked upon as an extension of big business's personnel screening and job training sections. Schools must not just prepare people for work but must also prepare them for living and leisure, particularly if we are going to have more creative leisure through modern technology. They must be prepared to live with a wide range of work choices and leisure choices, and be prepared to have continuing education throughout their lives in citizenship, self-expression, humanities, skills development, updating of qualifications, and job retraining. This continuing education will be essential in a rapidly changing world where technology wipes out entire industries almost overnight.

As a society we must, as I have said, develop completely new attitudes to the meaning of work, leisure and education, and accept that the advent of the computer chip and the capitalisation of primary and secondary industry will necessitate an ever-increasing percentage of the South

Australian work force being employed in tertiary and quaternary sectors of the real economy.

I turn now to the problem of female employment particularly that of married women. Very often when we have discussions on the problem of youth employment there seems to be an underlying assumption that married women in the work force are the cause of it all. As recently as in yesterday's *Advertiser*, Professor Karmel was discussing how to cut the teenage dole queue, and he made the statement that one of the causes is the increasing participation of women in the work force. It is true that married women are currently participating in the labour force at ever greater levels. Between 1964 and 1979, the proportion of married women participating in the labour force rose from 25½ per cent to just over 41 per cent, but the assumption then follows that they are, therefore, taking jobs that would otherwise have been taken by teenagers. This so-called explanation often prefaces the suggestion that, if married women were removed from the work force or discouraged from working by tax measures, this could effect a reduction in the number of unemployed teenagers. In actual fact, the removal of married women from the labour force would do very little to alleviate the unemployment problem—it would merely be shifting this problem from one group to another.

However, given the popular currency of the argument of married women workers depriving teenagers of jobs and being to some degree responsible for youth unemployment, it would appear that a more comprehensive reply to this charge is warranted. The assumptions underlying this argument should be exposed and analysed. The first main assumption is that the economy is somehow a static structure in which there is only a finite number of jobs and that one group of workers is employed at the expense of another—in this case, married women at the expense of teenagers.

A second assumption is that this limited number of jobs should be allocated on the basis of need, and that a teenager's need of a job is greater than the need of a married woman because she can, presumably, be supported by her husband if she resigns from her job. A third assumption is that married women and teenagers are interchangeable sectors of the work force, and that if married women left their jobs they could readily be replaced by unemployed teenagers.

The fourth assumption is that married women are a kind of reserve army of labour, encouraged into the work force in war-time or in times of economic prosperity to alleviate the labour shortage and expected to return home in times of economic downturn so that more needy workers can have their jobs. The fifth assumption is that marriage adequately provides economic security for women.

In relation to assumption No. 1, that there is a finite number of jobs and that women occupy some of those jobs at the expense of teenagers, it must be remembered that it certainly is not Federal Government policy to act on the assumption of a static economy; the assumption is that it is continually growing.

The assumption that one group works at the expense of another implies that there is a right to work depending on a factor such as age, sex or marital status. Why should migrants, married men or single adults have a greater right to employment than married women? Who defines the need? Who defines how great the need is? Who defines how a right is associated with one group over another in this respect?

The second assumption, that we can allocate on a needs basis, can be commented on thus: if need and not ability was the basis for filling jobs, one could argue that single mothers or widows should be given preference over single

men. On the basis of need, perhaps multiple job holding and overtime working would have to be eliminated. It could also be argued that teenagers should be supported by their parents in the same way as it is assumed that married women are supported by their husbands (although recently we have had statements made by the Federal Government that it is going to proceed with a policy based on just that assumption). Young unemployed receive unemployment benefits it should be remembered, whereas most unemployed married women are not eligible.

Assumption No. three, that women are interchangeable with teenagers in the work force, implies that skill, training, and maturity are not important in the work force. It implies that anybody can change with anybody else's job, and it denies what has been existing in the community for a long time, that there is a sexual segregation so far as job allocation is concerned.

Assumption No. four, that there is a reserve army of women which can be called on and then sent back, was a war-time concept. Women and married women have always worked, and they continue to work. They moved further out of the traditional areas of work for women during war-time, but with the increase in service industries since the war, there has been an increase in female employment in what were traditionally female dominated areas, and a segregated labour force exists, so few women work in men's areas, and vice versa. This is further divided into adult and junior segregated positions.

Assumption No. five is that marriage provides economic security for women. Changes in attitudes to divorce have meant that women can no longer expect to be maintained by a marriage partner all their lives. The median age for women at divorce is about 33 years. In addition, the inadequacy of marriage to provide economic security is evidenced by a survey in 1974 of income distribution. That is contained in the 1973-74 Australian Bureau of Statistics income distribution survey.

The survey showed that 43.8 per cent of single-income families earned less than \$6 000, compared with only 13.6 per cent of dual-income families earning less than this amount. It is important to have a clear picture of the rights and position of married women in the Australian labour force in relation to employment. When opening Federal Parliament in February 1978, the Governor-General reiterated the Federal Government's "fundamental belief that a better society can only be realised by giving the men and women of Australia a greater measure of choice, power and freedom".

I must now deal with some statistics of female employment in this country, from a Bureau of Statistics survey entitled "The Labour Force, May 1979". At that time there were 2 300 000 working females. This constituted 36 per cent of the labour force. Of those 2 300 000 females, there were 1 400 000 married women, constituting 22 per cent of the labour force. This is 41 per cent of all married women in Australia. In other words, 41 per cent of all married women work, in the traditional definition of work. Of those 1 400 000, there were 408 000 migrant married women in the labour force. On the other hand, in relation to youth employment at that time, there were 648 000 employed teenagers who made up only 10.7 per cent of the work force. There were 59 600 junior males unemployed—less than 1 per cent of the labour force. There were 73 000 junior females unemployed, 1 per cent of the total labour force.

Married women are defined by the bureau as excluding those widowed and divorced but includes those permanently separated. This definition excludes those in a *de facto* relationship and for this reason the term "married women" does not adequately indicate all women who are

dependants and also does not take account of the fact that many married women are the main breadwinners. Referring back to those figures, 122 000 unemployed youths are obviously not directly interchangeable with 1 400 000 married women workers.

The bureau's figures show some interesting information concerning the nature of the work that those 1 400 000 married women workers, the women who are classified as being employed, do. Of those, 227 000 married women were either employers or self-employed. Obviously, they were not in the category of being interchangeable with the youth unemployed. Unpaid family helpers accounted for 9 600.

Nearly 600 000 of employed married women (42 per cent) work part-time on an average of 16 hours a week. How much would this 16 hours a week part-time work be worth to a teenager? At teenage rates of pay, 16 hours work would approximate to the unemployment benefit (something for which married women are not eligible) and, of those teenagers seeking work, only 6 000 are seeking part-time work. Another factor that must be considered is the female who marries very young—the teenage bride, or brides not much older than teenagers. Some of those who are in the category of married women and who are working could just as easily be in the category of single female teenagers who are unemployed. Women now generally do not stop working when they marry, and they are marrying at an earlier age. Those jobs taken by single women in the past are now taken by women who have married at a younger age.

The figures show that 15.7 per cent work in professional or technical jobs, mainly in the nursing and teaching fields. These are occupations where teenagers do not have the necessary qualifications, so it is no use that group moving aside. The figures show that 31 per cent of employed married women have jobs in clerical areas and 27 per cent of women in these jobs work fewer than 15 hours. So, the comment I made earlier about part-time work still holds with this group.

Technological change in any case is removing many of these jobs, particularly those requiring less skill and less responsibility. That particular area in which married women are employed is a shrinking area of employment, as also is the sales area. There are 163 000 married women working as sales assistants and 23 per cent of these women work less than 15 hours. Again, there is the same problem with respect to part-time work. In this area, technological change, particularly in supermarkets, is reducing the need for unskilled labour.

Another 13 per cent or 176 000 married women, work as tradeswomen or process workers. Most of these women are migrants. This area is not one where unemployed teenagers wish to work, and only about 10 000 unemployed junior females were seeking work in these types of jobs in the bureau's figures. The parents and the teenagers themselves expect a better job than that of a process worker or a tradeswoman. Possibly, their aspirations are too high, but that is what they aim for. A further 18 per cent of employed married women work in service jobs, mostly doing domestic work. Again, it is not an area that is attractive to junior females.

There is very little correlation between the jobs that junior males and married women do. Junior males are not seeking jobs in the areas where women are working. The women are not holding down potential "jobs for the boys". The only argument that could really be raised is that to a small extent they are holding down potential "jobs for the girls". Unemployed junior females are mainly looking for work in the sales and clerical areas; unlike junior males, who are employed in many

occupations, the concentration of junior females in these occupations indicates the narrowness of their perception of the labour market as a result of the education system of the past—as a result of the sexual stereotypes that they develop from their parents, from the media, and from the magazines they read, they do not consider other possibilities. If you look around this Chamber, for example, even when all 47 members are here, 46 members are male, so this is one occupation that is not considered as a possibility for young females.

Mr. Lewis: None from the Labor Party.

