

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 27 August 1980

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

PETITION: AGE PENSION

A petition signed by 15 shop stewards representing the Australian Society of Engineers at General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler Australia Limited praying that the House urge the Government to make representations to the Federal Government to reduce the qualifying age for males from 65 to 60 years to obtain an age pension was presented by Mr. Keneally.

Petition received.

PETITION: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

A petition signed by 7 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling for questions, I wish to make a statement to the House, following my statement on Thursday 21 August in which I said:

Where I believe a question is out of order, I will immediately call the member to order and if, after a consultation with the Chair, the question that he is putting can be put in order, he will be given the opportunity later in Question Time to put that question.

I indicate that it is my intention to include within this practice a question that is said to be similar in substance to a question previously asked. If such a point of order is raised, I will ask the member to resume his seat while I determine the validity of the point of order privately. If the question is not similar, or after being suitably worded it is in order, I will call the member again as soon as it is convenient.

The Standing Orders Committee at its meeting today indicated its agreement with the principle and, as no member has raised any objection, I intend to follow this in the future.

PUNALUR PAPER MILLS

Mr. **BANNON**: Can the Premier say whether the Government has cancelled its contract with Punalur Paper Mills for the sale of more than \$60 000 000-worth of South Australian wood chips to India and the contract for the building of a new pulp mill in the South-East and, if so, why, and have negotiations with any other company been entered into? This question is directed to the Premier, who, of course, has the overall charge of economic development in this State and who, in fact, in speaking to this House earlier said that this was, in terms of jobs, the biggest new development that his Government had secured for South Australia in a list that he read to this

House on 31 July.

It has been reported that the Minister of Forests has cancelled the contract with Punalur and, as a result of South Australian Government decisions, the 500 new jobs which would have been generated by the Punalur deal, and boasted of by the Premier, have now been lost. I have been told that Punalur was placed in an impossible position in their negotiations with the Government, after the Government had announced it would sell its 60 per cent shareholding in Punwood the joint venture established to operate the project in South Australia. Punalur was willing to buy these shares, in addition to their own 40 per cent shareholding, but the Commonwealth Foreign Investment Review Board would not allow this. The Australian company, H. C. Sleigh, was prepared to buy shares in partnership with Punalur, and this was agreeable to the Indian company. However, the Government asked Punalur to borrow \$50 000 000 within six months for the pulp mill, on a company where 60 per cent of the shares were in limbo. I have been told that the Government was aware that this was an impossible task, and the Government has effectively sabotaged this important project for South Australia. Will the Premier, in view of its major economic development potential and, I would hope, his role in these negotiations, explain what lies behind the Government's reasoning in cancelling it?

The Hon. **D. O. TONKIN**: I hope that the Leader of the Opposition is asking this question out of concern for the future of the industry and for jobs in South Australia.

The Hon. **R. G. PAYNE**: Of course.

The Hon. **D. O. TONKIN**: Well, I am bound to observe that the Leader seems in some instances to rather glory in any failure or any setback which the Government has when things do not go as smoothly as they might. I sincerely hope that he is not doing the same thing now.

The Leader obviously has got his facts rather mixed up. I understand that he is working on hearsay. Yes, there has been a reason for the South Australian Government cancelling the existing contract and I would suggest that the Leader, or perhaps some other member on the other side of the House, could ask the question of the Minister of Forests, who would be delighted to give the full details. The Minister has been in close consultation with the Indian principal in negotiations during yesterday and today, as I understand it, and he has a great deal of up-to-date information which he could certainly give the Leader of the Opposition. It certainly is a decision which has not been taken lightly. Unfortunately, the Indian principal involved did not conform with certain of the requirements which were built into the contract.

The reason for that is far removed from that which the Leader has postulated. I hope that the project for a pulp mill and woodchip plant will go ahead. Whether it will go ahead in its present form, as it was originally contracted to do, is another matter. A great deal of interest is being shown in the proposition from sources other than the Indian company involved, and the situation now is that the Indian company has been invited to make further submissions, but it must be understood that it will make those submissions in competition, on the open market, with other principals and other companies from other countries who might be concerned. In other words, the situation has been opened up.

I have every confidence that there will be more than interest shown by other companies, too. There are Japanese interests which are particularly concerned to take part in a joint venture of this kind, and the Minister of Agriculture will be making contact with them, if he has not already done so. I suggest that the Leader should ask the Minister of Agriculture direct for those details. As I say,

the negotiations have been going on even during today, and I am not entirely up to date with what has been happening in the last hour or two.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Transport say how the costs of this Government's busway system compare with the costs of the former Government's l.r.t. proposal over the short term and long term, and whether the benefits of the bus scheme are comparable with those of the l.r.t. proposal?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member himself made a significant contribution to the debate on this matter in the House yesterday, and I recommend to those members who were not here at the time that they should read it. It is well known that the Government's north-east busway proposal has an estimated capital cost, in 1979 dollars, of \$39 000 000, as compared with the l.r.t. scheme put before the people at the last election by the former Government, at a cost of \$115 000 000. The Leader of the Opposition has been very strong in the last couple of days on the long-term benefits of the l.r.t. scheme. He has maintained that, in the long term, the costs will reverse.

Let us look at the estimated capital costs to the year 2005-6, after 20 years of operation. Under those figures, the north-east busway will cost \$64 000 000 and the former Government's scheme that was put before the people would have cost \$126 000 000. These figures have been canvassed by the member for Todd. However, if we take another very interesting table of figures, and that is the inflated cost until the start of the system in 1986, the capital cost inflated until 1986, there the scheme that I announced the day before yesterday will cost \$60 000 000, allowing an inflation rate of 10 per cent. The Leader of the Opposition has been at pains to say that 10 per cent is an inflation rate that he regards as low over the next few years. In fact, that is the inflated capital cost at 10 per cent of the north-east busway proposal—\$60 000 000. What is the inflated cost of the former Government's l.r.t. scheme, the high standard l.r.t. scheme that Mr. Virgo put before the people before the last election? That cost is \$178 000 000; that is the inflated cost at 1986.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier categorically deny that the Government intends to introduce legislation either to increase or decrease the number of members in this House, thereby forcing an electoral redistribution before the next State election?

The Premier's answer to a similar question yesterday has only served to increase the confusion and speculation concerning this issue. This is particularly so as the Attorney-General, the Leader of the Government in another place, has indicated on two separate occasions that the Government will not be moving to change the size of this House. On 18 October 1979, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Attorney-General stated:

It is not the intention of the Government to increase the size of the House of Assembly.

Again, on 14 August this year he denied categorically that there was any truth in the rumor that the Government intended to have an electoral redistribution during the life of the Parliament by changing the number of members in the House of Assembly. Is the Attorney-General more

straightforward and honest, or has the Government changed its mind again?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am tempted to answer "No" again, but, to save the Deputy Leader from making a fool of himself, let me recapitulate what happened yesterday. From memory, I believe I was asked whether I would confirm or (I think it was "categorically") deny. My answer was "No, I will neither confirm nor deny." I will now expand on that answer: I will neither confirm nor deny. The matter has not been considered.

NORTH-EAST TRANSPORT

Mr. RANDALL: Given Monday's announcement and reports in the press on the use of the Torrens River Valley as a transport corridor, what effect does this decision have on the implementation or otherwise of the proposals as outlined in the River Torrens Study? Some six weeks ago, the Government released to the public the River Torrens Study Report. I would say that some members of the public are members of committees and have followed that report with interest.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment.

Mr. RANDALL: The report details a plan, if accepted by the Government, to develop the Torrens River and its environs as a linear park. Reference is given to a transport proposal in this report, and I would appreciate it if the Minister would explain the situation to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I should commence my reply by referring to the statement in relation to the transport system as announced by the Minister of Transport. It is quite clear that the announcement that has been made and the opinion of the River Torrens committee, which was highlighted in that report and to which the Minister referred yesterday (I believe that I should mention it again), is that the transport corridor would not prejudice the Torrens River co-ordinated development scheme proposals. That is very significant and should be highlighted. The area which will be affected immediately and which will benefit as a result of the announcement made by the Minister of Transport is between Park Terrace and O.G. Road, and possibly part way towards Portrush Road. The exact details are being worked out by officers of the Department of Transport, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the councils concerned. The area will be developed as proposed by the River Torrens Study, which commenced (I fully acknowledge) in 1975 and was instigated by the member for Hartley.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There's nothing new in it.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: This outlines the co-ordinated plans and, if the honourable member who is interjecting studied the report, he might find the benefits for South Australia that it contains. The establishment of native plants is proposed.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible comment.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It is proposed to establish native plants instead of exotic vegetation, which has played havoc with much of the Torrens River. I believe that every honourable member will readily agree that much of the native state of the Torrens River is being destroyed by exotic plants.

Since coming to office, the present Government has made available some \$478 000 for a flood mitigation study. It has also provided a further \$200 000 for river clearing between O.G. Road and Darley Road. The Government

has already committed some \$678 000 to the well-being of the Torrens River. The further \$4 000 000 announced by the Minister of Transport will mean that the implementation of the Hassell Report can proceed forthwith. The immediate effect on the Engineering and Water Supply Department is that the work will provide approximately 100 additional jobs in the very near future, which will be of significant benefit to that department and also to the Government.

The benefits to be derived from the \$4 000 000 made available from the Department of Transport for this work will soon be recognised. I also recognise that the honourable member has a considerable interest in the lower reaches of the Torrens River, and I am aware of the article that appeared in the *News* on Tuesday 26 August which reported that the Henley and Grange council was urging an early commencement of work on the Torrens River in keeping with the Torrens River study report.

The honourable member has an interest not only because of his electorate but also because he has been a councillor on the Henley and Grange council and also a member on the Torrens River Standing Committee, which made a very large input into this report. As a result of the decision taken by the Government and announced by the Minister of Transport, the provision of \$4 000 000 will mean that the Torrens River study proposal will commence virtually forthwith.

QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Health explain what she meant in answer to a question from me in this House on 19 August when she stated in the final part of her answer that, if ever a women's hospital had a friend, the Queen Victoria Hospital had a friend in her, while the Minister appears to be doing everything to undermine that hospital? On that day I asked the Minister to give a firm declaration that the Queen Victoria Hospital would not be closed. The Minister told the House that she was not prepared to comment on the future of the hospital until she had had a recommendation from the Health Commission.

I accepted that answer, but this week a report in the *Advertiser* suggested that the Minister had in fact already made up her mind. On Tuesday, that paper reported what the Minister had told the National Council of Women in a speech, which I have been informed was not well received. She referred to a separate wing to be added to the Royal Adelaide Hospital to house some of the specialist services from the Queen Victoria Hospital. None of her other reported remarks suggested that the Minister had any faith in the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital. Therefore, today I am asking the Minister whether she is prepared now to state whether she is in favour of the hospital's closing.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I really wonder quite often whether the member for Napier ever bothers to read and absorb what is provided in the way of reports and in *Hansard* in response to questions without notice. I made it quite clear last week that I have received no representations from the Health Commission as to the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital, and I do not propose to make any decision until I receive recommendations.

The honourable member indicated last week that he had read the report of the task force. That report at no stage suggested closure; rather, it raised options as to relocation of services.

Mr. Hemmings: But relocation is closing.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am sorry, but the honourable member clearly does not understand anything about health planning or the need to provide obstetric and gynaecological services in the most appropriate place.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That may well be so. There has not been a suggestion of closure. No recommendations are before the commission at present, and there have never been any recommendations before me. I should be pleased to make available to the member for Napier a copy of the text of the speech that I gave to the National Council of Women.

Mr. Hemmings: It wasn't well received.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is the honourable member's interpretation, and the one that he wishes to place on it. I have since spoken to women who attended that meeting; they were interested to have the facts put before them as distinct from emotional appeals based on no knowledge of the facts. In that speech, I referred to the various options that the task force had canvassed. One of those options—

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

Mr. Becker: Did he ask a Dorothy Dixier?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: One is tempted to wonder whether the honourable member has. The task force at no stage suggested closure of the hospital. In my speech, I canvassed the various options. The fact that the *Advertiser* chose to report one particular option does not in any way mean that I did not deal with all of the options. I say once again, in simple language so that the honourable member can understand, that I have received no recommendations and, until I do, I will be making no decision about the manner in which the services at the Queen Victoria Hospital are delivered. There has never been a suggestion of closure; rather it has involved the manner in which those services will be delivered.

SOUTHERN DISTRICTS TRANSPORT

Mr. SCHMIDT: In a recent press statement made by the Minister of Transport, he alluded to the fact that, by making a recommendation regarding the north-east transport system, it would be of benefit to the southern areas. Can he explain how this will be of benefit to the southern transport system?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Proposals are currently before the Government for improvements to public transport in the southern areas, and several members will be interested in those proposals. In fact, they have referred to them in the current Address in Reply debate. However, this matter is intimately bound up with the provision of the north-east busway because, if we had gone to the former Government's system (which I have just shown the House would cost \$178 000 000 in 1986 dollars), precious little money would be available for improvements to public transport in other areas of the city. I make no bones about it: there are areas in the metropolitan area that need improved public transportation services, and the Government is giving due attention to providing those services. The great benefit that residents in the southern areas will receive from the Government's present north-east busway proposals is that, because of the much lower cost (less than one-third) of providing those services, additional money will be available to provide new services to areas in the honourable member's district.

O'BAHN

Mr. HAMILTON: Did the Minister of Transport, on 4 September 1979, in his capacity as Opposition spokesman on transport, issue a press release that stated:

O'Bahn would require the construction of only one bridge across the River Torrens, a substantial saving on the seven required by the l.r.t.

On what evidence did the Minister base his statement, and what has now caused the Minister to agree with the former Government's assessment?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Opposition, at that stage, but now the Government, made a policy statement before the September election that it would investigate the West German O'Bahn system with a view to providing a public transport system to residents of the north-eastern suburbs that would be cheaper and just as efficient as the former Government's own scheme. In preliminary investigations that were taking place at that stage (and the honourable member should realise that we did not have access to departmental engineers), it was proposed at one stage to use the Walkerville Terrace option. That option was seriously considered by the Government and, in reply to the honourable member's specific question, the option cuts out at least six or seven of those crossings of the river that will now be required. The Walkerville Terrace option was so seriously considered by this Government over the past few months that it commissioned two extra reports on the impact of that option on the community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As Minister of Transport, I must provide a public transport system to citizens of Adelaide, including citizens of the north-east, and that is my brief. We treated the Walkerville Terrace option seriously and commissioned two reports on the matter. It was found that in transport terms it was a substandard option. The former Government also commissioned special reports in putting the l.r.t. through the streets of St. Peters and it found, for the same reasons, that they were substandard transport options.

FLINDERS HOSPITAL

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Is the Minister of Health aware that there are problems at Flinders Medical Centre over treatment of casualty patients through demarcation disputes and does she intend to take any action? On Tuesday 19 August a constituent of mine was working with an axe. Unknown to him, a fragment of axe head flew off. That night his leg was swollen and was painful. On Wednesday 20 August, he visited his local doctor, who referred him to Marion X-ray Clinic. On Thursday 21 August he returned to his doctor, with the X-rays, which indicated that a piece of metal was in the patient's leg. The doctor made an incision to see whether he could trace the metal. He was unable to detect it, and immediately referred the patient to Flinders hospital with an open wound. After registering at the Flinders emergency reception the patient waited two hours, during which time no treatment was given, only to be told, "You have caused a demarcation dispute." The general surgeon said that it was an orthopaedic's job and the orthopaedic said that it was a general surgeon's job.

The patient was then told to return in seven days. The patient left, still with an open wound, and with a letter written by an intern to a surgeon stating:

Dear doctor, two to seven days ago metallic fb from axehead penetrated patient. Did not realise it entered, but in pain. Local doctor referred to, who took X-rays. He

presented to A&E surgical registrar of the day who referred to consulting clinic in seven days. Orthopaedic people not interested. Doctor . . . recommended private referral to you, as patient has pain and risk of infection. Could not contact you last evening. Thank you.

The patient returned to his own doctor, who made an appointment for the next day, 22 August, for a surgeon to look at the leg. On 22 August the surgeon admitted patient to Calvary Hospital and operated, but stated emphatically that no guarantee against infection could be given as wound had been open for 24 hours and, because of the deep-seated nature of the wound, stated that, if infection did set in, the consequences could be even a loss of the leg. I therefore seek the Minister's reply that any demarcation disputes amongst doctors at public hospitals will be resolved now before a tragedy occurs.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can certainly assure the member for Brighton that there are no demarcation disputes between doctors at Flinders or, as far as I am aware, at any other hospital in South Australia. The honourable member having advised me yesterday that he was going to ask this question, I contacted the Flinders Medical Centre for an immediate report, which I have received. The hospital states that there is very close co-operation in the management of all patients, particularly those admitted following trauma.