Mr. TRAINER: There are two from the Labor Party in the other Chamber. The main thrust of my argument is that women should not be expected to sacrifice themselves and step aside and vacate jobs for young people, jobs which, as I have tried to point out, are in areas not suitable for young males or even in most cases suitable for young females.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): To have the privilege of being elected to Parliament as a Labor Party candidate gives me the opportunity on this occasion to express the sentiments of the working people with whom I have lived and represented all my life. My election to Parliament cannot be seen in isolation from my very close association with the experiences I have shared with so many thousands of others over the past 30 years, which have led me to Parliament and which will guide whatever I have to say during my period as an elected representative in my electorate.

For the benefit of many members on the opposite side, I would like to outline part of my history. I was born in 1926, and I think that the majority of the older members in the House would agree with me that this was not a very good year to come into the land of the living. It was the forerunner to the depression years, and at the age of seven I used to have every other Monday morning off school to sell rabbits, to assist in putting bread and butter on the table for my brothers and sisters, because I came from a family of eight and my father was a shearer, when he could get the work, and also a jack-of-all-trades. In actual fact, I worked all through that time from when I was seven, going out to sell rabbits of a Monday morning for a shilling a pair. The common language in those days was “a deener a pair”. I see that a rabbit now, on special, costs \$1.48.

At the early age of 13½ years, my first job was with a German farmer who lived near Hamilton (I was born there), in Fraser's country. I worked as a sheaf turner, and I stooked hay. As a 13½-year-old lad, I was thrown into the work force to fork hay, and ended up with blisters on my hands, thus making me cry at night. Fortunately, my father was working at an adjoining German farmer's farm, and I used to go over there. The only sympathy he could give me was to tell me to rub mutton fat into my hands. He said, “Keep doing this and, after one or two weeks, your hands will come good, and you'll get used to using a fork.” Eventually, I became good at forking hay. That was my introduction to the work force. Later, I went fruit picking, where I met other people from other industries, such as a bullocky, a council worker, and some shearers, and they taught me about life. I left State school at 13½ years of age. Then came my education, which has continued ever since. I was taught by council workers, quarry workers, and shearers, and it was the best education anyone could get about work.

I worked pitching hay, and rabbiting, because there were many rabbits in the Western Districts of Victoria in those days, as the member for Victoria, would know, as he lives just over the Victorian border. I dug out stony rises for months. I also worked in skin stores, and cut wood and

sleepers. I have also worked in sawmills, and have planted pines and dug potatoes at Mount Gambier. I have performed sheep dipping and other types of casual station work. I did not stay on stations for long, however. If you trace back the history of many property owners, you will often find that they acquired their properties by poisoning the waterholes to rid themselves of Aborigines. Many property owners have 99-year leases. I have worked on some of these properties, and the Barr-Smiths and the McLachlans are the owners of some of them. How did they acquire their properties? They were given to them on 99-year leases. In the Western Districts of Victoria, the Hentys and others have a lot to answer for. I refer also to Rufus River.

The member for Mallee referred to the dingoes in his district, but I have never struck him or a dingo there, and I put in seven years there. If he knows anything about history, he should know the Rufus River and what it means. That was the river that ran red with the blood of slaughtered Aborigines. I advise members to see what the history books say about Rufus River. Talk about capitalism! I have heard some Government members talk about socialism as though it were a dirty word. Capitalism would have more to answer for than would socialism. I expected interjection from the Government side. I came through the great depression. I do not know what the painter from Glenelg went through, or whether he was here then, but I was here, and I was in the work force. I have been in the work force all my life. I have heard him speak about unionists. I have also heard the member for Mallee speak. I notice that the member for Henley Beach has left his seat. I have heard them speak about trade unions. The first job I had with the German farmer (and I have nothing against Germans)—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Well—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Agriculture must not interject when he is out of his seat.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I need some protection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will determine that.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The old German cocky (I will not name him) said, “Keith, come over and I will show you the accommodation.” I went over to his garage, in which there were some wooden poles with some superphosphate bags spread across them. That was my bed to sleep in. The palliasse was made of two chaff bags filled with straw. When you filled them you made sure there were no prickles. I was 13½ years old, and I was thrown out into a tool shed and garage. That was bad enough. Every morning I would get up and go outside. If anyone knows anything about the country he would immediately recognise a snake track, and I realised that I was not the only person sleeping in that shed. I notice Government members laughing. I always thought that a snake would end up in bed with me during the night or in the morning but, fortunately, it did not happen. I was there for four weeks, and returned over the years during harvest. I had to do that; that was the type of work I had to do in those days. I went fruit picking at Kyabrum. The accommodation there was provided by driving the horses out of the stables. There were three of us. When we went there, the stables had not been cleaned and the mosquitoes at pear-picking time would eat you. We also had to contend with flies from the manure in the stables. We refused to work until reasonable accommodation was given us.

He gave us the accommodation. We had the best accommodation of any of the pickers at Kyabram. When we left after picking his crop and the crops of two of his neighbours, he thanked us and said, “You are the best

workers I've had on the place." Do you know why? He could not get decent people to stay there because of the accommodation and the filthy way he expected people to live. This is what trade unions are all about.

I then worked in a shearing shed as a shed hand for two or three years. When I was 18, I joined the A.I.F. to go away to fight for my country. Do you know how much country I owned? I owned not one bit of country. My father owned an acre of land at Hamilton, in Digby Road. For anyone who does not know what the A.I.F. is, I will tell him it is the infantry. I was a volunteer who fought for the country I never had. Fortunately, I did not have to kill any of my fellow workers. I do not think the workers from Germany, Japan, Australia or any other country really wanted the war. Do you know who wanted the war? It was the multi-nationals, Liberals and capitalists.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: I see the Minister of Agriculture smiling. Do you know who were the first people who were slaughtered? It was those on the dole. The member for Mawson would not know that, because he would have been too young then. I do not blame him for that. Those people sacrificed their lives during the war. No-one should ever knock people on the dole. That has been the great song of the Liberal Government; it knocks people who are unemployed. These people are called dole-bludgers; those words are pretty indecent to be used by members of the Liberal Party. It is said that these people do not want work, and if they want work they can get it. What a lot of rot! There are no jobs for people.

I would like to point out another thing; after I had been in the Army for six months, the war finished. My father, who was too old to go to the war but who was wounded at Gallipoli in the First World War (he did his share and did not even get a pension for fighting for his country), was a good trade unionist, too. That has rubbed off on me, thank God. My mother was then told that dad had cancer and he would not live for six months. He died to that day at the age of 53 years.

I was the eldest unmarried boy; my mother applied for compassionate discharge for me. After a certain time, I received an honourable compassionate discharge from the Army. I came out and went shearing; I took on the industry that my father worked in. I had always wanted to be a shearer. From the age of 19 until 1969 I was a shearer. While I was a shearer, I also did jobs like wheat lumping. I worked on a chaff cutter, Hume pipes, water thrust, and did work with the Shire Council of Hamilton. I worked on a crusher and worked for a private contractor making roads. Do you know what making roads without a grader and without bitumen is like? I spread the roads, and became an expert with a square-mouthed shovel. I built the roads. That was what I went through. That was my education. I worked in the trans-shipping yards at Broken Hill where they unloaded from one line to the other because of the stupidity of the early Governments in Australia, which would not agree to a standard line. Everything that came through Broken Hill had to go on to the Silver City tramways, and had to be unloaded and reloaded. I did that work. I worked as curator of a bowling green and I picked fruit again, but I never liked it. It was not one of my games. I was shearing all this time.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Is there anything you've never done?

Mr. PLUNKETT: The only thing I was lucky enough not to do was to go to Kangaroo Island and shear for the Minister. I was never going so badly that I had to shear for him. I then went organising. I would not take on shearing contracting; I see a shearing contractor as an exploiter of labour. Those contractors used to bludge off the

workmen. Don't worry, I worked for them. There were some good contractors, though. I am not speaking of Kangaroo Island, but of some good contractors; there were not many of them but there were a few.

I then became an organiser with the Australian Workers Union in 1969. That was because of my life's activities. Even though I was not an official of the union I used to take militant action. I worked for 16 years for one contractor. I was a good shearer; there is no worry about that. The Minister of Agriculture can check out my history. Without skiting, I can say I was always classed as being a good shearer, but I was also classed as being a militant. I got jobs on my ability. Through my ability I have been able to shear, and I have been a militant all my life. All of my workmates in every other industry came to get advice from me. One of my mates who had been shearing with me was involved in a car accident when he was travelling down from Ivanhoe. We got word at Wentworth that there had been an accident near Pooncarie and we heard that a couple of shearers were involved. One of them was my mate. This particular person had broken his neck after a ramp had been hit. He had only just been married and bought a home. I do not know if anyone opposite has ever been in debt, but his wife did not have a deener.

I rang all my workmates in the area, who were unionists; we held a meeting at 10 o'clock the following morning, and we had a tar-poll muster. We collected \$700 there and then from the workers—the trade unionists. This money was collected from unionists, and the member for Glenelg is frightening his poor old constituents by saying that socialists and trade unionists are terrible people. Trade unionists have done more for people than a capitalist or a Liberal has ever done. A Liberal has never assisted anyone that I have ever seen. All the good legislation has been introduced by a Labor Government.

Who introduced long service leave? Don't tell me it was Menzies. It was not a Liberal Government. Who introduced and increased sick leave? It was the unions with the assistance of the Labor Government. What about four weeks leave? It took a long time to get four weeks leave. We now see one of our leading citizens in Adelaide saying that four weeks leave is too long for young people. I wonder if he has ever looked at the politicians on the other side who want to wind up Parliament tonight. They are not prepared to sit for another two weeks. How hypocritical can people be! Have you ever spoken to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and asked why he thinks this way? I know he is a time and motion man and has caused a bit of a stir since he became Lord Mayor, but have you people ever actually spoken to him about these matters? Surely, Dean Brown—

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The honourable member is referring to other honourable members as "you people". It is usual to refer to members as "honourable members" of the other side of the House or to refer to their district.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order, and I would suggest to the honourable member for Peake that he should refer to honourable members by their districts.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My apologies, especially to the member for Glenelg. He indicated that, when my maiden speech was over, he would get into me. If a person is going to attack you, the best line of defence is to attack him, and that is why the member for Glenelg has received a bit of attention from me.

I cannot think of any legislation introduced by the Liberal Party that has been of benefit to the workers. I

have racked my brain over this. After lunch, I spoke to one of my colleagues and asked him what the Liberals had done for the workers, and he said, "You've got me beat. Ask Dean Brown or one of the members on the other side."

I was involved in the introduction of the 40-hour week. That was when people worked on Saturday mornings. I have some respect for the member for Victoria, whom I knew for seven years at Naracoorte. In those days, even the farmers did not want a 44-hour week. They did not want to bring in the sheep on Saturday morning and lose half of their Saturday. The farmers were pleased when the 40-hour week was introduced but the graziers' associations and the stockowners' associations said, "You can't do that, or it will be taken as a precedent in the industry." Eventually, the 40-hour week came in, but nowadays there are not enough hours for people to get decent work.

Who introduced four weeks leave? There are a few solicitors on the other side. Perhaps they can find out who introduced these things. I am talking as a representative of the workers.

Mr. Lewis: So am I.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I hope the member for Mallee does represent the workers, because he has been elected to represent every person in his district. I think the member for Victoria does this, and that is why he gets a big vote, although he is in a blue-ribbon seat. I know many of my friends who vote Labor have a high regard for the member for Victoria, but I would expect also that the member for Mallee would look after the Labor people as well as the Liberals in his area.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: Who introduced maternity leave? I am pleased and honoured that a few members opposite have come into the Chamber to hear me speak. I would like to see the member for Mitcham here.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: I do not accept that anyone should be a part-time politician.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation across the Chamber.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am pleased that I have put a bit of life back into Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber, and I cannot hear the honourable member for Peake.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Would you like me to speak up, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am pleased to see that the member for Henley Beach has just entered the Chamber. I am sorry that he was not here earlier, but I am sure he has been listening, because he could have heard me without the microphones. I have explained to many of his colleagues why I am a trade unionist and why the trade unions exist. One of the reasons is to protect us from people such as the member for Henley Beach. I will not say what I called him once before, because my colleagues have told me that it is not done, but it is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Becker: What were your wages when you started work?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I was fortunate. I do not know whether the member for Hanson was born in Australia, but, except when I first went out in industry, I have never worked for scab rates of pay. I worked for 2s. 6d per week. When I first started work I was highly paid. I would sell about 20 pairs of rabbits at a deener a pair every Monday morning, beating the butchers around. I was seven or eight

years of age at the time. I also sold gum tips.

Mr. Lewis: That's scandalous.

Mr. PLUNKETT: For the information of the member for Mallee, that was the top price for rabbits in those days. If he does not remember the old currency, he might like to check up on his books. When I was 13½ years of age, I got 2s., working for the cocky and sleeping with the snakes. I joined the union and went into the shed as a shedhand and I got the top rate of pay. In my first year I was on junior rates, but after I had done one shed and had proved that I was a good worker I got full wages and I have always been on full wages since then. As a shearer, I got full wages, and if the member for Glenelg would care to check on what I am saying, I will give him the names of the sheds where I worked.

I have shorn 250 sheep a day. When I went into the shower, as soon as I turned on the water I would get cramps in the stomach, the legs and the arms. My mates had to carry me to bed and rub me with ice to shift the cramps. Those are the experiences I had as a worker, and that is why I get upset when members opposite criticise trade unions. Some people who criticise and who work in the unions have accepted the privileges that the trade unions have won for them. They have accepted every cent without a grumble, but they oppose strikes. The member for Henley Beach did not oppose the first strike; he was right up with it. But then he pulled out. I do not know whether his conscience pricked him.

In 1932, at the height of the depression, 34 per cent of trade unionists were unemployed. I hope Government members realise that we do not want another depression, although I fear we are getting towards that situation now, with capitalism and the attitude of the Fraser Government. The new threat is unemployment, the most degrading thing there is. That may not be so for some members opposite who have not been used to working, but for a person who has been used to work and cannot get a job unemployment is degrading.

I have three children, one of whom was unemployed for a short time. It was the most depressing thing I have seen. My daughter wanted to work, but could not get a job. Even though she is working now it is only casual work. Members opposite should not wish unemployment on anyone, and should do everything possible to help people get jobs. In the wake of unemployment, we have a drug problem. There was no such problem in the last depression, but it is a problem now, and I hope members opposite will study it seriously. I would not accuse the member for Mawson of treating this as a joke, although I notice he is laughing.

I am pretty rough, I know, but, for God's sake, when people speak of drugs don't treat it as a joke. I am pleased to see the member for Henley Beach has got that stupid smile off of his face. I would like to see the Premier lose his smile tonight. Crime is another thing that unemployment creates. Broken homes are a big problem. I do not know whether members on the other side give these things thought, but I lie awake at night (and did so before I got into Parliament, I add) wondering what will happen, because of my children, my friends' children and my workmates' children.

Alcoholism is another result of unemployment. People can say that the unemployed are a lot of drunks because they see a heap of lads on the booze. What members want to understand is why they are on the drink. They are people who are not able to get jobs. What can they do? These are the sorts of problem that the young people have facing them that, thank God, I did not have to face, because I might have ended up the same way. I like a drink, don't worry, and I did smoke for 30 years, but, by

God, I hate drugs and I don't like to see alcoholism. These are the things that I cannot stand when the Liberals speak against trade unions and defend capitalism. Capitalism! My God, this country, Australia, is going to end up a quarry because the Liberals are giving the country away—they are giving it to the multi-nationals. When you speak about anything at all it involves money—all members opposite can see is the dollar sign. I have noticed since I have been in this House (and I have been a member only since 15 September) that every time members opposite speak about uranium one can see the dollar signs come into their eyes. They are not worrying about the safety of the individual; they are not worrying about what will happen in the next 1 000 or 2 000 years. I have spoken to a few Liberals from another State, and they agree with me; they cannot stand the thought of uranium mining. We can do without uranium mining, don't worry about that. Don't ever be convinced that we have to mine it, because we do not.

I am a member of the Australian Workers Union, so immediately members opposite say that I support uranium mining because members of that union are wrong. I am from the South Australian branch of the Australian Workers Union and I have always opposed it and always will oppose it until I can be shown that it is safe to mine uranium.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order in interjecting.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that you are the Speaker because I think that you are the fairest Speaker that I could possibly have to protect me. I am trying to put a point. I am trying to explain one of the reasons why I cannot accept liberalism and capitalism. I am a socialist. Members on the other side talk about socialism. I live not far from Glenelg and I love swimming and walking. I go walking on the beach down around Glenelg. I have walked up and down that beach and have not seen a socialist, yet the member for Glenelg, I guarantee, has told his constituents that there are socialists, communists and unionists under every grain of sand in this area; that's how he gets them to vote for him. I have voted in that area and have seen the poor old people come in out of their sick beds to vote for him because he has put the fear of anything into them by telling them they have to vote Liberal otherwise—

Mr. Mathwin: I got the biggest majority I've ever had.

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

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite do not like it when I start rubbing it into them about their liberalism, because, in actual fact, most of the people on the other side (and I am not saying that the honourable gentlemen on the other side are without brains), particularly the new members, should have been allowed to speak and think for themselves a little because, in actual fact, every one of them who got up and spoke made it very clear that he had been told to get up and knock the unions, knock socialism and keep away from everything else. I feel sorry for the members for Mallee, Henley Beach and Mawson, because it is terrible when people cannot speak their own minds. I am fortunate to be on this side of the House, and I am pleased to say that the Leader did not come to me and drum into me, "Don't you say this, don't you say that"; that has not been the case. I am able to say what I like, and it is hurting the people over there. When you all start coming in I am very pleased—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to honourable members opposite as "honourable members opposite", not as "you".