There was no orthopaedic surgeon consulted about the patient in question, and consultation was made with the Senior Surgical Registrar, who is a qualified general surgeon. He believed that no further exploration of this wound was indicated at that stage, and that the patient should receive antibiotic therapy. The reason for this was that the wound was already two days old and an attempt at removal of the foreign body had already been undertaken that day.

I have asked for a detailed investigation to be carried out and that a full report be presented to me within the next 24 hours. I will be pleased to make a copy of that report available to the honourable member.

DRY-LAND FARMING CONGRESS

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Premier ask the Department of Foreign Affairs to arrange for an officer from that department to accompany the Minister of Agriculture on his mission to the Middle East later this year so that South Australia can avoid further embarrassment internationally from the Minister's negotiations and statements?

I have been reliably advised that in the 11 months since he has been in Cabinet the Minister of Agriculture has been involved in a number of embarrassing incidents of his own making which have disadvantaged this State internationally. Apart from the local matters of his well-chronicled statements about farming national parks and his historic role in fighting the Adelaide Hills bushfire, the Minister has reportedly insulted the Libyan Government, in particular, and Arab people in general, in statements that he made when cancelling a contract with the Libyan Government. It is now reported that the Minister has botched negotiations for the \$50 000 000 wood chip deal with India and the company concerned is reportedly incensed by the Minister's double-dealings.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting far beyond a reasonable explanation of his question. Unless he comes back to an explanation of the question, I will withdraw his leave to continue.

Mr. TRAINER: I was about to do so, Sir. The matter of immediate concern—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will do it now.

Mr. TRAINER:—that inspired this question took place on Monday. It has now been further reported that, at a reception on Monday evening for the Dry-Land Farming Congress being held in Adelaide, which was co-sponsored by the South Australian Department of Agriculture, Arab delegates from Syria, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Tunisia, and Iraq were again unnecessarily offended. I understand that after playing a Jewish tune for the Arab guests at the start of the evening the band then launched into the Israeli national song *Hava Nageela*.

In addition to this reported display of insensitivity, the Arab and Pakistani delegates were served roast pork, in direct contravention of Moslem practice. No Arab tunes were played at all during the evening. Such lack of sensitivity to cultural and religious matters is not conducive to successful diplomacy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I warned the honourable member previously that comment would not be acceptable to the Chair. The honourable member did come back to making factual statements as he understood them, but he is now commenting again. One further transgression of that nature and I will call upon the Minister to answer the question. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I would be delighted, but I think the opportunity has been taken from me.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The question was directed to me. I am remarkably sorry that the record of the member for Ascot Park in this House is so deplorable. He has without a doubt totally and absolutely misrepresented the situation yet again. I will make some reservation for the honourable member because he has obviously read, very quickly, a question that has been written out for him, I suspect again, by one of those brilliant minds which the Leader of the Opposition employs.

I was at that dry opening of the dry-land farming conference, and I am quite certain that the comments which the honourable member has made in asking his question are totally without foundation. If I could give him a piece of advice, I would say that he should check his facts before he commits his name to them. The delegates were invited to partake of a buffet meal, and a wide range of food was available. They were not served; they helped themselves. More than 40 countries are represented at the conference, which is a fine conference indeed and a great credit to the Department of Agriculture, and the other people who have put it on.

I notice that, in another place, the Hon. Mr. Chatterton spouted almost identical garbage. The musical entertainment was a selection of songs from all over the world. It was not, as the report suggested this morning, that only the two songs were played. I would think that probably two dozen items or more were given, finishing up with *Waltzing Matilda*, as representative of Australia. I do not know whether the honourable member has access to any Arabic music which could have been played by the orchestra. If he had, I am quite certain that we would be very grateful to receive it from him, and I am quite sure that, given a little practice, the orchestra could play it. Unless he is able to provide that Arabic music, I would say that there is not much point in his complaining here.

He says that the Minister of Agriculture has failed lamentably, or some such words, in achieving the wood chip contract. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will have an opportunity to speak for himself a little later and explain the true circumstances. The suggestion made by the honourable member is quite outrageous and without truth, and I suggest again that he should check his facts.

As for the suggestion that an officer from the Department of Foreign Affairs should accompany the Minister, may I put on record now our very great appreciation, and that of members opposite who have held Ministerial positions, of the enormous help which is always given by officers of the Department of Foreign Affairs whenever Ministers of this Government go overseas. Indeed, this applies also to private members in this Chamber. Those officers provide us with an excellent service and there is no doubt that, where an Ambassador or First Secretary can accompany a Minister, he will do so at all times. There has not been any complaint at all about the activities of the Minister of Agriculture or any other member of this Government who has been overseas—and neither should there be. This is in stark contrast to the behaviour which I could quote of a former Minister who deliberately went out of his way, when no longer a Minister, to get in touch with, I think, more than one Government of the countries to which the honourable member has referred, seeking to set himself up as an agent for South Australia, and to postulate to them South Australian Government's policies, when he had no standing whatever. That was a deliberate and absolute flouting of the normal protocol and diplomatic conventions.

Mr. McRae: Who are you referring to? Make this clear.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the member for Playford wishes to hear about it, it was the Hon. Mr. Chatterton who has engaged in interesting activities here, too—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest that, if the member for Playford wishes to ventilate the matter further, he should do so in the House at the proper time. I would be delighted to give him copies of the correspondence.

The Minister of Agriculture had a most successful visit overseas in negotiating recently a contract that was most valuable to South Australia. He will be undertaking further negotiations relatively soon. I am quite certain that he will perform his duties with efficiency, courtesy and success. The sort of activity in smearing that is being indulged in by members opposite will do nothing to enhance South Australia's reputation in international circles.

WOOD CHIP INDUSTRY

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister of Agriculture have anything to add to the reply given by the Premier to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about the alleged termination of the deed of agreement between the South Australian Government and Punwood Proprietary Limited?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Apparently, members opposite are hard of hearing. This agreement was in regard to a proposed pulp plant in the South-East.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Too jolly right I am prepared to answer a question for the member for Glenelg. I indicated to my colleague that it was important that I have the opportunity to expand on the Premier's reply, albeit that that reply was absolutely accurate, to a question of the Leader of the Opposition. In my reply to the member for Glenelg, it is important that I clarify a number of points and to answer the direct allegation that was incorporated in the Leader of the Opposition's question this afternoon.

It is true that the South Australian Government entered into a deed of agreement with Punwood Proprietary Limited on 5 March 1980 that served the purpose of allowing an Indian based company, Punalur Proprietary Limited, via Punwood Proprietary Limited, to establish both a chipping and pulping facility in the South-East of South Australia. I am sure that members will recall the expressed delight of the South Australian Government that we had secured an international party to the extent that there was a possibility of a project's being installed in this State that would not only accept a 3 000 000-tonne resource of round wood thinnings from our forest and adjacent plantations in the South-East of this State but also that those thinnings would be processed to the point of pulping within our State.

Among other things, in the deed of agreement of 5 March, the Indian based company, via Punwood Proprietary Limited, was, by 31 July 1980, to demonstrate to the South Australian Government its industrial and financial capacity to proceed with that proposed project. On 31 July 1980, the principals of Punalur Paper Mills, as the principals of Punwood Proprietary Limited, for the purposes of that agreement, provided the South Australian Government with its submission. Because that submission, as lodged in my hands on the morning of 31 July, was deficient, it had to be thoroughly investigated by officers of my department and, in my view, it was essential that, before any public comment was made about the contents of that submission, we should have the opportunity to discuss the details with the principals in person, and I repeat "the principals", because at that time a second party was identified in the proposal—H. C. Sleigh Limited of Australia. That company had joined with Punalur Paper Mills as a co-partner in the venture as a result of a direction by the Foreign Investment Review Board of this country.

I will not go into the details of that, but discussions have been held with those parties collectively. They received a document from me 13 days after 31 July, a period during which a thorough investigation of the submission had been made. In that document I have advised that the deed of agreement dated 5 March was terminated. As I indicated a moment ago, the discussions have proceeded between myself, the Australian manager of H. C. Sleigh Limited, and Mr. Dalmia, of India. In fact, discussions have been proceeding yesterday, last evening, and again this morning. As a result of a radio interview in which the former Minister of Forests, Mr. Chatterton, was involved, I then sought to extend the discussions with Mr. Dalmia to determine the source of the allegations made by Mr. Chatterton. I am assured that the allegations, which were repeated by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, are ill-founded.

I wish to tell the House about one other matter in relation to this. Whilst I was interviewed this afternoon between 1.15 and 1.45, so too was the Indian gentleman whom I mentioned, Mr. Dalmia. His comment to the press this afternoon was that he had no complaints with the South Australian Government generally, or with the Minister of Forests in particular. Mr. Dalmia said, "They have been fair to me."

During the period since this Government came into office, during which time we have had extensive negotiations and discussions with the Indian company referred to, it is my belief that the South Australian Government has been perfectly fair and proper in its application to this proposed project. Indeed, the Government was totally fair in its preparation of the deed of 5 March, as referred to. In fact, the dates and the project target details within that document were fed to us

by the principal of that Indian company.

That company made a request on 5 March for a copy of the document so that it could use it to seek to obtain the required financial backing necessary for this totally new project that it had proposed. Indeed, we furnished it with a copy of that document at the time. I make no reflections on, nor have I any criticism of, that Indian based company for having failed to come up with the necessary funds. However, it is a matter of fact that it has occurred, and as a result that agreement cannot be proceeded with and, accordingly, it has been terminated.

Might I say that that Indian company, with or without the nominated Australian partner, is most welcome to continue and get an act together with respect to resubmitting another proposal to the South Australian Government. The only difference now compared to the situation prior to 13 August is that, as a result of the termination of that agreement, as a State we are now obliged to invite the other interested parties around this country and outside this country that have shown interest in this particular resource to come forward with their respective submissions. Whether they will or will not is entirely up to those countries, but the invitation is open to them. Those companies that have expressed interest personally and by correspondence to us in the intervening months will indeed be contacted and invited.

I believe that, although that is only a very brief summary of what has taken place, it negates the allegations that have been made this afternoon about our handling of this issue. In fact, it demonstrates quite clearly that we have been fair; the other party to the agreement has declared that he has no complaint with us, yet in these strange circumstances the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and his colleague in the other place have seen fit to make a political issue out of something that is industrially important to South Australia, and the way that they are carrying on can have no effect other than to damage our inter-country relations with those with whom we have set out to deal.

Unfortunately, I do not have the opportunity now to further reply to the other allegations. However, I shall be pleased to do so, if I can only get a question about the matter from the Opposition. This is another classic example where I have had to organise one from my side of the House in order to get the facts straight. Here I sit, as lonely as a fowl on the front bench, waiting for a question from the Opposition, and it directs questions all around me to the Leader and to other places on subjects pertaining to my portfolio, but will not come direct to me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has long since given up answering the question, and is now indulging in abuse of members on this side of the House. I ask in the circumstances that you sit him down.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a point of order that I can uphold, as much as I would desire to do so. As I have indicated to the House many times, the nature of questions and answers is totally against the spirit of Question Time. The honourable Minister having concluded his remarks, I call on the honourable member for Price.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr. WHITTEN: Why has the Chief Secretary not replied to the request by the Opposition spokesman on legal and penal affairs, Hon. C. J. Sumner, M.L.C., for a briefing by the Department of Correctional Services on the problems of security in South Australian prisons and for permission to visit Yatala Labour Prison to assess the

situation at first hand? In his Ministerial statement to the House yesterday, the Minister referred to the protocol for members wishing to arrange visits to Government departments or facilities. However, on 24 July 1980, the Hon. Mr. Sumner wrote to the Chief Secretary requesting certain information on prison security, following the escape from Yatala Labour Prison of Joseph Tognolini. He also asked:

Are you prepared to permit me to be briefed by your department on the problems of security in South Australian prisons and in particular the escape of Mr. Tognolini from Yatala? I would also like the opportunity of visiting Yatala to assess the situation at first hand. Please let me know if you consent to such a briefing and visit.

The Minister replied on 31 July that the points raised by Mr. Sumner would be answered in a Ministerial statement that he would make to this House on that day. He did not, however, reply to the request for the briefing or the visit to the prison. Mr. Sumner wrote to the Minister on 12 August repeating his request and asking whether he could have an answer by Monday, the 18th. There has been no reply to this further request.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will study the honourable member's question and give him a reply.

PORT PIRIE

Mr. OLSEN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say what action the Government intends to take to encourage decentralisation in such areas as Port Pirie? What incentives will be given to expanding or new industries in those areas? A recent article in the *Australian*, written by Peter Ward, indicates that unemployment levels in Port Pirie were 12.6 per cent for males and 29.2 per cent for females in the 20 to 24 years of age group. Many people who are fighting for the advancement of the city have expressed resentment at the article entitled "Port Pirie prospers in a swamp of unemployment", as, I am informed, it does not reflect the current situation in that city.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I did see the article in the *Australian* and, furthermore, I have had a discussion with the Mayor (Mr. Jones) on the unemployment problems there and about what the South Australian Government could do to help. First, I will take up one or two points contained in the article in the *Australian*. I think it was grossly unfair to describe Port Pirie as "an unemployment swamp". All members would agree that such a description does not fit Port Pirie. I was concerned to see that the article quotes at length a survey undertaken by staff of, I think, Monash University, on the unemployment problem at Port Pirie. Unfortunately, the survey was undertaken in the last two weeks of January this year.

As we all know, the end of January is the worst time in the year to do an unemployment survey, because school leavers have come on to the job market. They have had their holiday and are now looking for jobs. To add to the problems, many industries are still shut down and therefore are not advertising for new employees. The figures quoted of unemployment at Port Pirie do not truly reflect the problem in that town. I indicate to the House that, based on the figures at the end of June, the adult male unemployment problem has decreased by 13 per cent compared to the figure at the end of January, and the adult female problem by 7 per cent.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The article concentrated especially on youth unemployment and, if the honourable member who represents part of that town will listen, I will

give him details of improvements in those figures. In the junior area the figure for unemployed males has dropped by 25 per cent and females by 16 per cent. These figures are freely available and are contained in the monthly statistics of the Commonwealth Employment Service, and I cannot understand why the article in the *Australian* did not mention the more recent figures.

Another very significant point to raise in relation to Port Pirie is that the number of job vacancies in the town has increased significantly. That situation reflects a healthy trend within Port Pirie, with falling unemployment and an increase in the number of job vacancies.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I find it interesting that the honourable member who represents part of Port Pirie should interject in such a way, because it suggests that he supports the article in the *Australian* when it called Port Pirie "an unemployment swamp". As the local member, that suggestion is a sad reflection on his home town, and I hope that some of his constituents may read his interjections supporting the *Australian* and have them printed in the local newspaper. I am sure they would be horrified to find one of their local members supporting such an article. When the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr. Jones, saw me, we discussed at length what initiatives could be taken in the town to attract new industry.

It is well known that the South Australian Government is considering the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in the Iron Triangle and that feasibility studies are well under way, with a final decision to be made soon on the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. These projects will have an enormous spin-off on the Iron Triangle, and will have an important effect on Port Pirie.

In discussions with Mr. Jones, we looked at the possibility of attracting other new industries to Port Pirie, and I suggested that a regional development organisation board should be formed similar to those established or to be considered in the South-East and Whyalla. I have offered to him the assistance of the Department of Trade and Industry in co-ordinating the activities of such a board, and I have asked the Mayor and industries in the town to ensure that they get this board off the ground and staff it. Through the department, we can feed in general State information to be given to industries when promoting Port Pirie. I am looking forward soon to further contact with the Mayor once he has this group together and has formed such a board.

In addition, I am pleased to say, as I announced in the House yesterday, that the State Government has been very generous in pay-roll tax and land tax rebates for decentralised industry and, in a full year, we expect, under the present policies, more than a 10-fold increase in the financial benefits, compared to the policies of the previous Government.

An honourable member: For Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, for the entire State. That is attracting significant interest, not only in South Australia but also in other States, of industries that would like to establish in decentralised areas.