Mr. PLUNKETT: I apologise, Sir; I accept that. Members, I will give you a resume of my history—

Members interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am pleased that the Premier has walked in. He still has a smile on his face. I have taken the smile off the face of the member for Henley Beach and a few others here, but I see that the Premier is still smiling. The only time I have seen that smile off the Premier's face was a week before the election. It was his campaign director who accomplished that and I take my hat off to him. What they must have done was feed him on lemons for a week, and I advise the same treatment for the member for Henley Beach. It is becoming an increasingly popular theme for the conservative elements in our society, the Liberal Party, the Country Party and the Democrats, to attempt to denigrate, belittle or in some other way blur the role of organised Labor in this country. Accusations of being communists, fellow travellers, and socialists are common to the heroics of those people opposed to the demands of working people to improve their standard of living.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Who wrote that part?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I wrote it myself. I must say I do not enjoy the best of eyesight and have trouble reading, but if the honourable gentleman is to go off the bat as well as I am able to he will need to practice. What he will have to do to get that practice is spend 53 years as a worker; that is the practice that I had. I travelled, during my working life, as an organiser for the Australian Workers Union in the South-East, for 6½ years, and in the city for 3½ years. As President of that union, I travelled with one of my comrades who was one of the best educated persons I have ever travelled with. Over a drink one night I said to him, "My God, I'd love to have your education." He said, "Keith, I'll tell you something; don't ever wish that you had my education. My education can be learnt out of books, but your education can never be learnt without practical experience." One has to be a worker to be able to speak like I speak. I would like to quote a saying of a very good friend of mine, Eddie Ward, who said:

I went to the university of adversity and the school of hard knocks where the lessons are long and never forgotten. That was the education I had. The education I received was from people who worked in industry. Some of those people were squatters. I could sit around a table with a squatter and discuss things with him as well as with any of my workmates.

Farmers have never been assisted in any way by the Liberal Party, because it is not interested in the smaller farmer or the smaller business. It is interested only in the big capitalist squatter, the likes of the Frasers and the Beggs—I could name the lot of them. They are all capitalists; they are not just ordinary farmers. The poor old farmer has never been assisted in any way by the Liberal Government. I am not only talking about the Liberal Government in this State; I am talking about the federals. If one sits down and speaks to the farmer in his own home, one sees he has never got any kicks along for making a living. He has had the fear of communism driven into him by the Liberal Party. The small business people have never been assisted.

I was a laughing stock when I first got up to speak. They thought, "Who is this uneducated person who left school at 13½ years of age? What would he know? He is not a solicitor or doctor, what is he? He is a bloody shearer. He has worked in different industries." I even had a school teacher ring me prior to the election. She asked me what qualifications I had to represent her in standing for the seat of Peake. I told her the qualifications that I had—that I have been a working man all my life, and surely a worker

should represent a worker.

Mr. Gunn: You are no Robinson Crusoe.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am not saying that I am Robinson Crusoe. All my colleagues are of the same mind. I would say there are many members on the other side who have never been workers.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Turn it up!

Mr. PLUNKETT: I hear the honourable member for Alexandra say, "Turn it up." I have been with plenty of shearing contractors, and I have never seen them work hard yet. They always put some poor devil on to do the work. I can see how hard the honourable gentleman who comes here in the morning and then comes here again at night time for about 10 minutes works. He does his other business for the rest of the day. I was surprised when I came into the House. I put in a lot of time in his area. I thought, "My God, this bloke must have something." I was convinced that he was a pretty capable person. Since 15 September, I have hardly ever seen him here. I have seen him come in the morning, stay for 10 minutes, leave, and then late again at night.

An honourable member: Who are you referring to?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am referring to the honourable gentleman who sits at the end of the House. You can put a name to him if you want to do so. The thing that amazed me about this sort of thing is that he draws a politician's salary. I can recall this same gentleman opposing an increase in wages for politicians a couple of years ago. He said that he would not have a bar of the increases. He thought that politicians were getting enough as it was. After being here for five or six weeks, I agree that he is getting paid plenty, because he is getting most of his money out of his own business. I do not want to throw aspersions on too many people, however.

I sympathise with some members opposite in relation to their misunderstanding of unions. I felt very sorry when the member for Glenelg made a fool of himself in this place concerning trade unions. My colleague said that he could research the stuff in the Library and that he did not know. I am very pleased that he was told this, and I hope he researched the matter and that some of the new members, and the older ones, as well, do some research on unions so that they can understand what they are all about. If they do, they will not criticise the unions.

I have heard a lot about compulsory strike ballots. In 1965-68 there was a Royal Commission the Chairman being the Hon. Lord Donovan. I will not bore members with the details, as I think they should research it themselves.

Mr. Mathwin: You have already.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is one thing that you cannot say. Not one member opposite has gone out to have a cup of coffee. The only one who has left is my colleague who sits in front of me, and he has bad ears. If members would give me a little bit of silence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the part on compulsory strike ballots, and I suggest that the honourable gentleman find this—

Mr. Mathwin: It is from the U.K.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Strikes are the same whether from here or in any other country. Surely, you do not think the trade unions operate any differently in other countries. I thought you had some intelligence. I want to continue thinking that way. Surely a trade unionist, just because he is in this country, is no different from anyone in another country.

Mr. Lewis: Russia?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I do not know whether the honourable gentleman has been to Russia. The Premier would be well advised to send a few of his colleagues to Russia and China to let them have a look around and get a

bit of experience. It is no good just sitting back and saying, "Russia". I have not been there, but I have read about it. I advise the honourable gentlemen to read about a country such as Russia before they say anything. It is the old question of the ostrich with its head in the sand. Members opposite criticise things and never do any research. The article on compulsory strike ballots states:

A number of witnesses have suggested to us that a secret ballot should be required before a strike can lawfully take place. This proposal is based on the belief that workers are likely to be less militant than their leaders and that, given the opportunity of such a ballot, they would often be likely to vote against strike action. It is clear that the scope of any legislation to this end, if it were to be effective, would have to be confined to major official strikes. A law forbidding strike action before the holding of a secret ballot could not be enforced in the case of small-scale unofficial stoppages, which make up the overwhelming majority of the total number of strikes. There is little justification in the available evidence for the view that workers are less likely to vote for strike action than their leaders; and findings from our workshop relations survey, already cited, confirm this. Experience in the U.S.A. has been that strike ballots are overwhelmingly likely to go in favour of strike action. This is also the experience of Canada, where strike ballots are compulsory in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. Two instances of ballots held in recent years in this country where the vote went against strike action are sometimes quoted in support of the case for compulsory secret ballots. One was held in connection with an industry-wide wage claim in engineering in 1962, and one in connection with action to secure the reinstatement of certain employees dismissed by the Ford Motor Company in 1963. But these ballots were held on the initiative of the unions concerned. They do not provide reliable evidence of what the outcome would be if ballots were held in quite different circumstances, and under the compulsion of the law.

Although I will not read the remainder of it, I think I have read sufficient for members to be able to understand that what Government members have been talking about over the past few weeks, as regards compulsory strike ballots, is complete rot. That points out to them that, if they were to research the matter before opening their mouth and saying something, it would do them good. The member for Henley Beach is nodding his head, because he is in agreement; he has worked as a unionist.

If five members of my union require a secret ballot, all they need to do is to raise their hands. A week prior to 15 September, I organised a meeting, in conjunction with other officials from the Australian Workers Union, of all council workers in the metropolitan area. We held the meeting at the Dom Polski Centre, Angas Street, Adelaide, and transported those attending in buses. About 1 400 attended the meeting, as a result of which they received at least \$10 a week increase in wages. We could show that the members were sick and tired of working for a take-home pay of about \$110 a week. Many of these workers have families and young children, and are paying off houses and motor cars. If any member tried to live on \$110 a week, he would realise that it is impossible.

I have a wife who has been educated to cook ordinary meals. We do not go out, and that type of thing. She can make a meal from almost anything, but she could not keep house on that pay. There is not much industrial action among council workers. They might get another increase next year. The rubbish that some Government members have been saying about trade unions is wrong. The worst part of it is that they know it is wrong, yet they still say it, and that really upsets me. I am a reasonable person. I have a bad temper. I have plenty of friends on the side of the

Government, and I have friends and relations in other States who are Liberals. I can speak to any of them. Because I am not some educated giant from a university, or anything like that, Government members should not think that that will affect how in Parliament I represent my constituents. I have mixed with different types of people all my life.

In the time remaining, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being reasonable and fair. I have spoken about experiences in my own life. I hope that, with more experience, I will be able to polish myself up and speak more acceptably to the House. I apologise to any member whom I may have offended.

Mr. PETERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

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 10 p.m.
Motion carried.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence with the House of Assembly resolution for the appointment of a Joint Committee and intimated that it would be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form the quorum necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee, the members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council to be the Hons. J. A. Carnie, B. A. Chatterton, and R. C. DeGaris.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

PYAP IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1—

Page 1, line 11 (clause 3)—After “amended” insert “(a)”.

No. 2—

Page 1 (clause 3)—After line 14 insert paragraph as follows:

and

(b) by striking out from subsection (1) the definition of “market value” and insert in lieu thereof the following definition:

“market value” of cattle means the value of the cattle calculated as if—

(a) the cattle were free from disease; and

(b) the cattle were sold and delivered to the purchaser—

(i) at the place where the cattle were

when ordered to be destroyed or when consent for their destruction was given; or

(ii) where the cattle are taken by and at the expense of the owner of the cattle to abattoirs designated by the chief inspector or an inspector when ordering or consenting to their destruction—at the abattoirs where the cattle were destroyed.