Other matters are being considered, and it is well known that B.H.A.S. is considering potential expansion, and that the State Government has already had discussions with that company. Also, several State Government departments that have had a close liaison with that company have discussed potential developments and expansion that depend on future plans. The State Government has ensured that it has made a great in-put into the Iron Triangle, and I am delighted to see that such action is having an effect.

Also, it is interesting to note that some of the companies

in the Iron Triangle are taking advantage of the pay-roll tax for youth employment scheme. I know that in that area more than 260 young people have been taken on under that scheme. In the metal industry, that will have a significant impact, because one area in which problems have developed with regard to a shortage of labour is in relation to skilled metal tradesmen. Another matter we are considering is how to increase the number of apprentices being trained in Whyalla and Port Pirie. That is important, because several companies have told us that unless they get more skilled tradesmen they will not be able to expand industries to the extent that they would like.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POL POT REGIME

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Last evening the member for Napier (who I notice is not in the House) insidiously and maliciously endeavoured to malign me by implying that I was a supporter of the Pol Pot regime. The honourable member was referring to my Address in Reply speech, which he obviously had not read. In his efforts to vilify me, he referred to my theological studies, and thereby church connections, and tried to connect that to what, if it were not unparliamentary, could only be described as a lie. He stated that I gave unequivocal support to the Pol Pot regime. This is a gross misrepresentation of my speech. If the honourable member had read my speech (and I am glad to see him come back into the Chamber), he would know that I was alluding to what I regard as the use of force, and as examples I referred to the invasion of Kampuchea by North Vietnam and the invasion of Afghanistan by Russia. I was also opposed to the tactic of inciting violence, as used by the former Prime Minister. I did not in any Christian or non-Christian way embrace the practices of the Pol Pot regime, as the member for Napier has implied I did.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL PARKS

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr. Millhouse: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Minister of Environment to make such a statement without leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I propose to persist with my objection to the suspension of Standing Orders in these circumstances until a better procedure is adopted for Ministerial statements. I do not know what the Minister is going to say in this statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is absolutely absurd for the House to be asked to give a Minister leave to make a Ministerial statement or, when that is refused, to suspend Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable

member's attention to the fact that we are debating the suspension of Standing Orders. I would ask the honourable member to contain himself to that particular motion and no other matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will confine myself to that, Sir. I have just said that it is absurd for us to be asked to suspend Standing Orders to allow a Minister to make a Ministerial statement when the House has no opportunity to know what it is about. It may be that he is going to tell us something about law enforcement in the Department for the Environment and, if he is, it is about time, but how do we know? It could be on any other subject at all.

I protest about this. I have had correspondence with you, Sir, I have had correspondence with the Premier, and I have also had correspondence on the suspension of Standing Orders in these circumstances with the Leader of the Opposition. Only today I had a letter from the Leader about this in which he said that he was not going to support me in these matters. He said:

I still stand by my earlier statement, believing that refusal to grant leave should only be exercised with extreme discretion and, in particular, in situations of prolonged and flagrant abuse of the procedure.

The Leader must have written that letter before he would not support me yesterday when there was a suspension of Standing Orders, and the result was that his own member for Elizabeth was maligned by the Chief Secretary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now straying widely from the purpose of the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the purpose of the motion, it is to override my objection to grant leave to make a Ministerial statement. However, I do not wish to detain the House now. I hope that we will not see a repetition, although I know my hope is vain, of the Labor Party voting with the Government as it does on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say "Aye"; against "No".

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it. Motion thus carried.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I have said previously that I would table this, the final Tobin report relating to the reorganisation of the law enforcement functions of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Among the many and varied functions of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is the administration of the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. The sections of this Act relating to the control, movement and protection of native fauna and flora are quite comprehensive and among the best in Australia.

The State of South Australia contains a variety of fauna which is unique and which requires considerable and constant input of work to protect and maintain. This work is almost wholly done by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Rangers in the field are wardens under the Act, with specialist back-up and investigation work being provided by an inspection section in the Adelaide head office.

Much of the work of the inspection section concentrates on servicing the animal registration scheme, which provides for control on the movement of protected fauna and flora, not only within the State but also between this

State and other States, and indeed overseas. Other functions of the inspection section include servicing the kangaroo sealed tag scheme, enforcing hunting legislation, laying of complaints, and institution of prosecution proceedings against would-be offenders.

In outlining the basic law enforcement function of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, it can be seen that this function is complex, demanding and often controversial. The controversial nature of this work is compounded by the fact that there is a significant trade in protected fauna for commercial purposes which can be conducted within the terms of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Unfortunately, there are some who disregard the provisions of the legislation and exploit the beauty of our native flora and fauna.

Public expectation for increased management and control of the environment and protected plants and animals has meant an increasing demand on the resources of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Let me say that I have had, and continue to have, total respect for the National Parks and Wildlife Service and its officers.

The inspection service within the National Parks and Wildlife Service has comprised five positions, of which one is still vacant. The section has operated within the overall operational framework of the service. It has in the past been severely hampered in its work by lack of staff, lack of training, lack of recognition, and by the sheer volume of work that it is expected to undertake, with increasing pressure being placed on the valuable and unique flora and fauna of the State. The position has been unsatisfactory and required some form of action.

During the past year the previous Government engaged Assistant Police Commissioner, S. Tobin, to compile a report on the law enforcement requirements of the Department for the Environment. As part of this exercise, Mr. Tobin examined the obligations and responsibilities placed on the National Parks and Wildlife Service in administering the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

This report has now been followed up by a detailed investigation by Mr. Tobin. As members would know, Mr. Tobin has since retired from the South Australian Police Force, and the present Government engaged him as a consultant to strengthen the law enforcement function of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. This investigation specifically examined the problems of law enforcement within the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The final report which I now table was completed in June this year. The report refers in its introduction to previous reports which were of an interim nature. The final report has concentrated on illegal activities associated with three main areas: the illegal taking of protected fauna in the field, the trade in protected fauna on the local market, and the interstate trade.

The recommendations in the report have been made with a view to providing a distribution throughout the State of competent law enforcement personnel. These personnel would be capable of dealing with the main problems associated with illegal trade and improving the standard of law enforcement generally among all field staff.

Specifically, the Tobin Report recommends that the establishment for the law enforcement section be set at an officer in charge, 11 inspectors, one clerical officer, and one typist. While the final detail on the method of operation of this personnel is yet to be established, the report recommends that six inspectors work from headquarters to carry out inspections and investigation. They would also form a tactical support group to carry out special operations and provide law enforcement support to field staff as the need arises. It is considered that one inspector

should become a full-time legal and training officer, and the remaining inspectors would be included in the programme of regionalisation now being undertaken by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is also intended to establish, or re-establish, as the case may be, satisfactory and continuing liaison with organisations within and outside the State who can contribute to the efficient operation of the section.

Mr. Tobin has also recommended that the organisation structure within the National Parks and Wildlife Service be amended to provide for the separation of law enforcement activities from other field operations. The section would be no longer known as the Inspection Section; it would be identified as the Law Enforcement Section, with operational personnel still being known as inspectors. Of course, it is my intention that the skills of the existing staff within the section will be recognised and used in the reorganisation.

In summary, the increased inspector strength will provide a team of officers with mixed skills at headquarters to deal with all inspection and investigation problems. A versatile inspector will be stationed in each regional office to perform a major role in law enforcement and provide support for field staff. Training and legal support will be upgraded to improve the competence and confidence of all wardens. Further working arrangements have been recommended in the report to place law enforcement generally on a more professional footing.

The recommended organisational change to separate law enforcement from other field operations is designed to improve supervision, reduce administrative delays, and to provide for the better co-ordination of all law enforcement activities. It does not relieve field staff of their authority or responsibility for law enforcement, nor does it reduce the need for co-operation between law enforcement and field staff. On the contrary, it should bring about an improvement in both areas.

Present indications are that illegal fauna trafficking is on the increase, and there are good reasons for believing that this trend will continue. The Bureau of Customs has stated that bird smuggling is still a common occurrence. Again, it is likely that this activity will increase as knowledge of this legal problem becomes known. Therefore, the staff increases and reorganisation recommended in the Tobin Report can be considered as only sufficient and essential to meet this growing challenge.

Finally, the Government has considered the Tobin Report and accepted the main recommendations. The Government has already approved the creation of a law enforcement section of 14 persons. The final organisational arrangements within the National Parks and Wildlife Service will depend upon the full review of the structure of the National Parks and Wildlife Service which is now nearing completion as part of the amalgamation process of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. The major upgrading of the law enforcement function in the National Parks and Wildlife Service will, the Government believes, go a long way towards containing criminal trafficking in our State's fauna heritage.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861-1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall that, when I made a Ministerial statement on 4 June regarding speculation in shares of the South Australian Gas Company, I referred to the fact that "changes to streamline the South Australian Gas Company's Act are contemplated". This Bill represents the outcome of that process.

Honourable members will also recall that, in that statement, I pointed out that "the Government has no intention of altering the legal framework applicable to the South Australian Gas Company". I went on to say:

This framework has been built up over a long period of time, under successive Governments, with a view to protecting the interests of the people of South Australia as a whole as well as shareholders and debenture holders in the South Australian Gas Company. This is because of its role as a "utility" company supplying an essential commodity to the people of this State.

I am re-emphasising these points at the outset because the Government has been watching very carefully the stock market trading in shares of the South Australian Gas Company. Because it appears that trading of a speculative nature is continuing and because it appears that there is doubt that the limit of 5 per cent on shareholdings is being observed, this Bill, in addition to containing clauses to "streamline" the company in line with modern company law, also contains provisions intended to preserve the company's status as a utility, serving the interests of all South Australians.

It may be of assistance to honourable members if I outline the legislative background to this Bill. The South Australian Gas Company was constituted by a deed of settlement dated 19 September 1861, and was incorporated by the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861. The deed of settlement contained many of the provisions that are necessary for the regulation and management of the internal affairs of the company. Those provisions are equivalent to those found in the articles of any company.

As well as incorporating the company, the Act of 1861 clothed it with certain specific powers and protections essential to the running of its business. Thus, the Act empowered the company to construct gas works, break up streets and to lay pipes, subject to certain conditions. That Act also repeated verbatim a number of the clauses from the deed of settlement, and it incorporated many of the sections of the Companies' Clauses Consolidation Act, 1847, and the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1847. The Act of 1861 has been amended on seven occasions.

In 1924, the Gas Act was passed to make special and detailed provisions relating to the price and quality of gas and the testing of meters, but it also contained sections relating to the capital of the company, issue of shares, its dividends, interest on bonds, and the establishment of a superannuation fund; it provides that its bonds shall be trustee securities. This Act has been amended eight times. It is this Act that currently gives the Government control of the company's dividends and capital. This structure has led to areas of conflict between the provisions of the deed and the Acts, and, of course, the provisions of the latter prevail.

This has meant that most of the provisions of the deed of settlement (which the deed allows to be altered by a general meeting of shareholders) could not be altered unless the appropriate Act was also amended in a similar manner; nonetheless, the deed has been amended for an increase of capital on 12 occasions, and its clauses have been amended by special resolutions of shareholders five times, as well as by the abovementioned Acts.

Honourable members will therefore appreciate that the constitution of the South Australian Gas Company is

extremely complicated, and many of the provisions that regulate its affairs are archaic and anachronistic. In these circumstances, substantial changes are necessary in order to achieve simplification and modernisation of the corporate structure of the company. I will outline the nature of these changes in a moment.

However, I believe it is appropriate to reflect for a moment on the achievements of the South Australian Gas Company. Notwithstanding the legal complexities to which I have just referred, the company has been able to manage its affairs to the point where it is a major supplier of energy to the South Australian community. Natural gas is reticulated to 208 000 consumers in Adelaide and Port Pirie, and at Whyalla and Mount Gambier a further 5 250 are supplied with gas manufactured from l.p.g. Approximately 5 000 kilometres of underground gas mains are presently operated to supply these consumers.

Outside these gas reticulation areas, the company's l.p.g. gas division supplies 35 000 consumers who are served by 157 agents throughout the State, Alice Springs and central Australia, and as far north as Tennant Creek. The company serves three distinct markets: domestic, 206 994 customers; commercial, 4 987 customers; and industrial, 1 206 customers.

Since natural gas was introduced in late 1969, the use of gas has increased over five-fold. Usage by domestic consumers has increased steadily at a rate of 7½ per cent per annum, but the greatest change has been in industry. Prior to natural gas in 1969, only 15 per cent of the gas send-out was consumed in industry, but last year 60 per cent went to this market. This has mainly been at the expense of oil, and clearly indicates the dependence of South Australian industry on reasonably priced, environmentally accepted natural gas.

Honourable members will, I am sure, agree that control of the marketing of this valuable indigenous fuel supply should be undertaken with a view to serving the best interests of the people of South Australia. However, before dealing with initiatives in this Bill in that regard, I will outline changes proposed with a view to bringing the company into line with modern company law and practice. These have been drafted after lengthy discussions with the directors of the South Australian Gas Company and consideration of their submissions.

It is proposed that those sections of the Gas Act relating to Government control and administrative matters of the company, such as its superannuation fund, be repealed and re-enacted in the company's own Act. This leaves untouched those provisions of the Gas Act relating to the quality and price of gas. It is also proposed that the whole of the Gas Company's Act be repealed but in such a way as to ensure that the identity of the company be preserved and continued, and so that the company remain a body incorporated by the 1861 Act. In particular, it is proposed that certain key provisions of the Companies Act be re-enacted with appropriate amendments and in modern language.

This is to apply particularly to provisions relating to limiting the liability of shareholders, providing for the authorised capital and the manner in which it can be increased, giving the company powers in respect of the property of others, and indemnifying it for damages inflicted, and those relating to offences against the company.

Further, it is proposed that the company's operations no longer be limited to South Australia and that a provision be included in the Bill exempting the company from all liability for damage suffered by any consumer as a result of failure of the supply of gas at any time. Such a provision gives the company protection similar to that enjoyed by

ETSA in its conditions of supply and by similar utilities interstate.

Finally, it is intended that the deed of settlement be repealed and in its place to substitute a schedule in three parts comprising the equivalent of the memorandum and articles of a company incorporated under the Companies Act together with a power to amend that schedule.

In its review of the legislative framework applying to the South Australian Gas Company, the Government has identified further changes to the Act of 1861 that it considers necessary to ensure that the company's status as a utility is preserved. These changes are as follows. The provisions relating to the enforceability of the 5 per cent limitation on shareholdings, inserted by means of an amendment to the 1861 Act, passed by this Parliament in 1979, have been strengthened.

Experience with those controls has shown that they are not totally adequate to deal with the situation with which they were intended to deal, namely, the holding of more than 5 per cent of the shares of the company by or on behalf of an individual, group of individuals or companies. The Bill therefore seeks to strengthen those provisions in the light of the experience of the past 12 months or so in administering the 1979 amendments and the review of companies and take-over laws by the Standing Committee of Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General. Thus, the Bill contains provisions tightening the definition of "associate", defining "relevant interests in shares", tightening the definition of "groups of associated shareholders", strengthening the power of the company to "request information from shareholders", enabling the company or the Corporate Affairs Commission to take court proceedings to ascertain whether the Act has been breached and empowering the Minister to order a divestiture of shares acquired in contravention of the Act.

It is the view of the Government and its legal advisers that these provisions will close any loopholes existing in the 1979 amendments. In passing, I point out that a major difficulty in regard to those amendments was to obtain the information in the first place in order to ascertain whether the Act was being breached. Further, the Bill requires the company to issue 20 000 class B shares to the S.G.I.C. These would each carry 100 votes at a general meeting. All other shares would be class A shares and would have one vote per share at a general meeting.

The price of shares to the S.G.I.C. is to be determined by the Minister having regard to the price of the company's shares on the Stock Exchange of Adelaide today. This provision, combined with the fact that S.G.I.C. is subject to Ministerial direction, will effectively put the company under Government control.

Mr. Bannon: Is the S.G.I.C. to be reimbursed?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The S.G.I.C. will be given shares that will earn it a dividend and, in terms of the issue of shares, it will be an investment. I understand that the closing price of Gas Company shares today was \$7. So, 20 000 shares at \$7 is an extensive investment.

Mr. Bannon: That is the price that will be paid?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have just explained. I will carry on with the second reading explanation. The mechanism to achieve this result has been chosen with a view to minimising any undue impact of this step on the company's share prices and limiting the funds that the S.G.I.C. will be required to invest in this way. Additionally, the Bill provides that the company shall not sell, assign, transfer, charge or otherwise deal with shares held by the company in South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary Limited without the consent of the Treasurer. Honourable members will recall that one of the factors leading to speculation in the

company's shares was the possible value to shareholders of the company's interest in South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation.

In my June statement, I pointed out that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation was set up to undertake exploration of the Cooper Basin, to locate additional gas reserves for this State, and that this activity was expected to use up all the funds available to it. I went on to say that "in this sense, South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation should not be regarded as a normal commercial enterprise". The provision in the Bill before the House today is intended to put beyond doubt that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation is seen by the Government purely as the vehicle for essential and costly exploration activity, and not as the basis for a windfall gain to the South Australian Gas Company's shareholders.

Finally, as the measures that I have just described are related to the Government's expectations that the company continue to operate as a utility, any changes to the company's objectives agreed on by shareholders are not effective unless approved by the Minister.

That, in broad terms, outlines the Bill that I have introduced into the House today. I emphasise that the Government has proposed additional measures to those necessary to simplify and modernise the legal framework in which the company operates in order to preserve the company's status and role as an energy utility. It is essential that its management and its expertise be directed to ensuring that the State's needs for energy in the form of reticulated natural gas and l.p.g. are met as efficiently and responsibly as possible. This would not be possible if there was to be continuous speculation in the company's shares and attempts to obtain control of it that might not be in the best interests of the people of this State and its customers. The Bill seeks to achieve the Government's objectives in this regard fairly and effectively. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by striking out all of its present provisions (except for the section dealing with short title) and inserting entirely new provisions in their place. These new provisions are as follows. New section 2 sets out the definitions that are required for the purposes of the new Act. New section 3 defines the conditions under which a person is to be regarded as an associate of another person for the purposes of the new Act. These provisions follow fairly closely the similar provisions in the Santos Bill and in various other Acts dealing with company take-over situations.

New section 4 deals with the cases in which a person will be regarded as having a relevant interest in a share in the company. A relevant interest arises where a person has power to exercise or control the exercise of a voting right attached to a share or to dispose of or to exercise control of the disposal of a share. New section 5 defines what is meant by a group of associated shareholders. Where one or more shareholders are associates of any other shareholder, those shareholders and the shareholder of whom they are associates constitute a group of associated shareholders. Where two or more shareholders are associates of a person who is not a shareholder, those shareholders constitute a group of associated shareholders.

New section 6 provides for the company to continue in existence as a body corporate. It deals with the objects of

the company, which are to be set out in Part A of the schedule to the Bill and provides that the administration of the company's affairs is to be governed by Part B of the schedule. Thus, the schedule constitutes in effect the memorandum and article of the company. New section 7 provides the company is a company limited by shares, and a liability of its members for the debts of the company is limited to the amount unpaid upon the shares.

New section 8 deals with the share capital of the company. The share capital is to be \$2 500 000 divided into shares of 50c each, of which 4 980 000 are to be class A shares and 20 000 are to be class B shares. All the existing shares of the company will constitute class A shares, and the class B shares are to be issued by the directors as soon as practicable after the commencement of the amending Act. The class B shares will be issued to the State Government Insurance Commission, and the moneys payable upon the issue are to be paid as soon as those shares are issued.

New subsection (5) provides that each class A share carries one vote at a general meeting or poll of the shareholders and each class B share will carry 100 votes. New subsection (6) empowers the company to increase its share capital by the creation of new shares, to consolidate or divide any of its share capital into shares of greater or lesser denomination, or to convert or make provision for the conversion of shares into stock. Subsection (7) provides that these powers are not to be exercised in such a manner as to reduce the proportionate voting power of the holders of class B shares.

New section 9 limits the power of the company to issue shares, bonds or debentures. The issue must be approved by the Treasurer. In addition, the dividends payable upon shares are not to exceed a rate that is 2 per cent per annum in excess of the semi-government (private) loan rate. New section 10 provides that a shareholder is not entitled to vote unless he is registered in respect of the shares that he holds.

New section 11 provides that no shareholder or group of associated shareholders is to hold more than 5 per cent of the shares of the company. This percentage may be increased by regulation. The prohibition does not, however, apply to the State Government Insurance Commission or a group of associated shareholders of which the State Government Insurance Commission is a member. In determining the number of shares held by a shareholder for the purposes of this provision, if the shareholder or an associate of the shareholder has a relevant interest in shares, those shares must also be brought into account, and, if a person has a relevant interest in the share of a shareholder, any other shares held by that person or any of his associates, or in which that person or any of his associates has a relevant interest, must also be brought into account.

New section 12 empowers the company to administer interrogatories to a transferee of shares in order to determine whether he is a member of a group of associated shareholders, whether he has a relevant interest in shares other than those subject to the transfer, and various other related matters. Subsection (2) provides that, if the transferee does not reply to the interrogatories, or if the directors are not satisfied of the veracity of the declaration, the company may refuse to register the transfer.

New section 13 is a somewhat similar provision relating to shareholders. New section 14 provides that a person may be summoned before the Supreme Court to be examined in relation to the question of whether a shareholder or a group of associated shareholders holds more than the maximum permissible number of shares in

the company. The answers that he gives upon an examination under this new section will be admissible in legal proceedings that arise under the new provisions.

New section 15 empowers the Minister to require a shareholder or a member of a group of associated shareholders that holds more than the maximum permissible number of shares to dispose of his shares or a specified number of them to a person who neither is nor intends to become an associate of that shareholder or of any other person specified in the notice. New section 16 deals with the company's superannuation scheme.

New section 17 is a power of compulsory acquisition. New section 18 empowers the company to lay or install pipes or apparatus under public roads and to excavate roads for the purpose of repairing pipes or apparatus previously laid. New section 19 empowers authorised employees of the company to enter premises for the purpose of inspecting pipes and apparatus to ensure that they comply with the appropriate safety regulations of the company.

New section 20 empowers the company to cut off the supply of gas to premises after a final account has been rendered and a notice of the company's intention to do so has been given to the occupier of the relevant premises. New section 21 provides that the company is not to deal in its shares in South Australian Oil and Gas without the approval of the Treasurer. Subsection (2) provides that the State Government Insurance Commission is not to deal in its class B shares in the company without the approval of the Treasurer. New section 22 establishes an offence relating to the unlawful diversion of gas.

New section 23 deals with wilful damage to the pipes or equipment of the company. New section 24 provides that pipes and apparatus laid and installed by the company do not become fixtures and remain the property of the company. New section 25 protects the plant and equipment of the company from execution under the judgments of courts. New section 26 provides that the company does not incur liability in contract or tort as a result of the cutting off or failure of the supply of gas to premises.

New section 27 provides for the summary disposal of offences and stipulates that an allegation in a complaint that the defendant acted without the consent of the company is to be accepted as proved in the absence of proof to the contrary. New section 28 deals with service of notices. New section 29 provides for the revocation of the deed of settlement.

I need not deal in detail with the contents of the schedule to the Act. As I mentioned earlier, Parts A and B correspond to the memorandum and articles of a company incorporated under the Companies Act and contain the kinds of provision that one would expect to find in the memorandum and articles of such a company.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1980

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gas Act, 1924-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is consequential upon the amendments proposed to the South Australian Gas Company's Act. The Gas Act presently contains quite a number of provisions that regulate the administration of the South Australian Gas Company. These provisions, so far as they remain

relevant, are now to be transferred to the South Australian Gas Company's Act. They will, of course, fall much more appropriately in that Act.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals section 3 of the principal Act. This section is a repealing provision relating to the South Australian Gas Company's Act. Clause 4 amends section 25 of the principal Act. The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate into section 25 the material presently contained in section 25a of the principal Act. Clauses 5, 6 and 7 make consequential repeals flowing from the proposed amendments to the South Australian Gas Company's Act.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

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

That for the remainder of the session, in relation to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and the Public Purposes Loan Bill—

Suspension of Standing Orders

1. Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bills to be presented and read a first time together and one motion moved without delay and one question put in regard to, respectively, the second readings, the Estimates Committees, the Estimates Committees Reports stage and the third readings of both Bills together.

2. Standing Orders be so far suspended as would require the Bills to be considered in a Committee of the whole House.

Consideration in Estimates Committees

3. On completion of the second readings of the Bills, a Member may discuss grievances on a motion which shall be moved by a Minister—"That the House note grievances", on the passing of which the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the schedules to the Bills shall be referred to an Estimates Committee. Such referral shall be on motion, moved by a Minister, of which notice has been given. The Committee may be ordered to report by a specified date.

4. There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A Committee may ask for explanations from Ministers of the Crown, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

5. The Speaker may, at the request of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, with one day's notice, reallocate any proposed expenditures from one Committee to the other, if

in his opinion, such reallocation is necessary to facilitate compliance with an order of the House relating to the time of reporting.

6. Forthwith at its first meeting, an Estimates Committee shall agree to a timetable for examining the items of proposed expenditure. Such timetable shall be notified to the Speaker and may not be varied without his concurrence.

Members

7. Each Estimates Committee shall consist of nine Members.

8. The Members to serve on each Committee shall be nominated by the mover, but if any one Member so demand they shall be elected in ballot.

9. A Member may be discharged from an Estimates Committee if, at the end of the examination of any item of proposed expenditure, he delivers in writing to the Speaker a request to be so discharged; provided that the Member may nominate another Member in substitution, such Member indicating on the same notice his concurrence to serve.

10. In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of an Estimates Committee, the Speaker may nominate a Member in substitution but in so doing shall have regard to the composition of the Committee as elected by the House.

11. An Estimates Committee may proceed to the despatch of business notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership.

Chairmen

12. The Chairman of—

(a) Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees; and

(b) Estimates Committee B shall be nominated in writing by the Premier to the Speaker.

13. Any Member of the Committee shall take the Chair temporarily whenever requested so to do by the Chairman of the Committee during the sitting of that Committee.

Quorum

14. The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be four, of whom one shall be the Chairman or Acting Chairman and, if at any time a quorum be not present, the Chairman shall suspend the proceedings of the Committee until a quorum be present, or adjourn the Committee.

Participation by Other Members

15. Members of the House, not being Members of the Committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the Committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum. Standing Order No. 393 shall not apply.

Sitting Times

16. An Estimates Committee shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays at 11.00 a.m. and shall adjourn by 10.00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays and 5.30 p.m. on Thursdays. If a Committee is sitting at 12.30 p.m. or 6.00 p.m. the sitting shall be suspended for one hour and a half.

Proceedings of Estimates Committee

17. Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee shall follow, as far as possible, the procedures observed in a select committee of the House, except that the sittings of the Committee shall be open to the public and Standing Order No. 395 shall not apply.

Hansard Report

18. A Hansard report of Estimates Committee proceedings shall be circulated, in manner similar to the House Hansard, as soon as practicable after completion of the Committee's proceedings.

Report of an Estimates Committee

19. A report of an Estimates Committee shall be presented by the Chairman of that Committee or a Member of the Committee deputed by him and shall contain any resolutions or expressions of opinion of the Committee.

20. On a report from an Estimates Committee being

presented, it may be taken into consideration forthwith or a future day appointed for its consideration.

21. In considering a report from an Estimates Committee, the following question shall be proposed: "That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee . . . be agreed to (and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the Committee in relation thereto be noted)".

22. Upon the completion of consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B the question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate: "That the remainder of the Bills be agreed to".

23. When the Bills have been agreed to by the House, the third readings may be taken into consideration forthwith, or made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

Time Limits

24. The following time limits shall apply in relation to the following questions—

"That the House note grievances"

One Minister and Leader of Opposition or Member deputed by him—30 minutes.

Any other Member—10 minutes.

"That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee . . . be agreed to"

One Minister and Leader of Opposition or Member deputed by him—Unlimited.

Any other Member—30 minutes.

The establishment of Budget Estimates Committees, together with the progressive introduction of programme and performance Budgets (the first of which shall be examined by this year's Estimates Committees), constitutes the cornerstone of the Government's budgetary reform policy.

That policy, I would remind the House, has several principal objectives. First, and most importantly, the Government is dedicated to improving both the efficiency and the effectiveness of all public expenditures. Secondly, the Government is committed to presenting the Budget papers and the public accounts in such a form as will permit that standard of performance to be properly measured. Thirdly, the Government is determined to restore to Parliament the means by which this institution can more effectively discharge its constitutional responsibilities.

In this respect, it must be said that in recent years the principle of responsible Government has been weakened in this State because Parliament has not been provided with either the comprehensive information or the time needed to acquaint itself fully with Government activities. In these circumstances, Governments of the day have retained the confidence of this House more from a sense of Party loyalty and Party discipline than from an informed Parliamentary judgment of Government performance.

Conscientious members, on both sides of the House, and on the cross benches, have frequently been frustrated in their attempts to fathom all the relevant details of Government financial management. Nowhere has this been more evident than in Parliament's consideration of the Budget, which is the principal expression of any Government's policies and priorities and arguably the most important document tabled annually in this House.

This Government has undertaken the task, the monumental reformatory task, of ensuring that henceforth Parliament will have the means—both the information and the time—which are needed if Government is truly to be held accountable for its actions. As to the first requirement, that of better, more complete and intelligible information, the Government believes that the introduction of programme and performance budgeting will substantially achieve the high standards required. I shall refer in more detail to programme and performance

Budgets during presentation of the State Budget tomorrow.

With regard to providing more time in which this House can consider the Budget, the Government believes that the establishment of Estimates Committees, in the terms proposed, will provide greater opportunity than ever before for all members to inform themselves of the details of public financial management.

I turn now to the details of the Sessional Orders, which are incorporated in the notice of motion.

Clause 1 is substantially the same as earlier suspensions. It will permit the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and the Public Purposes Loan Bill to be introduced and debated together. I anticipate that passage of a Public Finance Act Amendment Bill later in this session will remove the need for this particular suspension in future years and, indeed, I trust that this will be the last occasion on which we must use this artificial means of comparing the Revenue Account and the Loan Account together.

Clause 2 removes the Committee of the whole procedure, which is to be replaced by Estimates Committees.

Clause 3 preserves the right of members (a jealously guarded right, although sometimes not always taken up on cue) to participate in a grievance debate upon completion of the second reading of the Bills. Indeed, in calculating the likely time frame for the passage of these Bills, the Government has meticulously ensured that no less time is provided for the second reading and grievance debates than in earlier years.

Clause 3 also provides for the referral of the Bills to Estimates Committees and empowers the House to require those committees to report by a specified date. It is the Government's intention that the committees will first sit on 30 September and report to the House two weeks later on 14 October. This means that the time which would normally be devoted to debate in the Committee of the whole will be doubled from one week to two, and further, since there are now to be two committees, that the total time to be spent in Committee will effectively be quadrupled.

Clause 4 provides that there shall be two Estimates Committees, to be known respectively as Estimates Committee A and B. Members familiar with the Government's policy on this matter will note that this is one Committee less than the number foreshadowed before the election. Owing to the availability of *Hansard* and table staff, however, it is not possible in this first year of operation to service three committees sitting simultaneously. Notwithstanding this reduction, the Government believes that the task of inquiry will be performed no less efficiently with only two committees, which is the same number as used by the Commonwealth House of Representatives even though the Federal Budget is infinitely more complex.

Clause 4 also empowers the Estimates Committees to seek information relating to items of proposed expenditure from Ministers of the Crown. Two associated matters which I wish to explain to the House are, first, that it is the Government's intention that every possible step should be taken to utilise fully the Estimates Committees. Accordingly, the Government shall move, in another place, for the suspension of Standing Orders to permit Ministers in that place to appear personally before the committees. Secondly, although Ministers will normally be accompanied by their senior advisers, who shall be available to provide factual information to the Estimates Committees, the Government is of the view that committee inquiries should at all times be directed to Ministers. The discretion then rests with the Minister to

refer the question to his or her advisers for direct answer to the committee.

As I said earlier, the principal object of establishing Estimates Committees is to strengthen the operation of responsible Government, that is, to strengthen the direct responsibility of Ministers of the Crown to members of this Parliament. Accordingly, it is only Ministers who will be called to appear before Estimates Committees, though public servants will accompany their Ministers on those occasions, and it will be only Ministers to whom inquiries should properly be directed. Again, the Minister will be able to call on his expert public servant for the required information.

Finally, clause 4 establishes the right of an Estimates Committee to formulate a resolution or expression of opinion regarding a proposed item of expenditure. Such resolution, if any, shall later be considered by the House. The committees may not, however, vote on the proposed expenditure or vary the amount of proposed expenditure.