No. 3—

Page 1, lines 18 and 19 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (b).

No. 4—

Page 1, lines 20 to 25 and page 2, lines 1 and 2 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert paragraph as follows:

and

(c) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

(2) Where the chief inspector or an inspector orders or consents to the destruction of cattle in the circumstances referred to in subsection (1) (a) or (1) (c) of this section, he may, by notice in writing given to the owner of the cattle, direct that the cattle be taken by the owner to abattoirs designated in the notice so that they may be destroyed at those abattoirs.

(2a) If the owner of cattle fails to comply with a direction under subsection (2) of this section, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

(2b) It shall be a defence to a charge of an offence against subsection (2a) of this section for the defendant to prove that the direction to which the charge relates was not reasonable in the circumstances.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. I will briefly explain why my colleagues in the other place have chosen to amend the Bill, which, a few days ago, we agreed to. It appears that, in relation to clause 3, the definition of “market value” (that is, of the carcass or portion of the carcass of the cattle for which compensation is to be paid) was left as it was; in the opinion of my colleagues and/or their advisers, this was inadequate. The amendment is minor in words but, in their opinion, apparently major in intention. I have had the benefit of explanations during the dinner adjournment. The Parliamentary Counsel, my colleagues, senior officers of the department and I are now satisfied that, indeed, it is essential to provide this new definition, as it is designed to bring the present definition into conformity with what has been the current practice.

Where the cattle are destroyed on the farm on which they are condemned the market value should, as the present definition suggests, be calculated on the basis of a hypothetical sale of healthy cattle to a purchaser who accepts delivery on the farm. If, however, the owner is required to take the cattle to a designated abattoirs for destruction, the hypothetical market value should obviously reflect the expense of transporting the cattle to the abattoirs. The present definition does not provide for this; hence, an expanded definition is inserted which will mean that the enhancements of value resulting from transportation of cattle to the abattoirs will be reflected in the compensation payable under the principal Act. Those

notes which have accompanied the material forwarded to me from the other place sufficiently explain the reasons behind amendment No. 1. I seek the support of members opposite, and I am confident that I have the support of Government members, to uphold the request that has come from the Legislative Council. Further, it is my understanding that there was no voiced objection from any of the members in that place with respect to amendment No. 1.

With respect to the second amendment before the House, wherein it is proposed to replace section 5 (2a), objection was taken to this provision on the grounds that it confers too wide a discretion upon the Minister. Members will note that in the original Bill the Minister had the power to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I have given undertakings to industry to fully explain these provisions. Subsection (2a), which is subject to this amendment, deals with Ministerial powers to apply compensation to specific cattle which are destroyed outside the designated abattoirs. I would hope, on the basis of the comment a moment ago by my colleague, that the House supports the amendment giving effect, for the time being, to deleting that subsection. Likewise, I support the move involving the minor amendment No. 3 as put forward by our colleagues in the other place.

Motion carried.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Chairman. In April 1979 the Art Gallery Board requested that the Act be amended to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Chairman by the Governor. The need for an appropriate person who can act in the absence of the Chairman has been perceived for some time, and the matter has become particularly urgent, as the present Chairman of the board will be overseas during 1980.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 provides for the appointment by the Governor of a Deputy Chairman. Clause 3 provides that, in the absence of the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman shall preside at any meeting of the board. In the absence of both the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, the members present at the meeting shall elect one of their number to preside at the meeting. I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present—

Mr. Hemmings: On the third recount.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whilst the Speaker is on his feet undertaking procedural matters, all honourable members will refrain from comment. That includes the honourable member for Napier. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This measure has our support. It is a machinery Bill and one that we would have introduced had we still been in Government.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 19 February 1980 at 2 p.m.

I have moved this motion because the Government has honoured its undertakings to Parliament and the public that we would complete the programme outlined. That programme which we outlined at the start of this part of the session was that we would introduce a Budget, albeit a Budget delayed due to an election which the Opposition no doubt deemed to be untimely. We undertook to get the Budget through as expeditiously as we could. We did that, after giving the Opposition five hours more than average allowed in the past six years. We completed that undertaking.

We introduced Bills of great significance to the public of South Australia to give effect to some of our election promises; namely, Bills to abolish succession duties and gift duties and to provide significant pay-roll tax concessions. We introduced some minor Bills with the cooperation of the Opposition. We were able to despatch those measures quickly, as we have demonstrated tonight.

Mr. Duncan: You know something about running quickly; you're running scared.

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As this is the last day of the sitting before the Christmas season—

Mr. Duncan: Shame!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Elizabeth can cry "shame" but members know how he behaved in Government. We know the privileges which were withdrawn from the then Opposition. I make no apology for the fact that we have completed our undertakings and we intend that the House shall rise today.

I would like to wish all the people associated with the working of Parliament all the best for the Christmas season. I take the opportunity of thanking the Parliament House staff and wishing them and all members, including the member for Elizabeth, the best of Christmas greetings. I mention particularly those who make this place so harmonious to work in. The Clerks at the table—

Mr. Duncan: If it's so harmonious, why don't you stay here longer?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously asked the honourable member for Elizabeth not to interject. I warn the honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Elizabeth is so churlish that he will not join in extending good wishes to the staff, he is running true to form. I would like to refer to the Clerks of the House who have recently been appointed, and take the opportunity of congratulating them and you, Mr. Speaker, and the other officers who have recently assumed office here. The *Hansard* staff have invariably given us good service in the whole of the time that I have been associated with Parliament House. The office staff, including the typists and the messengers, have all been helpful and obliging, as have been the library staff.

I mention all these people because they have given significant service and they continue to do so, and they have done so again this year. I refer to Miss Stengert and the catering staff who have given us outstanding help and service. The telephonists, the caretakers and anyone who

is associated in any way with the efficient running of this Parliament and this institution is deserving of our thanks, which I proffer at this time. It is a team effort at Parliament House. I have been told that there are about 70 people involved in the efficient running of this place, and we owe them a considerable debt of gratitude. I do not intend to elaborate on the motion. I made clear that the Government has honoured its undertaking to the public and the Opposition.

We extend to members of the opposition, along with the Parliament House staff, the best of good wishes for the Christmas season and hope that they come back refreshed in the new year.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the motion. The date is 13 November, and here we are facing the ludicrous spectacle of the Deputy Premier and Leader of the House wishing us all a merry Christmas and suggesting that we as members of Parliament of this State should pack up our bags, go home and not return until later in the new year. Admittedly, John Martin's Christmas pageant was held on Saturday, and it would appear that the Deputy Premier, along with some other members, was present. That possibly encouraged him to think that Christmas had arrived and that it was time for us to leave. However, I point out that not only are there many shopping days to Christmas but also there are many days of business that should be cleared up in this House before we rise. It is quite extraordinary that the new Government, which has already during the course of this session requested special concessions from the Opposition so that the Budget debate could take place prior to the Address in Reply, should guillotine that Budget debate, and now, at the beginning of a Parliamentary week, in an unprecedented manner, adjourn the House. This move is completely contrary to the expectation not only of members on this side but also of members opposite.

Our advice from the Government was quite clearly that we would be sitting throughout this week. Indeed, when the original schedule for Parliamentary sittings was published, it was suggested that there would be a further week beyond this week if the business of the House required it, and indeed it does. We are still in the middle of the Address in Reply debate, and there are still at least two new members of this House who have not yet made their contributions to that debate: the member for Semaphore was due to speak some time during this week and, on the other side, the member for Mallee, who appears to have been muzzled by his colleagues in the Government. Apart from the discourtesy to new members, we have the unprecedented act of closing up the House before the Address in Reply debate has finished.

There is indeed business to be conducted. The schedule suggested that business would continue until the end of next week. In fact, following the guillotine on the Budget, we were told that a limited time would be allowed for the Address in Reply debate, and it was to be finalised at the end of this week. It is interesting that by adjourning the House at this stage the Government is avoiding questions on notice that it has to answer each Tuesday and is also avoiding questions without notice that it flounders through every day Parliament sits. In addition, by allowing the Address in Reply debate to continue into the new year, the Government is successfully avoiding private members' business for a portion of that time. All in all, it seems to be a quite clear attempt by the Government to muzzle Parliament, to suppress the rights of the Opposition and to ensure that the Government gets up and out of this place as quickly as it can, because, to be quite frank, the Government has discovered that Parliament is the kitchen,

it is extremely hot in here, and it has to go.

Last week the Deputy Premier told us that we would be definitely sitting throughout this week. Indeed, some of us made arrangements as a consequence of that, and I will indicate a personal example. I invited some guests into the House tomorrow evening, and I waited until Thursday to finally confirm with them that we would be sitting on that night and that they could enjoy hospitality here. I checked right up until virtually that last moment that we would in fact be sitting throughout this week. It was not until yesterday at 11.30 in a telephone call to my deputy that we learned for the first time that the Deputy Premier, apparently of his own volition and without any reference to Cabinet, had decided that the House would rise tonight. That was completely inconsistent with the schedule that we were given. All members are provided with a legislative programme that sets out the business of the week as the Government sees it.