Clause 6 requires each committee, at its first meeting, to arrange a time table for the examination of estimates, and not, thereafter, to depart substantially from that time table without Mr. Speaker's concurrence. The obvious reason for this requirement is that Ministers, public servants and, not least, members themselves, will need to organise their schedules during the two weeks of committee sittings and must therefore know, with a reasonable degree of certainty, when their special interests shall be called on for examination.

Clauses 7 to 15 provide that each committee shall comprise nine members, including a Chairman and Deputy Chairman. It is appropriate to say now that it is suggested that the Chairman of Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees (the member for Eyre) and, since there is no Deputy Chairman or Deputy Speaker, it is necessary to nominate the member for Goyder to be the Chairman of Estimates Committee B, and that is what I propose to do.

These clauses also provide features which are designed to accommodate the special interests of all members of the House. First, the right of all members to participate in an Estimates Committee is guaranteed by clause 15. I know that this has been a matter of concern to the member for Mitcham, the member for Flinders and the member for Semaphore.

The only restrictions that shall apply to an attending member, who is not a formal member of the Estimates Committee, is that he may not ask questions of a Minister until the committee has completed its own questioning, and then, in accordance with the traditions of the House, may ask only such questions as have not been asked already. Further, a member of the House, not being a member of the committee, may not vote, move a motion, or be counted for the purpose of a quorum. There is no question that members who are not members of the committee will be able to take part in the deliberations of the committee, with that one proviso, that members of the committee themselves will take the first questions, at the discretion of the Chairman.

Secondly, the rather wide disparity between quorum requirements and total membership, which is a difference of five, or more than half the committee, recognises that official members of one committee may have a special interest in a matter before the other committee, and, therefore, may wish to withdraw temporarily to attend that other committee. The Sessional Order has thus been drawn to permit the greatest possible movement of members between committees without hindering the progress of either one.

Of special significance is clause 9, which has been

included at the suggestion of and to accommodate the wishes of the Opposition and which therefore provides ample evidence of the Government's desire to operate bilaterally in this matter, in the interests of better Government and better scrutiny of Parliament.

Clause 9 recognises that, under the normal membership provisions of Estimates Committees, the Opposition spokesman on any given portfolio may not be a member of the committee which examines the estimates of that portfolio. If that were to happen, the Opposition spokesman concerned would, at best, be relegated to the status of a member-observer, able to ask questions only when the committee had completed its inquiries. In order to overcome this problem, and, as I say, to demonstrate the Government's *bona fides*, clause 9 permits any member of an Estimates Committee to withdraw from membership of the committee and nominate another member to take his place. In such cases, the nominated member must simultaneously signify his willingness to join the committee. It should be noted that the transfer of membership will be permitted only during the interval that occurs between the consideration of two sets of estimates. That proviso, while predominantly intended for the Opposition, can equally well apply to members on the cross bench, provided that they can obtain an agreement with a member of the committee.

With special regard to the one independent member of the House, and the two representatives of minor Parties, I point out that, in addition to the membership and observer provisions already specified, any member of an Estimates Committee who wishes to withdraw from membership, but who fails to secure the agreement of another member to take his place, may nevertheless be replaced by another member, nominated by Mr. Speaker, who shall have regard to the composition of the committee as elected by the House.

Clause 18 ensures that the proceedings of Estimates Committees shall be recorded in *Hansard*. It is the intention of the Government, so far as is practicable, to ensure that any information requested by a committee, but not available that day, shall be provided at the commencement of the next day's sitting and so incorporated into *Hansard* at that time.

The remaining clauses of the order govern the procedures of the House upon the completion of Estimates Committee hearings. Each committee shall report to the House, and the opinions of the committees, if any, shall be debated on the motion "That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee A or B [as the case may be] be agreed to and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the committee in relation thereto be noted."

Naturally, this motion will be capable of amendment should any member wish to move the reduction of a proposed vote and so express a want of confidence in the Government. I point out, however, that since the motion will relate to all the proposed expenditures considered by any one Estimates Committee, any member seeking to reduce the proposed amount in two or more of those expenditures will need to include all such items of disagreement in the one amendment.

With regard to the division of work between the two committees, I wish to say that the Government will ensure, as far as possible, that the load is distributed equitably. This does not mean that the number of estimates to be considered by each committee will be equal but, rather, that the apportionment of large and small departmental estimates between the committees will be balanced. Even so, there remains the possibility that one committee may complete its investigations far earlier

than the other, or that one committee may not be able to complete its investigations at all. To cover this contingency, clause 5 authorises Mr. Speaker to redistribute the work load to facilitate compliance with the order of the House relating to the time of reporting.

Finally, I wish to emphasise the pioneering nature of this exercise. The Government does not expect, in this first year of operation, that the deliberations of Estimates Committees will be conducted entirely without difficulty. There may well be unforeseen problems, though they are likely to be problems of procedure, not of principle. In any event, the Government recognises the novelty of the procedure no less than it recognises the considerable benefits to be gained by Parliament. The Government trusts that all members will participate gainfully and in a spirit of goodwill and political neutrality. For one thing is certain—the major advantages to be gained, which stand above Party politics, will never be realised if Party politics are permitted to dominate proceedings.

One further undertaking I give the House is that the opinions of the committees and of all members as to Estimates Committee procedure and possible improvement of the Sessional Order, that is, in future proceedings will be carefully considered by the Government. It is our intention, eventually, to refer the matter of establishing Estimates Committees to the Standing Orders Committee, for recommendations that will entrench the provision in the procedures of the House, but no such step is contemplated until all members have had the opportunity to express an initial opinion, and until we can be sure that the procedures set down are effective and work efficiently.

Two matters have been brought to my attention since yesterday which, if attended to, would ensure the better working of the Sessional Orders. As clause 9 now stands, when a member wishes to be discharged from the committee he must deliver his decision in writing to the Speaker. If, however, the Speaker is not available, then the Government agrees that the member should be able to deliver the request to the Clerk instead. Accordingly, I propose to insert the words "or Clerk" after "Speaker". The second matter was raised by the member for Mitcham and concerns the right of a member to move an amendment to the motion in clause 21. Standing Orders provide that such an amendment cannot proceed without a seconder. While I would make the point that, if the honourable member cannot command a seconder for his amendment, he is unlikely to command the majority in the vote, I am happy in the spirit in which the Estimates Committees are to be established to insert a new clause 21a to read, "Any amendment moved pursuant to clause 21 shall not require a seconder."

Mr. Millhouse: That's not quite the best form—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am happy to listen to balanced and reasonable suggestions from the member for Mitcham. With the addition of the two amendments, or if there is a better form of words that could be used (and that is a matter for the House to decide), I commend the Sessional Order to the House.

Several people have spent a considerable time in developing the idea of Estimates Committees and in researching the application of those committees in other Parliaments of the Commonwealth, and I put on record my thanks to them. Officers of my staff when I was Leader of the Opposition, officers of the Premier's Department, and other Ministerial officers have been involved, and I express my gratitude also to the table officers and members of your staff, Mr. Speaker, who have been more than helpful in devising this Sessional Order.

Also, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his co-operation, and place on record my belief that these orders

have been drawn up with the co-operation of both sides, and I am grateful that we have a spirit of accord that I hope will be carried into the deliberations of the Estimates Committees. The procedure has been directed to providing every member with an opportunity to obtain factual information. In that regard I believe that it is an extremely important and noteworthy development in the Parliamentary procedure of this Parliament. In commending the Sessional Orders, I move the amendments that I have already discussed.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Sessional Orders proposed by the Premier and his two amendments, which we agree improve the orders as they stand. We welcome the attempt by the Government to give effect to the policies it enunciated when in Opposition that it would introduce the Estimates Committee procedure. However, I sound a note of caution, in that we are embarking on an experimental path, and until we have gone through the first set of Estimates and the first Budget considerations we will not really be able to assess whether or not the procedure proposed is adequate or has improved our consideration of the Budget. We support the objects that the Government has in mind in introducing this procedure.

As the Sessional Orders spell out, the procedure outlined provides considerable opportunities for all members actively to question, in a potentially more effective way, expenditures and expenditure priorities of the Government.

In referring to problems in considering previous Budgets, the Premier said that two specific factors had been at work in limiting efficient and effective Parliamentary consideration. The first was the lack of information supplied by the Government to assist members, and the second referred to the lack of time provided by Parliament in the Committee of the Whole. I suggest that one must qualify both these statements, and add a further factor. While agreeing with the Premier that generally in recent years the effectiveness of Parliament's review of the Budget has not been very great, I point out that in relation to information it is up to members what sort of questions they ask, their degree of probing, and the research they have done in preparing those questions for the debate. If information has not been sufficient, that has partly been caused by the lack of research and effort put into preparing the proper questions, particularly by members of the Opposition.

Concerning time, that is also a fair comment, because Parliament has not had sufficient time in recent years to deal with the full Estimates. One of the most attractive features of the proposed procedure is the opportunity it provides to the House to consider each and every Estimate and to be able to question each and every Minister concerning the administration and financial programmes of his department. That is a great opportunity. The third factor is one that the Premier for the sake of completeness should have referred to. It relates to the tactics of the Opposition in handling the debate through Committee. In the past few years of the previous Government the standard of debate and questioning deteriorated considerably, at times bordering on an exercise in trivia and repetition, and using filibusters that went into the early hours, not yielding concrete or useful information but aimed only at keeping the House in permanent session, all to no great effect. We in Government were the victims of that procedure. I think we have demonstrated in our first Budget period in Opposition that we could use such tactics as effectively as did the previous Opposition. In a sense, that is one reason why we welcome what is the time for

breaking that circuit, because considerations had deteriorated somewhat.

I stress that the nature of the questioning that took place on the Government's first Budget by us in Opposition was aimed at eliciting information in a situation that we considered was more frustrating than was the situation when the present Government was in Opposition. While criticisms can be levelled at both sides for the way in which the procedure was undertaken, it was still a fact that, in the course of Budget deliberations last year, not sufficient information was provided by the Government, and its approach to that debate, which was not very different from the approach to previous debates, did not sit easily alongside the rather grandiose election promises it had made about the way in which the Opposition's rights should be restored and greater opportunities should be given, and so on.

Having said that, I recognise and place on record my belief, that the Government is attempting to remedy that situation on this occasion. The Government has gone a long way to implementing, by means of these Sessional Orders and this procedure, the sort of policies it enunciated. It is an experiment well worth trying. I appreciate the remarks the Premier made about the provision of greater information. Whether or not programme and performance budgeting can indeed lead to a fuller and better consideration of the Budget is something we can judge only after we have had the experience of it. Certainly, this procedure provides us with an opportunity to delve fully and, I believe, more productively than the difficult situations of the Committee of the Whole has allowed in the past. Certainly, the ability to have each and every Minister directly before the committee will be of considerable use.

As far as the time table is concerned, I certainly agree with the Premier that adequate notice should be given when each set of Estimates is to be considered to ensure that not only the Minister and his officers are ready for their appearance before the committee but also to ensure that the appropriate members from each side are available to serve on the committee.

We appreciate the procedure provided under clause 9 which allows members to be discharged from these committees and replaced in considering specific sets of Estimates. I think that will ensure a far more effective committee consideration. While notice when Estimates are to come on is important, obviously there must be considerable flexibility in the time taken by each committee on these sets of Estimates. That is something that can be found only through experience. Indeed, there may be some areas which do not require much questioning or much time, and there may be others that require far more than the average. I would hope that flexibility will be allowed by the Government. I think the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, have been empowered with the ability to distribute the work load amongst the committees ensures that we will be able to have some balance in the time allowed for the consideration of the various Estimates.

I believe that I need say no more except to express the hope that this experiment will succeed in the objectives that the Government and the Opposition see it achieving. The fact that consultation took place in the formulation of these Sessional Orders and that consultation will continue in relation to the detailed workings of the committees and in the review of the procedure at the end of the exercise, it bodes well for some kind of bipartisan approach aimed at making the Parliament more effective, which is the Government's aim. In that we are certainly prepared to co-operate and be involved.

We welcome the experience as an opportunity and an

experiment. We do see some problems in it, but we are not prepared to do other than enter wholeheartedly into the exercise to try to make it work and make it effective.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I would have preferred the Leader of the Opposition to say "tripartisan" rather than a "bipartisan" approach to this. I must say that I had not seen these proposals until yesterday when they were distributed to all members of the House.

Mr. McRae: Neither had I.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I gather that some members of the honourable member's Party had, and had taken part in discussions on them. If those members did not tell him about it, that is a matter for them. I did not know what was happening; I wondered whether we were going to get anything. I do not want to intrude a jarring note but I just make clear that I knew nothing of these proposals until they were distributed yesterday.

In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, I can say that I am probably in as good a position as anyone else in this place to judge which of the two major Parties, to use the Premier's implied term, is to blame for the break-down of the system which we have used up to now. There is no difference between the two—absolutely none at all. We have had the farce in the past few years of getting through only a number of the lines of the departments before the guillotine has been imposed, and that has been the end of it. Some Ministers have not been queried at all on their departments. For the past few years it was the Liberal Party that filibustered, and then last year it was the Labor Party that filibustered even more, and with no more excuse than the Liberals had had, so both Parties must take the blame for what has happened, if blame it be. Certainly, we had to have some sort of a change, if the considerations of the Budget were to mean anything in this place, if we were to do more than consider just a few of the departments.

When I first read this document through, I was immediately reminded of something which a previous Clerk of this House used to say again and again. I refer to Mr. Gordon Combe, who has recently retired as the Ombudsman, who said that it was the duty of Parliament and the duty, particularly, that he felt he had as the Clerk of this House to preserve the right of individual members in here, and to make sure they were not in any way whittled down. I am not for a moment suggesting that the responsibility for any whittling away of the opportunities for private members under these proposed Sessional Orders is the responsibility of Clerks of the Table.

Mr. Lewis: I should hope not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I just said that I am not. What an idiotic interjection!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed, and that would have been better not said, like most interjections of the member for Mallee. There is no doubt that under these Sessional Orders the opportunities open to a sole member (I use that term to embrace the member for Flinders, the member for Semaphore, and me) are cut down. It may be that other members do not care too much about that, or it may be that there is no other way to control what had become uncontrolled than to do this. However, there are several significant problems, one of which is being remedied by the amendment moved by the Premier, for ordinary members. First, it seems to me (and I have not compared this with the present procedures, but it must be so because the opportunity to speak is virtually unlimited at present when we are in the Committee of the Whole) that the number of opportunities to speak is reduced. Secondly, the length of time which an ordinary member can take up

is reduced. There is 10 minutes on the grievance debate and then 30 minutes on the debate to adopt the Estimates pursuant to clause 21.

The third matter that I mention is the one which the Premier has covered. At present, it is possible for any member to move for the reduction of a line, and therefore a motion of no-confidence in the Government, without requiring a seconder because a seconder is not required in Committee. However, as the clause has been drawn (and I accept that it was done unwittingly), clause 21 does require a seconder because it is in the House and not in the Committee, and that meant that there would have to be a seconder. The Premier said that if a member could not get a seconder he would not be doing too well. At the risk of some pain to you, Sir, I remind the House of one occasion when I did not have any support for the reduction of a line, but politically it was a telling occasion. I think it was in 1975, when the Hon. Mr. Virgo, then the Minister of Transport, had said some silly thing about country transportation costs that had caused a lot of annoyance in country areas of the State.

It was not long before the Goyder by-election, caused by the resignation of Mr. Steele Hall, and I moved to reduce the Minister of Transport line by \$1 on the basis of what he had said, which had caused outrage in the country. Not one member in this House supported me, and what happened to me this afternoon happened on that occasion. The thing was called off, and I can recall the then member for Torrens, Mr. John Coumbe, saying afterwards that he hoped that I could then get on to make some responsible opposition, or some silly phrase like that, to the Budget.

That was reported in the country, and the fact was that it did cause a reaction in favour of the Liberal Movement. As you, Sir, will remember only too well, Mr. Boundy was elected as the Liberal Movement candidate. In my view, that was one of a number of elements in the victory that the Liberal Movement had on that occasion. I did not have a seconder, so let no member think that, because one does not get a seconder in this place, it means that the effort is not worth while.

I appreciate the Premier's being prepared to move the amendment so that a seconder will not be required, but the occasion is still cut down, because it can be done only once. We all put ourselves in our own positions, and we never know, in politics, when we are going to be on our own. A few years ago, I would not have thought that I would be on my own. I do not regret that I am, but I would never have thought that it would happen to me. It may happen to other members. No honourable member thought that I would survive the next election, but I have survived a number of elections.

At present, it is possible to move a reduction of any line, but in future it will be possible to move that motion only once, and one will have to put into it as many references as one can, and there will be only 30 minutes for the member to canvass the lot of them. So, that is a real reduction in the opportunities of a private member.

The fourth point is one about which I am still not happy in spite of assurances, which the Premier has given and which I have discussed informally with you, Sir. I make the assumption which I think is conclusively correct that I will have no guernsey on either of these two committees. I will not be one of the 18 members to serve on either committee A or committee B. I doubt whether the member for Flinders or the member for Semaphore will be on them, although perhaps the member for Flinders will be. I do not know about that, but I assume that I will not be.

There is no doubt that, on a literal reading of clause 15, the participation of any member apart from the lucky nine,

either original or substituted, is at the discretion of the Chairman of the committee. This is how it reads:

Members of the House, not being members of the committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the committee, but shall not vote . . .

I can see this happening: the member for Eyre will be one of the chairmen, and the member for Goyder the other. If I cross the member for Eyre (I think this is more likely than my crossing the member for Goyder; every time I get up in this place when he is in the Chair, even though he is one of my prize constituents, he warns me, or something), he can say to me, pursuant to clause 15, that I will not take any further part in the committee's deliberations. That is there; that is the literal meaning. It might not be the intention, and I hope that it does not happen. I have used the member for Eyre as an example, but I hope he will not hold it against me.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall see. I will not give him the good representation in this place that I give him now if he does take it out on me. The participation of any member outside the nine is, under this clause, entirely at the discretion of the Chairman. I think that that is cutting it down too much. It may be, as the Premier explained, that the intention is that other members can speak after members of the committee, but that is not written into the Sessional Orders anywhere, and I wish it were.

I agree with what is perfectly obvious: that this must be an experiment. Sessional Orders such as this cannot be drawn perfectly the first time. We will find a lot of bugs in them. Inevitably, we have not seen those bugs yet; none of us have. However, they will become obvious as time goes on, and it will be necessary to amend the Sessional Orders. I hope that we will all steadily bear in mind that the consideration of the Budget should, as far as possible, put every member on an equal footing, to whichever Party he belongs, be it Government, Labor Party, Independent, Democrats, or Country Party. It should not matter. The aim of the exercise should be to give us all a better opportunity than we have had in the past few years because of the breakdown in the system.

That is all I want to say about that, but I have one last point for the Premier. The amendment that I suggested following clause 21 was something that I worked out quickly last night. Looking at it this morning, I think that the wording is not quite as good as it should be. It would do, but it is not as felicitous as it should be. I suggest that we should insert a new paragraph 21a, to read as follows:

An amendment moved to the question proposed in clause 21 shall not require a seconder.

I have made sure that the Premier has got that wording, and I suggest that it would fit in better and sound better than the wording which he mentioned, and which was originally mine. I appreciate his readiness and the readiness of the Labor Party to insert this to overcome what was obviously an effect not intended. I suggest that would be a better way of doing it.

The SPEAKER: Is the further amendment of the member for Mitcham seconded?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite prepared to accept the amendment the honourable member has put forward.

Mr. McRAE: I will second it.

The SPEAKER: Would the Premier, by leave, withdraw his original amendment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier then duly seconds the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. McRAE: I do not want to canvass any of the ground covered by previous speakers, except to say that the point raised by the member for Mitcham in relation to clause 15 seems a valid one. I think the words are otiose anyway. If we strike out "at the discretion of the Chairman", we are losing nothing. The Chairman must, in the nature of things, have control of the proceedings. Nothing is lost, and everything seems to be gained. I move:

That the words "at the discretion of the Chairman" appearing in clause 15 be struck out.

Mr. PETERSON: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: Are there any other contributors to the debate? If the Premier speaks, he closes the debate on the amendments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful for the spirit in which this motion has been debated. Referring first to the contribution of the member for Mitcham, I am pleased indeed to welcome his approval in principle. Although the honourable member has not gone along without some reservations, I believe that he has expressed his approval in principle for the Sessional Orders. I am grateful to the honourable member for that.

In answer to the reservations that the honourable member expressed, I indicate that certainly there is a reduction in the time available for honourable members to move the reduction of a line. I have not done any detailed research in regard to the number of times on which such a motion has been moved in the Committee stages of a Budget debate over the past few years, but to my recollection that has occurred two, three or four times, and no more, as far as we have been able to go in terms of the progress made.

I do not imagine that there would be a major problem in a member's moving a reduction of a line in the half-hour period. Obviously, if such a move is contemplated, it will be made because of a very deep-felt commitment to a particular principle or item of expenditure and, with respect to the honourable member, I am certain that he will be able to address himself with great force to such matters within that period.

Mr. Millhouse: It only takes more effort to say it all in the proper time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: For a man of the honourable member's physical and verbal attributes, I am sure that it will present no problem at all. The whole principle is one to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, namely that far more time will be available for the examination of the things that really matter, like expenditure and the facts and figures that are available. That is more important, I believe, than any attempt to raise a political protest, which I am sure can be done in the 30-minute period.

The participation issue, to which the member for Playford moved an amendment, is to be at the discretion of the Chairman. In other words, the intention is that the Chairman, as always, will have control over the deliberations of the committee, and it is his responsibility to ensure that questions do not become repetitious. As I envisage the situation, it may well be that the members of a committee will deal with a particular item of expenditure and ask questions in relation to it; a member who is not a member of the committee may then enter the committee room and, having missed what has gone on in the preceding 20 minutes or half hour, may catch the Chairman's eye and seek leave to ask the same or similar questions. If that happens, the Chairman must have the power to say, "This question has already been asked or answered, and, in the interests of allowing proceedings to flow, there is no way that question can be answered, and it must be ruled out of order." The words "at the discretion of the Chairman" reinforce the fact that the Chairman is in

the Chair and in charge of the proceedings of the committee, and that he has the authority to ensure that questions do not become repetitious. That is the only reason for the provision. It may well be an excess of caution.

Mr. McRae: It is an excess of caution.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Nevertheless, it can do no harm, and I assure the member for Playford that it is certainly not the intention of the Government, in drawing up these orders, that there should be any undue influence or discrimination against a member who is not a member of the committee.

Mr. Millhouse: I think the member for Playford's point is that the Chairman is always in charge of proceedings, whether or not that is stated.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I quite agree, but I believe in this instance that it is better left in to reinforce the point. I repeat that it will not be easy for people who are not members of the committee and who enter halfway through the proceedings to fit into the committee atmosphere straight away. I prefer to see the provision left as it is to reinforce the Chairman's authority.

Regarding the other amendment moved by the member for Mitcham, I have already intimated that I totally agree with it. I believe that the amendment provides better wording, and I quite agree that individual members in the Committee stages should have the right to move motions without requiring a seconder. As this, in effect, replaces the Committee stage, members should still have the right to have their voice heard without the need for a seconder; I am perfectly happy to accept that.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the previous Committee stages of consideration of the Budget and referred to filibusters, flights of fancy and to the rather prolonged debates and discussions that went on during that time. I am pleased that the Leader has acknowledged that there have been faults on both sides of the House, particularly on the Opposition side, regardless of which Party was in Opposition. I am very pleased that he acknowledges that this Party is honouring the undertakings that it gave before the election, and, further, that this experiment is well worth trying.

I should like to make clear that we will certainly make every effort to ensure that these sessional orders work and that the whole principle of Estimates Committees works to the advantage of every member of the House and to the Parliament as a whole. I believe that what has been said this afternoon indicates that every honourable member will be using his or her best endeavours to ensure that the scheme works. There are likely to be changes: this has been mentioned by everyone. There is no doubt that there will be changes. It may be that we will not come up with a perfect Sessional Order next year, but I want to ensure that we have something as close to perfect as possible (I know that we may never reach perfection) before it is incorporated in Standing Orders.

I ask all honourable members to approach the exercise (which will be conducted in the two weeks from 30 September, if the schedule is approved) with an open mind and in a spirit of co-operation. Certainly, the Government will adopt that approach, and I repeat that, from what I have heard, I believe that that approach will be adopted by every member in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin's amendment carried.

The House divided on Mr. McRae's amendment:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Blacker, Max Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, McRae (teller), Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Billard.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

New clause 21a inserted.

Motion as amended carried.

PORTUS HOUSE

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That in the opinion of this Council any decision by the Government to demolish the property at 1 Park Terrace, Gilberton, known as Portus House, is premature. Portus House is a significant part of the built heritage of South Australia and must be retained while any option exists for alternative transport corridors to meet the needs of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978-1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The aim of this Bill is to provide a mechanism that will enable significant aspects of the privately owned cultural and natural environment to be conserved by means other than acquisition or planning controls. Honourable members will be aware that one of the objectives of the Department for the Environment is to conserve significant aspects of the cultural and natural environment. Traditionally, important items or areas have been acquired and managed by the Government or subjected to controls which restrict development in some way.

As a means by which conservation objectives may be achieved, these methods suffer certain disadvantages. Acquisition is likely to be prohibitively expensive, both in terms of initial cost and subsequent management expenses, and must therefore be very selective and apply only to the most significant areas. Control measures may be cheaper than outright acquisition but experience has shown that their use can be counter productive, because they may create antagonism amongst affected landholders. Moreover, controls are negative by nature and cannot compel a landholder to manage his land in a particular way. Dissatisfaction with the above methods has led to the development of an alternative approach. This involved the management of significant features by landholders in accordance with an agreement negotiated between the Government and landholder. The offer of incentives, such as rate relief or management assistance may, in appropriate cases, be used to encourage landholders to enter such agreements.

While it is, and always has been, possible for the Government to reach agreement with a landholder that his land will be managed in a particular way, such an agreement will bind only that landholder and not his successors in title. However, where the Government, in accordance with the terms of an agreement and in order to secure certain conservation or land management objec-

tives, has provided a landholder with finance, development approval or other assistance, it will wish to ensure that any successor in title to that landholder will comply with the terms of the agreement. Similarly, a landholder who has striven to conserve or maintain an aspect of his land will not wish to see his efforts undone by the actions of a future landholder. At present, the law provides only limited opportunities for long-term management of items or areas by agreement with landholders. The use of covenants, a land management mechanism based upon agreement between landholders, is superficially the most appropriate of existing mechanisms. However, a covenant will only bind successors in title if it satisfies certain requirements. The covenant may only contain conditions of a negative nature, and it must relate to two properties, one which bears the burden of the covenant and one which enjoys the benefit. Generally, the two properties must be adjoining. These requirements militate against the use of covenants for conservation or land management purposes. Rarely will the Government own land adjoining that of a landholder with whom it may wish to reach agreement and, equally important, either party may wish to include in any agreement, conditions requiring positive actions, such as maintenance of a building or the care and regeneration of native vegetation. It is the purpose of this Bill to overcome these difficulties by introducing into the State's legislation a new mechanism called a heritage agreement. The heritage agreement mechanism will enable landholders to ensure on a voluntary basis the long-term conservation of significant aspects of the cultural and/or natural environment present on their property.

The landholder will be able to agree with a designated authority that an aspect of the landholder's property will be conserved and managed in a certain way. The agreement may be expressed to run for a fixed term of years or to last in perpetuity, but in any event would bind the landholder's successors in title as long as it was in existence. The agreement would not require a dominant property as in covenants, and could include both negative and positive provisions. The Minister, in his capacity as the corporation, the trustee of the State Heritage, is to be the authority that will enter into heritage agreements with landholders. However, provision is also made for local government or non-government bodies, with the approval of the Minister, to enter into a heritage agreement instead of the Minister as the authority under the agreement.

Since the terms of individual agreements may vary according to the needs of particular situations, heritage agreements may be used for a variety of conservation and land management purposes, from the preservation and management of native habitat to the restoration and maintenance of historic buildings. Their use departs from the traditional belief that the Government has the sole responsibility to protect natural and cultural resources, and, by involving individuals directly with protective measures on their own lands, can build on and help foster community support for conservation measures.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act which sets out the arrangement of the Act. The clause inserts a heading for a new Part IIIA relating to heritage agreements. Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act, the definition section, by inserting definitions

required for the provisions relating to heritage agreements. Clause 5 amends section 8 of the principal Act which sets out the functions of the South Australian Heritage Committee. The clause adds the further function of advising the Minister on any matter relating to a heritage agreement or proposed heritage agreement. Clause 6 changes the heading to Part III of the principal Act.

Clause 7 provides for the enactment of a new Part IIIA relating to heritage agreements. Proposed new section 16a provides that an authority, the Minister in his capacity as the corporation, the trustee of the State Heritage, or with the approval of the Minister, any other body corporate, may enter into heritage agreements. The authority may enter into a heritage agreement with the owner of any land or building that is or is proposed to be registered as a State heritage item under Part III of the principal Act or in respect of any land or building that the Minister does not propose to register as a State heritage item but that he considers should be preserved or enhanced having regard to its aesthetic, scientific, architectural, historical or cultural value or interest to its relationship to a registered item or to its effect on the environment. The South Australian Heritage Act, 1978-1979, was essentially designed to preserve those items that are of considerable significance to the heritage of the State. Many items, however, while having importance, may not be appropriate for listing. For example, the conservation of native habitat on private land is seen as an essential complement to the State's parks and reserves system, providing a means for genetic exchange between the larger parks, but individual areas may not be considered of sufficient significance to warrant listing. Proposed new section 16a also provides that the Minister consult with the Heritage Committee before entering into a heritage agreement.

Proposed new section 16b sets out the terms that may be agreed to under a heritage agreement and provides for the legal effect of such an agreement. These terms are all directed towards securing the preservation or enhancement of the land or building in question and are deemed to be binding on the corporation and the owner of the land or building who enters into the agreement. Where the operation of a heritage agreement is registered by the Registrar-General, the agreement is deemed to bind the successors in title of that owner. In general terms, the effect of this provision is that an agreement when so registered will have priority over any competing rights or interests in respect of the land or building other than prior registered rights or interests.

Proposed new section 16b also makes provision for financial and other assistance to landholders who enter into heritage agreements. This is considered necessary in view of the fact that in many cases the market value of land subject to such agreement will be reduced as a result of its reduced development potential. It is clear that landholders will more readily co-operate if there is some sharing of the costs and burdens involved. Proposed new section 16b provides that heritage agreements will be enforceable by the ordinary civil remedies that apply to contracts, but with the additional power for the authority to obtain an award of damages against any owner who intentionally or recklessly damages the land or building in breach of the heritage agreement. The section provides for variation or termination of a heritage agreement by agreement between the authority and the current owner or in a manner or in circumstances provided for in the agreement.

Proposed new section 16c provides for the case where the land or building subject to a heritage agreement is registered as a State heritage item. The new section is designed to resolve any conflict or inconsistency between

the restrictions that may have been agreed to under the heritage agreement and the restriction imposed by Part VAA of the Planning and Development Act. This is done by providing that the heritage agreement may specify that Part VAA is not to apply to the registered item. Any such provision in a heritage agreement would have effect according to its terms while the heritage agreement is in force. Proposed new section 16d is designed to facilitate proof of any heritage agreement in any legal proceedings.

Proposed new section 16e requires the Minister to establish a register of heritage agreements which is to be made available for public inspection. Clause 8 provides for the enactment of a new section 26a requiring the Registrar-General to make appropriate entries in the records kept at the Lands Titles Office or the General Registry Office in respect of any land that is registered as a State heritage item or subject to a heritage agreement. As a result, any person searching the title would immediately be apprised of the existence of a heritage agreement and could then under proposed new section 16e obtain a copy of that agreement.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPRAISERS ACT AND AUCTIONEERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes the repeal of the Appraisers Act, 1934-1961, and the repeal of the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1961. The Auctioneers Act was introduced to consolidate South Australian Statutes of 1862 and 1920, which in turn consolidated earlier legislation based on English Statutes. The English precedents required auctioneers to be licensed and made provision for licence fees and renewals, in lieu of the former practice of imposing duty on auction sales. The main purpose of all these Statutes appears to have been to raise revenue, although the Auctioneers Act also provides that only fit and proper persons may be licensed. No other licensing criteria are provided for.

Similarly, the Appraisers Act was introduced to consolidate earlier Statutes, based on English precedents, dealing with appraisers. The main purpose of the legislation, as with the Auctioneers Act, was to raise revenue. The person issuing the licence must be satisfied as to the applicant's character and qualifications, but no other licensing criteria are established.