This week's programme clearly spelt out that we would be sitting not only on Tuesday but also on Wednesday and Thursday and that we would conclude our debates on Thursday 15 November. That sheet is prepared on a Monday and is circulated to the Opposition some time later the same morning. We received that in the normal course of events. In fact, that was contrary to the advice we had been given by the Deputy Premier. It was even more striking to notice that, after contacting the Government Whip, because the Deputy Premier was not available, I found that he was totally ignorant that arrangements had been changed. The Deputy Premier made a last-minute panic decision to finish sittings of this House today instead of allowing it to run the full week. These circumstances seem quite extraordinary, and for this reason the Opposition strongly opposes this motion. It is unprecedented to finish the sittings of the House before Christmas without the Address in Reply debate having been completed.

I have spoken about new members' opportunities. What are the reasons we have been given? In an unprecedented situation, one would have a right to expect that there were some strong and cogent reasons why the Government wants the House to rise at the beginning of a scheduled sitting week. We have been given little indication by the Deputy Premier tonight of the reasons. He will probably try to put up some feeble excuses in the light of the remarks I am making during the course of this debate, but to date we have heard nothing from him except what has been printed in the press.

The point that the Leader made in the press was that Government Ministers needed time to become familiar with their departments and the machinery of government. That is a very interesting admission. Certainly, Opposition members have noticed the Ministers' lack of familiarity with their departments, and their total fumbling and ineptitude in regard to the workings of government. We concede that they certainly need to take some lessons and learn more about government, but let us put that in perspective: the Ministers need time to become familiar with government.

For a start, the House sits at 2 p.m. on only three days of the week. In other words, throughout the week, from Monday to Friday, every morning is free for work in the Ministers' departments, and each Monday and Friday is totally free for work in the Cabinet and as Ministers. It seems that a lot of time could be set aside if the Ministers were prepared to get up early enough in the morning and get into their offices to make themselves familiar with their departments.

Secondly, the Address in Reply debate on which we have been engaged does not require Ministerial

attendance. The Ministers can continue to work. They have offices in Parliament House and public servants who are familiar with coming here to work on dockets and to discuss matters of policy with Ministers. There is no way in the world that the Address in Reply debate ties up the Ministers in a way that prevents them, during the time Parliament is sitting in the week, from going about their ordinary departmental business and work. Again, it is extraordinary that they suggest they need more time in that situation.

Thirdly, we would have been quite happy to give Ministers one or two weeks off in the course of the sitting. The Government said, "We will commence our sittings on a certain day and we will sit right through without a break." The previous Government ensured that the Parliamentary sittings were broken up and that we would have two or three weeks of sitting and then a week off. If the practice had been adopted by the new Government, it would have been seen as perfectly reasonable. That proposition was never put to us. It was never suggested. It was the Deputy Premier himself who said, "We will be sitting through continuously until we get these debates over." Now, he has decided that he cannot do that and the House must rise.

Finally, the Government may well argue that there have been late sitting nights. Indeed, that is true, but I point out that the time to which the House sits each night is very much in the Government's hands. All members know that if we sit late and if we carry our business into the early hours of the morning, it is because the Government permits us to do so.

Again, that is no excuse; particularly during the Address in Reply debate, when we have been rising at the normal time of 10 p.m. or 10.30 p.m., it is absolutely no argument that could be put by the Government. That is the argument about the time for Ministers to become familiar with their departments. One would argue, looking at their performance, that Ministers need familiarisation with their departments. It is not through lack of time, but because of the confusion and disruption in Government departments, resulting, first, from their absurd administrative arrangements, their putting together of functions which have found it very difficult to gel and which are at odds with each other, such as transport, recreation and sport, health and tourism, the Chief Secretary and the police with fisheries.

Secondly, the extra work caused by the creation of new departments and the splitting of departments and overlapping responsibilities has made the task of familiarisation much more difficult. Fisheries and Agriculture have been dismembered; there is the State Development and Trade and Industry confusion; the Mines and Energy and Tourism relationship; the splitting of Community Development; and Housing being torn away from Urban and Regional Affairs. All these administrative changes may have made it difficult for Ministers to become familiar with their departments, because they have broken up the orderly Public Service arrangements of the previous Government. In the course of that, the Public Service itself has gone offside. Political moves, especially those made by the Minister of Housing and others revealed in the course of this session, have resulted in problems with the Public Service.

It seems clear that the time taken for familiarisation can be laid at the feet of the Government itself. The Government has wasted time in this House, it has taken up Question Time with long and turgid statements, Ministerial and others. It has organised a round robin of questions under the guillotine from its back-benchers to prolong the Budget debate. There has been acute

sensitivity on the part of Ministers about their performance.

It did not take them long to tear up some of the previous Government's projects, to open and unveil various other things in the community that were prepared or developed while our Government was in office. They have come into Government claiming to have a programme to put into operation, and they have been found wanting in that.

This Parliament is really rising because of the difficulties revealed in its administration over the past few weeks, with all the problems in the economy, the problems with the Budget, and the pay-roll tax measures. We recall the pay-roll tax legislation being introduced, with the Premier telling us that it was in order, and that the Opposition's criticisms were nonsense, but late one night the Bill came back to this House with amendments to be made, all recognising that our criticisms had been valid.

There have been examples of muddling and ineptitude on the part of the Government, making it clear why it wants to get out of this House as quickly as possible. They cannot afford to stay, even for another two days, as originally programmed. They hope that, in the time between Christmas (which is six weeks away) and the resumption of Parliament, they will get a better run from the media than they have had within this House. They hope to cover up some of their administrative problems, and they hope that some of their Cabinet problems discussed today in Question Time, with Ministers making contradictory statements, can be papered over.

The answer to the question why we are rising at this stage is not because there is no business or because they need time to familiarise themselves with their portfolios: it is because of the Government's performance. We think of the performance of the Deputy Premier, who promised the House a long statement on uranium.

Mr. Payne: You can't believe anything he says.

Mr. BANNON: It appears that, in the course of my remarks, I have been informed that an arrangement made with the Deputy Premier has now been cancelled, which is absolutely typical of what is going on at the moment in this House. I was told that I was given until—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr. Wright: Four minutes you agreed to reply.

Mr. BANNON: An arrangement has been broken. I put on record in *Hansard* that an arrangement has been broken whereby I was to speak until 9.50 p.m. on this subject. I have now been advised that, in view of the remarks that have been made (and presumably they have hurt the Government and it cannot take it, which is the same reason the Government is pulling the House up at this stage), the grievance debate has now been cancelled. I ask the Deputy Premier to confirm whether that is indeed the case.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Leader does not know who his Whip is. The last thing that happened was that Mr. McRae came across and said, "You will take 10 minutes, he will take 10 minutes, and you will get 10 minutes to reply." The Opposition has three managers; that is the problem. The Opposition does not know who is in charge.

Mr. BANNON: I am afraid that the Deputy Premier has a work history of the schoolroom and of the Opposition benches. Between the two experiences, he has shown that he is simply not fit to be the Leader of this House. His style is abrasive and abusive; he is not trustworthy in terms of the arrangements he has made; he seems to think he is disciplining a class of schoolboys instead of dealing with legislators in the State of South Australia; and he seems to forget that he is the Leader of the Government, capable of decisions, instead of a rumbustious Opposition agitator,

the role he has played for the past five years.

The Opposition will not tolerate that. If this House, and this democratic institution, breaks down it will be because of behaviour like the honourable member's. I understand that some discussion has ensued and that the school master has relented. I simply say that we are being forced to rise because the Government does not feel fully capable of facing the Opposition in this House. It has been uncomfortable because of the questions it has been asked. Also, the Government is aware of the number of serious issues raised, and is not prepared to accept them. It is, indeed, a sorry start for the new Government. Today's statements were indicative of the Government's arrogance. Two major policy statements were made on which the Opposition had no right of reply, or any comeback. If that is how the Government is going to start in government, and if that is a sign of things to come, we are in for a difficult three years.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): Whatever arrangement was made—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Premier speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No wonder they call him "hurricane lantern"; he is dim and has to be carried. I shall not reply at length now because, unfortunately, there are three managers on the other side of the House. When I was making the Budget debate arrangements I went to the then Whip. He could not make up his mind, so I went to the Leader. However, he could not make up his mind either, and said "Caucus will have to decide tomorrow." The same thing has happened all along the line. If anyone talks about pathetic performance, and if anybody sitting in the gallery will make comparisons in relation to pathetic performances—

The SPEAKER: Order! Reference to the gallery is not permitted in debate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Anybody reading *Hansard* would know where the pathetic performance was; and we have witnessed another one tonight. I will keep my part of the bargain. The last arrangement made with the third Opposition Whip was that we would have 10 minutes each; I would speak for 10 minutes, the Leader would speak for 10 minutes and I would have the right of reply. I finished up with two minutes. I reject the garbage spoken by the Leader. When Labor came into Government in 1970, the Liberal Party waited for a month or two before the Labor Government decided to bring Parliament together. This Government brought Parliament together at short notice. It had had no time to prepare a lengthy legislative programme which, of course, is required. The Government is doing the sensible thing, it has honoured its undertaking to the public and to members opposite. The Deputy Leader agreed with me that it would not be a bad idea to carry over the Address in Reply debate to next year. He said that to me last week. I ask honourable members to judge the rights of this.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I think the first matter I must put straight tonight is the allegation in this morning's press that I made no protest yesterday when the Deputy Premier called me in relation to the early closing down of the House.

I have been in this House since July 1971. Whilst I have not always been proud of my own conduct in this place (I would be less than honest if I did not say that), and I have been somewhat reticent about some of the situations that have occurred in this place, I have never before seen an example such as that set this week in this House, or for that matter for the whole of this Parliament, by this Government. People have been denied their rights in this place. The Government started off on an arrogant note in this place, and it is finishing off on a more arrogant note. I give this warning to the Government— if it continues with this arrogance, it will be their downfall before its 3½ years is up, because no Government can carry on in the manner the Government is pursuing at the moment if democracy is to be retained in this House.

The telephone call I received from the Deputy Premier yesterday went something like this: he said, "Jack, it's our intention to close down tomorrow night. Do you have any objections?" I said, "If there are any objections, our executive will be meeting at 2.15 p.m., and I'll tell you about those objections." The Deputy Premier cannot deny that. I said, "What about the new members who haven't spoken? Surely they have some rights in this place. It doesn't matter about the old hands. They have had the joy of speaking in many debates," but I was concerned about the new members. The Deputy Premier assured me that that would be agreed to. However, I notice that one Government member has not had the opportunity of speaking.

At about 3.15 p.m. yesterday, the Deputy Premier was advised (after keeping his own Whip ignorant of the situation throughout the day, and I suppose that the remainder of back-bench members were not informed; he kept the Whip on the telephone for 17½ minutes while the Whip tried to contact him) to the effect that the Opposition was objecting to the early closing down of the House. They are the facts, not as reported in this morning's *Advertiser* where the Deputy Premier alleged that I had made no comment at that stage, and did not object. I told him this was not a one-man band. I told him the executive was discussing the matter and that, if there were objections, this would be conveyed to him. That was the proper way of going about it. If the Liberal Party is a one-man band, the Labor Party is not. The Labor Party acts on a consensus vote, whereas it appears that a one-man decision was made in this regard.

Last week, going on the list that had been provided to us, we were unaware whether we would sit for a week or two more weeks (it could even have been three weeks). I was walking past the Deputy Premier's office, put my head in, and said, "What about putting us in the picture about the sittings of the House?" The Deputy Premier said, "I think we'll get up next week." I said, "Will you get up next week, or are you only thinking about it?" He said, "I think we'll finish next Thursday," or two days from now. I said, "Can I convey that to the Leader?" He said, "Yes, that'll be the plan."

Proof that he said that to me was the sheet that came out yesterday morning advising us of the sittings of the House, that it would be sitting for the rest of the week, and the

Opposition made plans on that basis. Yet the decision was made, and it was not even a Cabinet decision, because Cabinet had not met in the morning. So, the Deputy Premier made the unilateral decision to get up today, after one day's sitting, thus depriving us of five whole days sittings. On the programme we received, it was the Government's intention to sit the whole of this week, and into the following week. I am not complaining about next week, because that does not worry me a great deal. No plans outside the political arena were made to that accord. I believed what the Deputy Premier told me last week that we would be sitting this week. The Opposition would have been satisfied to sit the rest of this week, and would not have complained. The personal guarantee was given to me, and I think that the Government should certainly have honoured that undertaking, as I had conveyed it to the rest of my Party.

One must consider this situation seriously. The Government had intended to sit a further two days, but suddenly collapses. One needs to ask questions about that. Is something being hidden? Is something going on in the State that the people and the Opposition have not been told about? Is something going to happen tomorrow or Thursday that the Government is worried about?

Mr. Keneally: Is it the hit list?

Mr. Wright: It could be. The Minister of Health admitted today that there is a hit list. That is the first admission we have had about the Liberal Party's hit list. It is there for the whole of the State to see. I am concerned about this situation. The whole attitude of this Government, right from the commencement point, has been one of total arrogance, standing over the Opposition, and creating positions that did not exist before; all these matters have been concerning the people of South Australia as well as the Opposition. Today we see the finale. It is the meanest and lowest trick that has been played in this House since I have been here. I have not always agreed with some things done in the heat of the moment and I have later criticised myself for them. I have had my problems and disputes in this House as other members have.

However, I have never been involved in a premeditated tipping of the bucket on a former Minister who is not here to defend himself. The Opposition will not have the opportunity to defend that Minister in the House tomorrow, as we will not be sitting. I am talking about the former Minister of Transport. The present Minister of Transport, whether of his own volition or of the volition of the Government, today accused the previous Minister of maladministration. Everyone who knows the Hon. G. T. Virgo knows that he would not maladminister. Whatever he did would have been in the best interests of this State and its people. No opportunity was given to the Opposition today. We had to wait until Question Time was over and then the bucket was tipped by the Minister of Transport, with no opportunity for redress by the Opposition on behalf of the previous Minister of Transport. I condemn that action. It was the meanest, lowest and most despicable trick that I have ever seen in this House. Whatever sins I have committed in this House would not compare with that one.

We heard the Minister of Industrial Affairs give us a long resumé about the Public Buildings Department. He also laid the blame fairly and squarely at the feet of either past Ministers or, more importantly, the head of the branch at that time, Mr. Dunn, who has no opportunity of defending himself. That position has been adequately covered by a statement issued by the former Premier tonight, and therefore I will say no more about it. If the Government is going to continue in its present vein it

cannot expect a very good future in this House, because the Opposition will keep exposing it on every opportunity that it gets. That is one of the reasons why the House is not sitting beyond this point.

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I remind the Opposition that when it won Government in 1970 it took an inordinately long time to call Parliament together. We were forced to call this House together because we had the pressing business of getting through a State Budget, which was behind schedule, and also implementing some election promises which we had given to the public of South Australia. We have honoured those promises. We told the public and the Opposition that when we had done those things the House would rise. The Opposition knew that.

Regarding this business about the guillotine, the precedent was set last year by the then Deputy Leader of the Government, the defeated member for Brighton, Hon. Hugh Hudson. He applied the guillotine, so do not let the Opposition squawk about that. I remind the Deputy Leader that last week he was quite happy at the suggestion that the Address in Reply debate could be carried over. He has mentioned the member for Mallee. That member, with other new members on this side, was quite happy. I sought them out and asked whether they minded carrying their speeches over, and they had no objection whatsoever. The supposition by the Deputy Leader is in error on that score, too.

I understand that the member for Semaphore agreed not to speak so that he could have a grizzle tonight. We can hardly be blamed for that situation. In relation to all the Questions on Notice that the Opposition says have not been answered, I think the Premier today pointed out that a record number of Question on Notice have been processed by this Government in half the time. This Government has processed a record number, more than double, in half the time. Obviously, if we sat until Christmas, the Opposition would not be satisfied on that score. This nonsense about depriving members of answers to question is so much balderdash.

My recollection of my conversation with the Deputy Leader (and, of course, this is a matter of memory) is that I said "We will finish next week." That is what we are doing. The Opposition has said that I will not co-operate. I represented the Opposition in negotiations with the then Deputy Premier, Mr. Corcoran, after the changes instituted by the then Attorney-General (now the Chief Justice) had constricted the rights of members markedly. We were going to be invited to a conference on Mondays about the programme for the week. On the first Monday, we fronted up. The Whip was with me.

Mr. Wright: Let's talk about the present.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition says it is hard done by, but let us compare the style of Government. I was never telephoned when any change in the Government's programme was mooted. I and the then Opposition Whip walked into the office of the Deputy Premier for this so-called conference to be convened in terms of Mr. King's change of Standing Orders. We had a programme stuck under our nose. I could not use the adjectives that were used. It was a matter of, "This is the so-and-so programme, we are the so-and-so Government, and you so-and-sos like it or lump it." That is how the then Government dealt with us, and the Whip will testify to that.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not been here long enough to know the treatment that was meted out to

us in Opposition. We have treated the Opposition with kid gloves. As to its allegations about fumbling, if ever one saw an ineffective and fumbling Opposition, one would only have had to see the charade of Opposition that has been going on here in the past four weeks. We are adjourning the session for the reason that we enunciated at the beginning of it, namely, that we were sitting to put the Budget through and to put through the election promises. We have done it. We said that we would sit for four weeks, or possibly longer if we did not have time to put those matters through. Now they have been carried.

Members opposite have short memories. The fact is that, when they were in Government, they sought on every occasion to grind the Opposition into the dirt by fair means or foul. Now they complain about the treatment we have given them, but I believe that the treatment has been eminently fair. I reject the allegations. They must whinge about something. In my portfolio, the tactics of the Opposition have been to postulate a pack of lies and ask me to respond to them.