Applications for licences under the Auctioneers Act are made to the local court of limited jurisdiction nearest to the applicant's usual place of residence. In practice, most applications are heard by magistrates in the Adelaide Local Court. The magistrate issues a certificate that the applicant is a fit and proper person to be licensed; the certificate and required fee are then presented to the cashier in the Commercial Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, who issues the necessary licence. Licences under the Appraisers Act are issued by the same cashier, but there is no court hearing.

These two Statutes provide a scheme for the licensing of auctioneers and appraisers, the payment of licence fees, renewal of licences, exemption of certain persons (for example, municipal officers), and prescribe penalties for operating without a licence.

Unlike most occupational licensing Statutes, no body is established under the Acts to hear applications or to regulate the conduct of licensees, nor is there any power to

discipline licensees if proper cause exists. In effect, the protection afforded to members of the public from objectionable behaviour of auctioneers or appraisers is negligible. Once a licence has been issued, there is no power vested in any authority to cancel or suspend it. Very few complaints are received about these classes of occupation. The complaints that are received concern auctioneers and valuers of land and auctioneers of second-hand motor vehicles, and these occupations are already subject to stringent controls under the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1979, the Land Valuers Licensing Act, 1969-1974, and the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, 1971.

There are about 100 licensed appraisers in South Australia. This number includes many persons also licensed under the Land Valuers Licensing Act. The number of licensed auctioneers is much greater, being about 1 000. Most of these, however, are licensed or registered under the Land and Business Agents Act and are subject to the controls established under that Act. The number of persons who are regulated only by the Auctioneers Act and the Appraisers Act is therefore relatively small. Although some revenue is raised, these Acts do not provide an effective method of regulating these persons or protecting the public from any undesirable activities. Accordingly, the Government considers that there is no valid reason for retaining these Acts and proposes that they be repealed as one step in the process of giving effect to its policy of eliminating unnecessary regulation of trade and industry.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of the Appraisers Act, 1934-1961. Clause 4 provides for the repeal of the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1961.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 26 August. Page 647.)

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I conclude my remarks by saying that I trust that I have given the House further evidence of the difference between the Government and the Opposition with respect to the important and serious matters of unemployment and housing in our community, particularly emphasising that the Opposition puts people first, whilst the Government consistently puts vested economic interests at the top of its priorities.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I take this opportunity to make a detailed statement on the industrial training initiatives of the South Australian Government.

Australia is on the verge of a minerals and resources boom which will create a huge demand for skilled tradesmen and technicians in the next decade. In addition, significant new investment is being made in manufacturing industry. Earlier this year, the Federal Minister for Commerce and Industry (Mr. Lynch), released figures which estimated that \$29 billion would be invested in Australia during the 1980's. This is a staggering sum, but already consulting economists and planners in Australia's leading companies have suggested that this figure is conservative and that as much as \$60 billion and even \$70 billion will be spent in resource projects in this country in the decade up to 1990.

Whichever figures one prefers to use, the conclusion is still the same: coupled with the rapid introduction of new technology, Australia, and this State, will need large numbers of skilled workers, including those in professions. This year the Metal Trades Industry Association produced some alarming figures. Despite the high unemployment in this country, 80 per cent of the members of that association throughout Australia were forced to ask their tradesmen to work overtime. Some 35 per cent of the employers were employing unqualified workers in tradesmen's jobs; 48 per cent had delayed projects because they could not find enough skilled men; and 32 per cent had to abandon expansion plans for the same reason.

Turning specifically to this State, I point out that the Metal Industries Association of South Australia has just released details of a survey among its members on the current shortages of qualified labour. The association says that, having regard to interstate labour demands and taking the most conservative outlook as to future major developments in South Australia, evidence now exists of serious difficulties for the industry. The survey, taken in the first two weeks of this month, covered only 10 per cent of the association's members (I understand the association has 400 members). It reveals an existing shortage of 303 skilled workers.

To give some examples, there is an immediate demand for 146 boilermakers, 52 welders, and 46 fitters. In the semi-skilled area, there is a shortage of 27 workers, especially riggers. In the area of professional-management supervisors, there is a short-fall of 26 people, including engineers, foremen, and programmers.

There are also difficulties reported by companies for future recruitment. In the three categories I have mentioned, there is a need for an additional 80 workers. The Metal Industries Association expresses concern that these shortages will compound as new orders, contracts, and subcontracts come on line. This highlights the crisis that is developing.

To give an example of future demand, it has been stated that 26 000 skilled tradesmen will be required for new development projects in Western Australia alone over the next five years. In South Australia, the Redcliff petrochemical complex is expected to require a construction force at its peak of nearly 1 900 skilled workers. During construction, considerable off-site work will be generated. When it is in operation the plant itself will need a work force of more than 500 people.

The Roxby Downs project will magnify these demands. Some 3 000 to 5 000 people will be needed to construct and operate the facility, and its earnings will support a town with a population of between 20 000 and 30 000 people. Of course, they are approximate figures because the company has not given final details. Obviously Governments and employers need to tackle the problems that exist with our training schemes in Australia because not enough skilled tradesmen are being trained to meet the demand. For many years, practically all of our attention regarding training has been devoted to those whose chosen career is in one of the professions or in a skilled trade. As a result, in the subprofessional area, a false division (even a demarcation) has developed between those in training to be tradesmen through the apprenticeship system, and those who do not have that opportunity.

Another problem with the existing apprenticeship arrangement is that the number of people being trained is adversely affected by any economic down-turn. Employers generally train only the number of apprentices they can afford to employ, and for whom they have the need at the present time. If they look to the future, it is to their own

needs, and not to the likely requirements of the industry or the state of the nation. In looking to the future, employers look to the next one or two years and not to the next four or five years, which is the period required to train a skilled tradesman. Too often, if there is a slackening of the economy, employers suddenly stop taking on new apprentices.

Many future employers do not yet have establishments in this State and they will be unable to train the people they will need to begin operations here. Dow Chemicals will need trained people to start the Redcliff project. Unfortunately, the apprenticeship scheme of training, as it has developed in Australia, is too rigid and inflexible. Much of the training, and the length of training, does not necessarily equate to present needs, nor does it make allowance for the different levels and types of skill required for specific jobs.

Similarly, no regard is given to the different abilities and aptitudes of individuals: all must undertake the same training and over the same period. All apprenticeships in South Australia are for four years, whereas there is no doubt that it is possible to train people in some trades in a shorter period. Other training may require more than four years. It does not take the same time to train a bricklayer as it does to train an electrician.

Many people look on apprenticeships as an end to rather than the means of training. There is a tendency to regard apprenticeship as "the" system of training, rather than "a" system. This is not to say that we should not have an apprenticeship system, or that it should be downgraded, but rather that there are other forms of training that can, and should, go side by side with the apprenticeship system.

In an age of rapidly changing technology, automation and international competition, the survival and growth of our industry will depend on our technical and managerial skills. The present apprenticeship system is not meeting the need to produce the skilled tradesmen and craftsmen that Australian industry will require in the future. Despite the predictions of an increasing need for skilled workers in the 1980's the number of new apprentices in Australia in 1978-79 was 41 383, about the same as in 1973-74. Reflecting the depressed economic conditions in this State, the number of new apprentices engaged in South Australia between 1977 and 1979 fell by about 30 per cent.

I am pleased to be able to report that the situation is improving. The number of indentures lodged with the State Apprenticeship Commission for the first seven months of this year was 2 112; this represents an increase of 17.6 per cent, compared to the 1 796 apprentices taken on in the first seven months of 1979. It is particularly pleasing to note that the main increase has been in the metal trades area, where shortages are already being experienced in some sections of the industry. In the first seven months of this year, 1 038 indentures were lodged, compared with 851 last year, a rise this year of 22 per cent.

However, not enough attention has been given to training people other than those being trained as tradesmen through the apprenticeship scheme. In recent years, three States, Western Australia, Victoria and Queensland, have replaced their apprenticeship authorities with industrial training authorities. This should have been done in South Australia but, until the Liberal Government was elected last September, nothing was done to achieve such a result. One of the main aspects of our industrial training policy announced before the most recent election was that an Industrial and Commercial Training Act would replace the existing Apprentices Act. The purpose of the new Act would be to facilitate the establishment of a new, unified approach to vocational

training in this State.

It must be stressed that we do not want to abolish the present apprenticeship scheme. We want to link it with other commercial and industrial training schemes. As I mentioned earlier, apprenticeship should not be regarded as the only training scheme: it can be complemented by other forms of training.

Last May, the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment distributed a discussion paper on the proposal for a new Industrial and Commercial Training Act, seeking public comment, particularly from the United Trades and Labor Council and employer associations. In the light of these comments the department's proposals have been revised, and shortly I will discuss these with representatives of the employers and the United Trades and Labor Council.

During my recent visit to Canada, where they are also facing the need to train sufficient people to meet their future needs, it became very clear to me that changes must not be made rapidly. There must be full consultation so that any changes are understood and accepted by those involved.

While the department's discussion paper proposes that a new commission be established that can be concerned with all types of industrial and commercial training, there is no intention that it should immediately exercise authority in many new areas. The role of Government is to make sure that adequate training arrangements are provided to ensure that new skills can be learned, and existing skills upgraded, and that, in this development and provision of training, employers and trade unions be consulted. In many cases employers are better able to provide training than are Governments; it is not just a case of everyone sitting back and asking the Government to provide the facilities.

It may be helpful if I briefly mention the main ideas contained in the department's discussion paper. It is suggested that the core of the scheme should be the establishment of an Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. The commission would consist of a Chairman, two members from the Government, three employer members, and three from the trade unions. The commission would be supported by training advisory committees, which would have equal representation from the employers, unions, and some Government representation.

The emphasis would be upon ensuring that training courses and facilities are available to allow any person, irrespective of age or sex, to be taught trade, technical, and commercial skills to cater for the needs of industry and commerce, to enhance the industrial development of the State, and to provide individuals with opportunities for personal and career development. It is envisaged that present apprenticeship arrangements will be continued, but the commission will also be authorised to establish other training or retraining schemes. There would be provision for a person to enter into a contract of training with an employer, should this be needed, for a specified period of time, involving a combination of theoretical instruction and practical work experience. However, many training arrangements would not need a contract.

It is intended to further develop pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational training at the post-secondary level. Under the proposed new Act, the commission would be authorised to deal with training in occupations other than the traditional apprenticeship trades, training for technicians, and training for particular groups, such as handicapped and disadvantaged people.

The intention is to authorise the commission to deal with a wide range of training, but not all training

arrangements will need its approval. The Government is also discussing a proposal by the Master Builders Association of South Australia that a group apprenticeship scheme be established for the building and construction industry, with the association acting as the employer. The proposed scheme would be similar to those operating in New South Wales and Victoria.

The proposal would allow a number of contractors or sub-contractors to provide specialist work experience for an apprentice employed by the Master Builders Association of South Australia. Potential participants would be smaller builders or specialist contractors who collectively would provide a wide range of skills to apprentices in a co-ordinated programme of training and work experience. The Government is also holding discussions at present with another association to look at the possibility of establishing such a group apprenticeship training scheme in other areas besides the building industry.

As well as this proposal, the Government is also looking at other means of boosting apprenticeship training using public and private facilities. This is important, as there is high unemployment but a shortage of skilled tradesmen. I mentioned earlier the rapid changes in technology that are taking place. The Government has announced the setting up of a Council on Technological Change to study the effects such changes will have on society and to recommend ways of getting the maximum benefits from adopting new technology. The council will include representatives of employers, trade unions, universities and Government. The Government is firmly committed to a policy of using high technology to keep South Australian industry competitive.

One of the Liberal Party's policy proposals before the last election was that the impact of technological change on employment should be kept under close review. It is now clear that the Government should consider much wider issues than simply the impact of new technology on employment. The Government needs to take steps to minimise the disruptions these changes may cause to some individuals and companies.

Technological change is not limited by State or national boundaries, and any action taken by the State Government needs to be related to actions taken by other Governments, particularly the Commonwealth Government following the Myers Committee Report. The Technological Change Council will advise me on: technological changes most likely to occur in the State and the likely effects these changes will have on employment and what sections of the community will be most affected; what areas the Government should study in detail as a basis for formulating policy; and recommend the most effective ways the Government can smooth the adjustment process for employees and other members of the community affected by technological changes, and in particular examine the need for retraining.

Because of the fundamental nature of the changes that are taking place, considerable concern and, in some cases, fear, has arisen about employment. While some of this apprehension is well founded, some is based on inadequate information. The fact that technological change will affect employment opportunities and skill requirements must be recognised. However, the employment implications if South Australian industry does not keep pace with changing technology are likely to be much greater and more costly in both social and economic terms. If the House wants a classic example of the dangers of not participating in new technologies, it has only to look at the car industry and the problems that face those countries that have rejected new technology.

To enable the Government to understand the consequences of new technology and to help us to formulate policy, consultation with employer and management associations, trade unions, professional bodies and academics is necessary. The South Australian Council on Technological Change will help us in this. In order to develop an effective training policy, it is also necessary to have an effective means of forecasting future employment needs.

Earlier this month I released the report of the State Working Party on Manpower Forecasting. Headed by Professor R. J. Blandy of Flinders University, the working party consisted of representatives of Government, private employers and the trade unions. After studying the report it was decided to set up a Manpower Forecasting Unit within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

This is part of an overall programme for better manpower planning being developed in conjunction with the proposed new Industrial and Commercial Training Act and with the State Council on Technological Change. The Government has taken three significant new initiatives in looking to the future. This move towards manpower planning will take South Australia to the forefront of manpower planning in Australia. As the working party has pointed out, it is not possible to guarantee that forecasts of the future will prove to be correct, but rational action can only be based on an idea of what that future may hold. I am not saying that the future can be predicted accurately but, with the huge development projects expected to be undertaken in this State, some indication is needed of the likely supply, and demand for, various categories of workers.

The Government has decided to phase in the working party's main recommendation that initially the unit concentrate on developing five specified techniques of manpower forecasting. Other recommendations by the committee will be further considered next year after the unit has become operational and has come to grips with basic problems. These recommendations include the mounting of two research projects aimed at aiding forecasting and a better understanding of the labour market.

The Manpower Forecasting Unit will undertake, co-ordinate and generally organise the production of forecasts of future labour need of South Australia, and this could involve commissioning studies from private consultants. The unit will liaise closely with Federal and State Government departments, particularly the Commonwealth Bureau of Labour Market Research, and other agencies concerned with the collection of data, analysis and forecasting of future manpower needs. I see the formation of the unit as an important step in the future development of this State in helping to ensure that we have the necessary skilled people that will be needed in our work force.

Finally, I stress that our community must be even more positive in its approach to training and its investment in people—our most valuable resource. I ask employers to take on as many new apprentices next year as possible, especially in the metal trades. Similarly, trade unions must be responsive to the changes that are needed through this decade and beyond.

Government, employers and unions must all work together to achieve the improvements necessary in our training policies, which must develop with advancing technology and the changing shape of Australian and South Australian industry and commerce.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I will follow the lead of

most members who have spoken so far in the debate by expressing my support for the motion regarding the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, although I have some reservations concerning some of the content, and the concept itself, of the Address in Reply.

One item of His Excellency's Speech which particularly worried me was the brief reference it contained to the current Government's intention to amend the Electoral Act. This concern developed further shortly afterwards when I listened to the Premier replying to a question without notice on the Government's plans to make amendments to the voting system used for the other place, the Legislative Council. On its proven record, the Liberal Party, without the moderating influence it once had from Steele Hall and the present member for Mitcham, cannot, I suspect, be entrusted to democratise anything. The stunned attitude of the Liberal Party when the Playford gerrymander was broken and was unable to hold back the A.L.P., led by Frank Walsh, in 1965, resembled the attitude of Queen Victoria in the last century, when she said on one occasion, "It seems to me to be a defect of our much famed Constitution to have to part with an admirable Government like Lord Salisbury's for no reason of any importance or any particular reason, merely on account of the number of votes."

A Party composed of those who are so dedicated to the concept of free enterprise, the concept of the shrewd individual getting the jump on his fellow man, is obviously willing to practise any deceit to get ahead and hold on to power. It would appear that no slander or deceit is too great, and yet they expect their opponents to shake hands afterwards and say what a good contest it was. Anything seems to go. Black can be black today and white tomorrow, as long as, apparently, they can get ahead and stay ahead.