The SPEAKER: Order! I indicated to the House earlier today that use of the term "lies" would not be tolerated by the Chair in any circumstances. I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the words.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. They were a pack of falsehoods. The Opposition then expects the Government to respond, and it claims it is being effective.

Mr. WRIGHT: I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do this reluctantly. The Deputy Premier is continually speaking to the gallery. I thought that honourable members were supposed to look at you, Sir, when speaking.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I can't bear to look at you.

The SPEAKER: Order! An honourable member has raised a point of order. I do not uphold the point of order, because the Deputy Premier has been addressing all sections of the House, including the Chair.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refute totally the nonsense that has been trotted out tonight in defence of what is a pathetically weak Opposition.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The House has been presented tonight and yesterday with a classic example of the powers that one man in this Parliament arrogates to himself. As I understand it, the Deputy Premier decided by himself to end this session of Parliament. He did not take the trouble to consult with his colleagues, and I understand that, when they found out about his decision, he was not very popular. More particularly, tonight, at the end of this session, when the House was given the opportunity to debate the motion, the Deputy Premier spoke, which is fair enough. Honourable members can understand that. However, the Deputy Premier again took the floor in this adjournment debate, and he has effectively muzzled members of his own Party.

The Opposition is not concerned that the Deputy Premier wished to muzzle us, because we are used to it. He has the numbers and can do that, but tonight he would not even give any of his own members the opportunity to speak in the debate on the motion to adjourn the House or in the adjournment debate.

I do not take much pleasure in saying what I have to say about the honourable member, because I was on a committee with him in the early years of our Parliamentary life, and I built up a respect for him. To the surprise of many of my colleagues, I like the man, but the fact of life is that the Deputy Premier as a Minister has been an absolute disaster. The Government knows this,

and its back bench is acutely aware of it, the Opposition is acutely aware of this, and the Deputy Premier wants to stop this Parliament before the community at large becomes aware of it.

For the fact that the community is not aware of this, the Deputy Premier can thank the press. He knows that what I am saying is correct. He is totally inept within the responsibilities that have been given to him by the Government. He knows that, if he continues as he has, his position is much in doubt. Such a serious charge I do not make lightly, but it is a fact of life.

Along with the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health has progressively under questioning been showing her ineptitude as well. The Government would be afraid, if this session were to continue, that other Ministers would show up in that way. Today we saw what I considered to be an absolutely scandalous performance by a man for whom I had some respect—the Minister of Transport. What he said about the Hon. G.T. Virgo was scandalous, particularly as the retired former Minister has no opportunity to defend himself. In particular, Opposition colleagues of the retired former Minister, who hold him in high regard, were not given the opportunity to question the Minister of Transport in Question Time as to why he made these statements and to challenge those statements.

This situation is typical of the attitude of the Liberal Party in Government. I entered Parliament in 1970, and I can recall being told by more senior colleagues then that the Liberal Party in Government is absolutely ruthless, that it has no consideration for the rights of the Opposition in Parliament at all and rides roughshod over the Opposition. As I had not experienced that, I was rather cynical that any Government could be as bad as we were told previous Liberal Governments had been.

During my nine years in this House, when we were the governing Party, I sometimes felt embarrassed that similar charges were made against the Labor Party, the then Government. I spoke to those senior members again and they told me not to worry about it, because if the Liberal Party were in Government it would be twice as bad.

We had a classic example of that during this Parliament. One of the senior members of the present Government (indeed, a member on the Government front bench) said, during a debate on what the House was going to do, when the Opposition was complaining bitterly about our actions, "What will you do?" I said, "It will probably depend on the agreement between the Leader of the House and his counterpart." In reply, he said, "What are you worrying about? You have the numbers, and you can do what you like."

That man now sits on the Government front bench, and that is absolutely the Liberal Party's attitude, which is always shown when it is in Government. There is no doubt that the Liberal Party believes it was born to rule; it also believes, in its scheme of things, that Oppositions have absolutely no rights. That has been demonstrated tonight.

The Leader and Deputy Leader have said that this House could sit for another week or more to get the Address in Reply debate finished. I challenge the Government to check through the records to see whether the House has ever risen before Christmas in a new session and some new members have not had the opportunity to speak.

I do not suggest that the Government wants to get out of this place before the member for Mallee has the opportunity to make a few comments. I do not believe that is the case at all. I do believe, however, that the Government is running scared. It is not a matter of whether or not we should continue with the Address in Reply debate that is worrying the Government. Rather, it

is the possibility that Question Time will continue to be the embarrassment that it currently is for the Government. The Government cannot expect to continue forever the honeymoon that it is presently having with the South Australian press.

As Government back-benchers, and certainly Opposition members, know, the Premier and Deputy Premier are not measuring up, despite what the media is saying. That fact comes home to roost with Government back-benchers. I know that those back-benchers are not happy with some of the members on the front bench and that, if those front bench members continue in their present manner, drastic action is likely to be taken. I do not say that with any pleasure, as I consider that Ministers ought to be given an opportunity to show their worth. However, if Ministers are absolutely incompetent or totally unable to research their responsibilities, they do not deserve the sympathy of Opposition members, and they will not get the sympathy of their back-benchers.

The matter of Questions on Notice concerns me considerably. I have a series of Questions on Notice to the Minister of Fisheries regarding the prawn industry. I wanted to receive the answers thereto before Christmas and within the next month or so before the prawn season began. I want to help my constituents, who sought from the previous Government and who are hoping to get from the present Government some justice regarding entry to the prawn industry.

However, I will not be given the answers to those questions, nor will I get publicity from them, until about next February, and that is not good enough, because in the meantime at least one of my fisherman constituents is likely to find himself in the Bankruptcy Court. I do not look upon that situation with any pleasure at all.

If the Government was prepared to honour its agreement that the session should run this week and next week, many questions without notice and Questions on Notice that need to be answered immediately could be asked and answered. I am afraid, however, that that is the very fact from which the Government is running away. It is running scared because it is being shown up as an incompetent Government.

I well recall the attitude of the present Deputy Premier when in Opposition to decisions taken in this House. He was most scathing in his criticism. Now, when he gets the opportunity, that Minister is even worse than any of the members whom he criticised previously. That is complete hypocrisy. It is no good the Deputy Premier's throwing up to members of the former Government what they did previously. As he was critical of what the previous Government did, one would have expected the Minister to act differently now. However, when given the opportunity, not only did he do what he accused the previous Government of doing but also he acted in an even worse manner; that is hypocrisy.

What disturbs me, to return to the point that I started with, is the power that this man arrogates to himself—that he can determine when the House adjourns and that, when that adjournment motion is discussed in the House and when people might have the opportunity to question his decision, he pre-empts any discussion by members of his own Party. If he could, he would do it to the Opposition as well. It was only under extreme pressure that members of the Opposition forced the honourable gentleman to give us time in this adjournment debate to make some very short comments on this subject. It is a disgraceful end to a disgraceful period of government by

the Liberal Party. One only hopes that when they come back in the new year—

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

Dr. BILLARD (Newland): I wish to speak initially in defence of some of the charges made in this debate. I speak as a member of the Liberal back-bench and in so doing I say that the members of the Liberal back-bench can and do speak for themselves and will continue to do so without the help of the Opposition. Several charges (in fact, a personalised attack) has been made on the Deputy Premier tonight. As far as I am concerned, and I believe as far as the people of South Australia are concerned, the Deputy Premier has moved actively in an area where action was demanded by the electorate during the campaign. He has sought to reveal information to the public that had been kept hidden and secret by the previous Administration. I believe that his activities in this area have been recognised for their value by the media, by members of the Liberal Party, and by the public.

I now want to talk briefly about the attitude expressed by Mr. Hawke toward the States, but unfortunately I cannot say much because of the time. Such suggestions hold some credence in the community because of the low regard that politicians have within the community generally. One of the reasons why they have this low regard in the community is related to the abuse of the privileges of power by Parliamentarians in Australia. One abuse has been the frequent elections we have had during the 1970's, and I believe the public showed on 15 September that it was heartily sick of frequent elections. A second reason is the way in which politicians personalise their attack on members of the opposing Party. I believe it is high time that we as politicians sought to unite the people, and to recognise and respect others who hold different views. It is a healthy society where we can accept that people can have a diversity of views and not seek to polarise the community. How can we as politicians expect to have the respect of the public if we do not respect each other.

Mr. Payne interjecting:

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

Dr. BILLARD: How can we expect to achieve the respect of the public if we are continually ascribing illwill to members of the other Party when we disagree with them? I could quote numerous examples from the debate that has gone on through this session. For example, the member for Baudin—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before I put the motion to the House, I take this opportunity to accept the greetings and the appreciation accorded to members of the staff by speakers earlier in this debate. I thank all members for the assistance that they have afforded me in the conduct of the House in this brief period. I extend to all, the best wishes for the coming festive season on behalf of my wife and myself to the members, their staff and their families. I take this opportunity to wish the honourable member for Spence a very successful visit to the C.P.A. conference in New Zealand and a successful study tour that will follow.

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 February 1980 at 2 p.m.