The concept in this State of democratic elections is a new and fragile concept, and it is very easily breached. It was a democratic election in 1979 which the Labor Party lost in this State. Our complaint is not against the result. We were defeated fairly and squarely. All our complaints have been based upon the deceitful campaign run during that election by the Liberal Party, the press, and certain business interests.

While researching for an Oxford debate in which I took part and which was telecast last month, I found a delightful example of how bad a fraud was the unreformed House of Commons in the last century. Elections were held (if you could call them elections) in pocket boroughs, which meant that the local lord had a handful of electors in his pocket, and could thereby arrange the election result.

It is said that Lord Melville used to boast that he personally selected 39 of the 45 Scottish members of Parliament, and on the Island of Bute only 21 people were voters, and only one of them lived there. An early nineteenth century election records that only one person attended the election meeting called by the sheriff and the returning officer. This person took the chair, constituted the meeting, called out the names of the freehold voters, answered his own name, took the list of possible candidates and chose himself, moved and seconded his own nomination, put the question to the vote, and unanimously returned himself. There appears to have been no vote of thanks to the chairman! It would seem that that would be the sort of electoral philosophy that the Liberal Party would support.

We have progressed since those days, but our Parliamentary democracy is a hard-won and fragile prize that must be protected. The Opposition will resist any efforts to interfere, for example, with the Legislative Council's system of optional preferential voting if such

amendments would effectively disfranchise thousands of voters whose intentions on their ballot-papers are clear, but who have difficulty in filling out the entire ballot-paper, with what may in many cases be dozens of consecutive numbers, without a mistake that would render their vote informal.

I referred earlier to the concept of the Address in Reply itself. I find it fatuous and time consuming to have most of the members in this Chamber committed to the task of each delivering a one-hour monologue in this fashion, and I agree with those earlier speakers, such as the member for Hartley, who have criticised this aspect of Parliamentary procedure.

You will see, Sir, on the Notice Paper that the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply has been debated on 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 19, 20, 21 and 26 August, and that is a lot of days taken up by this part of the Parliamentary procedure. I have not kept an exact score on the number of hours for which members have spoken.

Mr. Randall: You're not here enough.

Mr. TRAINER: I am not up in the billiard room, like the member opposite. I have kept no exact score of the number of members who have spoken. Normally, the 10 Ministers do not participate in this debate, although the Minister of Industrial Affairs has just spoken for about half an hour and I understand that the Minister of Education will be participating later. The Speaker does not participate.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister of Education is coming back into the House, is he? He was conspicuous by his absence during a division earlier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TRAINER: I estimate that about 35 members will speak for about an hour each—35 hours of precious Parliamentary time taken up in what is basically a fairly unproductive way. A handful of members in the House make extremely useful contributions and do not just attempt to fill out an hour as best they can. But when members do speak in the Address in Reply debate, it is often to an almost empty Chamber.

Mr. Lewis: Whose fault is that?

Mr. TRAINER: It is the fault of the Government. It is the Government's responsibility to maintain a quorum in this House. Members opposite should be aware of that. This Government neglects its responsibility to maintain a quorum.

Members interjecting:

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. TRAINER: It is a scandal the way this Government is not able to maintain a quorum. Previous Governments in the last decade were very strict on maintaining a quorum. There would be harsh words from the Whip, the Premier, the Deputy Premier, or Ministers if back-benchers did not maintain a quorum, and yet we see this cavalier attitude from the Government, and it is an absolute disgrace.

I return again to the concept of the Address in Reply and ask what purpose it serves. Very few members are listening, and from the number of interjections it is obvious that members opposite are not doing much thinking, either.

Mr. Becker: I hope you're not reading your speech.

Mr. TRAINER: I am referring to fairly copious notes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TRAINER: It is not much good appealing to members opposite to pay attention, because their only purpose in listening is in order to interject, so I am

probably wasting my time. It is no good members on this side in the course of their speeches appealing to Ministers to take a particular action, because members on this side would be ignored by definition, because we are Opposition members, and can be ignored with impunity. Back-benchers on the Government side will probably also be ignored if they make a plea in their Address in Reply speeches for some action, but in their case it is because their requests are usually silly and impracticable. The press is not particularly interested, and no-one will read very much of it in *Hansard*. The speeches we hear in the Address in Reply debate will not move men's hearts and minds for centuries to come, although they might move some other part of the anatomy, in those cases perhaps like the member for Mallee, where a speech serves as a mental catharsis.

I ask again what purpose these one-hour diatribes serve. They prove that someone can go a whole 60 minutes and last the distance. Within the gentle confines of Parliament we can, perhaps, through this procedure, express or display an atavistic streak, a genteel version of trial by ordeal, a form of tribalism, with members of the tribe displaying their merit by lasting the distance. However, judging by the content of the speeches of members opposite, such as the member for Henley Beach, it would seem that this trial by ordeal would instead in his case be trial by ordure for those braves who manage to stay in the Chamber.

Could not members, other than those who are newly sworn in, forgo these 60-minute trials by ordure and gain rights instead to additional 10-minute grievance debates? Apart from the cut and thrust of Question Time, the liveliest contributions are usually those speeches which occur as part of the adjournment debate. Unfortunately, these are often late at night and, therefore, the effect is lost: the press has gone to bed and so have the journalists; members are dispersed around the building, poised ready to go home in that last half hour.

Mr. Randall: Speak for yourself.

Mr. TRAINER: I am not speaking for myself, because I am one of those who try to work in this place. The opportunities to speak are too few, three each night, alternating, two from one side of the House and one from the other. Could not additional grievance debates, perhaps, be slotted in after Question Time when the House is still in a state of ferment, when most members are present, the press is present, and there are people in the public gallery? Brief 10-minute grievance debates produce better speeches; they are better for the speaker and easier on the listener. As is often mentioned in after dinner speeches, where people use this analogy, a speech should be like a bikini; enough to cover the subject but brief enough to be interesting. Shorter speaking opportunities, by definition, will occur more often in the life of a Parliament. It would be more beneficial for a speaker to have a 10-minute opportunity every two weeks or so than to have an annual or bi-annual 60-minute marathon. Topics can actually be topical, but with infrequent and lengthy speaking periods, an issue may have long since passed from topicality by the time an opportunity arises to discuss it.

If a member needs more than 10 minutes to debate certain issues, he may be able to cover the subject in two 10-minute speeches a couple of weeks apart, or perhaps he could come to an arrangement with another member who may be willing to pass up his 10 minutes or make some sort of exchange. If, in addition to the three grievance speeches as part of the adjournment debate, we replace the Address in Reply procedure with three more grievance debates following Question Time on two days of each week, this

would provide 15 10-minute opportunities per sitting week for members on this side and for back-benchers on the Government side. Those two groups of members constitute about 36 members, and there would be 15 opportunities for those 36 members, which is slightly less than one opportunity per fortnight.

The total number of hours used in regard to my proposal—the briefer speeches—in a Parliament would probably be on a par with the time taken by the 35 hours or so of Address in Reply contributions, with the major difference being that they would be spread out over the year rather than jammed into one long, boring session. The contributions could be livelier, less rambling, more topical and, most importantly, they would be briefer. Some members in this House deliver only two kinds of speech—long boring speeches and short boring speeches. Given the choice, I would rather be subject to the latter lesser evil. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will give my suggestion serious consideration in an effort to raise the level of debate in this Chamber.

As I said earlier, the contributions in the Address in Reply procedure are of varying standards. One or two members attempted a philosophical treatise, but the overall standard was poor. The rot set in with the member for Newland, who tried to present what was supposed to be the definitive speech on the benefits of the Government's uranium policy. Obviously, some thought had gone into the contribution, but he fell down badly in his pretence that there was any degree of unanimity of thought in scientific circles in regard to uranium. The scientific world is divided; there is more than one school of thought. It is not just scientists versus the irrationals; the scientific world is divided, and few people are so foolhardy as to guarantee, with 100 per cent certainty, that this field is a safe one. In his favour, I must say that the member for Newland has one good point; he has a grasp of the total energy situation and has obviously learnt some physics somewhere.

Something that must be considered is the fact that the overall temperature of the earth is slowly rising because of mankind's energy use in conjunction with the greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere, which is further aggravating the situation. The temperature of the earth normally remains fairly constant because the rate at which heat is radiated into space is greater than, or equal to, the rate at which heat is produced. If we use more energy, we produce more heat on the face of the globe, because all energy is ultimately turned into heat; whether it is fuel that is used in a car which produces heat by direct combustion or by overcoming internal and external friction, or some other means, all energy, in the last analysis, produces heat. All electrical goods, for example, whether a light globe, a radiator, a TV set or a computer, produce heat. I have even heard of cases in which computer facilities in a corporation have had their excess heat used in order to supplement the air-conditioning of that institution.

All factories and power stations, whether they use nuclear or fossil fuel, will produce heat in their environment. Heat will be produced in the immediate vicinity of the power station; vast quantities of cooling water are used, regardless of the method of fuelling that power station. Heat will be generated when electricity is transmitted along the wires; heat will be further generated in the equipment that is at the end of those wires. Even the metabolism of human beings on the face of the planet produces a certain amount of heat. All work, all movement, is capable of producing a slight increase in the temperature of the environment.

The heat normally produced around someone or

something in its immediate environment is dissipated by conduction, radiation and convection, and it moves around the globe, but the overall temperature of the globe as a whole will slowly increase if heat does not escape from this closed system. Heat must be able to radiate into space from the globe. There are three major sources of this heat; the first is the sunlight that falls on the face of the globe; the second category involves a certain amount of natural heat produced by the tides, volcanic eruptions, etc.; and the third category is man-made heat. That third category is within our control. I would like to see figures made available in regard to the scale of this man-made heat. Is it possible that the temperature of the earth can be raised, by heat produced from man's greed for energy, at a greater rate than it can escape? If it is as great as I suspect, we must turn in the last analysis to solar energy as the only form that does not increase the total amount of heat on the globe's surface.

I mentioned earlier that the rot set in with the mover of this motion. The situation then went past the point of redemption with the absolutely inane comments made by the seconder, the member for Mawson, who quoted at length from a periodical called *Freedom Lifeline*, copies of which were circulated to most of us, he said. I did not get a copy of that journal but I would have liked a copy to add to my personal collection of publications from the lunatic fringe of the right wing. As part of my tertiary studies some time ago, I started a collection of right wing exotica. The article concerned drew on a weird book entitled *The Naked Communist*, which was written by a Mr. W. Cleon Skoussen, who, I notice, also wrote another book entitled *The Naked Capitalist*.

Mr. Skoussen is supposedly an ex-F.B.I. official, although in the blurbs and fly sheets I have never seen what kind of official he was. Perhaps he was the janitor. He obviously sees conspiracies everywhere. I suspect he was so crazy that even J. Edgar Hoover would have tossed him out of the F.B.I. That is probably why he was an ex-F.B.I. official. J. Edgar Hoover was famous for giving instructions to his chauffeur that, no matter where they were going, he must perform no left turns; the poor chauffeur, wherever they were travelling in metropolitan areas of the United States, had to work out a very bizarre route to their destination so that no left turns would be required by the vehicle. In Australia, as far as I can ascertain, Mr. Skoussen's books are sold only at places like the Heritage Book Shop and at League of Rights meetings, which is something I discovered while investigating the weird conspiracy theories of the extreme right as part of the aforementioned tertiary studies.

One wonders how the member for Mawson could deliver such a speech with a straight face, and the answer to such wonderment is that he could not; he was grinning from ear to ear. I am sure that the member for Mawson is not so silly as to have meant it all; at least I hope not. The question then arises: why on earth did he make that particular speech? For whom was it given? Which odd people does he expect to read it in *Hansard* and then compliment him on his grasp of the international communist-capitalist-negro-freemason-Jewish-Chinese conspiracy to subvert the world? Does he expect to see it reprinted in *Elector's Voice*, that marvellous publication of the League of Rights? Recently members would probably have received the August-September 1980 copy with the quaint headline on the front, which had a bit of a misprint. Where it was attempted to have as a headline "Is a Christian counter-offensive under way?"; somehow or other through a typographical error it came out as "Is a Christian counter-offensive way under?" I just wonder who the speech was intended for? For whose benefit was

such nonsense recited in this Chamber? I expect that I may be able to give my grandchildren some benefit because of it, because I shall have the member for Mawson's speech bound so that they can have it on their shelves alongside such classical children's fables as *Biggles Flies Undone* and *The Famous Five Go Wife Swapping*.

The member for Mawson's contribution was not the only silly one. The speech from the member for Mallee, as is his wont, was also somewhat strange. I understand that a few days ago he allowed himself to be captured by Adelaide University students as part of their Prosh day celebrations.

Mr. Millhouse: It was on my suggestion, actually.

Mr. TRAINER: These kidnaps are a fairly traditional part of Prosh day celebrations. In fact, I took part in one myself, in about 1961 I think, where we prearranged with the late Johnny O'Keefe to capture him from the stage of the Palais Royal, and a good time was had by all. In this case, when the member for Mallee allowed himself to be kidnapped, the captors rang Liberal headquarters, I understand, and issued a demand for \$50 to get him back. I also understand, off the record, that his captors were told they would be given \$50 to keep him captive. I am also informed that the member for Mallee demanded the right, as the member for Mallee, to attend the inaugural meeting of the Yumali branch of the National Country Party. Also, I have been told, he sought tickets for the Australian Labor Party's ball at Tailem Bend.

Mr. Lewis: I made a donation when I could not go.

Mr. TRAINER: We will not knock that. On the other hand, perhaps some of the front-benchers opposite could take him in hand and explain to him which Party he is in, as he is obviously not too sure to which Party he owes his allegiance. Perhaps they could try to convince him that the Liberal Party really does want him and that it would pay any ransom required on any future Prosh day occasions.

Mr. Millhouse: They are running short of numbers and so for that reason they cannot afford to lose him, as we saw this afternoon.

Mr. TRAINER: Yes, the way that vote went, you are probably quite correct. Perhaps the member concerned could be more tactful about the privileges he seems to consider to be his by right as the member for Mallee, such as insisting that he have admission to other political Parties' functions. I hope he does not extend his requirements as local Parliamentary member to the stage of reinstating the *droit de seigneur*, also known as the *jux prima nocte*. Members can look up their mediaeval history to find out what that is.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that English is the language spoken in this Chamber.

Mr. TRAINER: Indeed; I was merely quoting a couple of terms that are frequently used in a historical context. I turn now to some of the activities of the Minister of Health, to whom I referred earlier, regarding her action of sending a letter to a photocopying company in my electorate and the diversion she managed to find to take attention away from her action on that issue.

My next point may sound only a minor issue, but something that concerned me in this House on 12 August was her use of a Dorothy Dix question from the member for Morphett on the issue of pharmaceutical products being used by young people in the community seeking highs. I thought that there was a certain lack of finesse in her actually spelling out the particular compound that was favoured among some drug takers in the community, and this was again printed in the press the next day under its full title. People in this field working with young people involved with drugs have told me that there is a great deal

of danger in giving publicity to these sorts of avenues. One example that is often quoted to me is the example of glue sniffing whereby, whenever publicity is given by, for example, a programme compered by Michael Willesee which goes into great detail concerning the use of Glad bags, the celluloid bags, and the particular type of glue and so on, even when the publicity is given to the horrendous circumstances surrounding someone who has died from sniffing one of these glues, the rate of glue sniffing in the community goes up overnight as a result of that publicity. It is possible that, after the Dorothy Dix question to the Minister and the report in the press the next day, there may well have been a rush on the cough mixture mentioned by name by this particular publicity hungry Minister. I realise that no ill-will was intended on her part, but a matter like this is somewhat delicate and should be treated a little more judiciously.

Mr. Oswald: In fairness to the Minister, that was not a Dorothy Dix question. The Minister answered the question very well, as it was a delicate situation, so I agree with you on the naming of drugs in the House.

Mr. TRAINER: I am interested that the member for Morphett does concede that Government back-benchers do ask Dorothy Dix questions. I refer again to the activities of the Minister and to her actions with respect to the hospitals section of the Health Commission, the likely impact of the financial restrictions that have already been placed on the Hospitals Department, and the future restrictions that we may well hear about in the State Budget tomorrow. The member for Unley has referred in passing to the Minister and her department withdrawing the supply of biscuits from the cups of tea and so forth served in hospitals. Indeed, it has been suggested to me that in the same way that Margaret Thatcher, in England, after withdrawing the free milk for schoolchildren, ended up with a title "Margaret Thatcher the milk snatcher", with apologies to Sesame Street, a similar title would be applicable to the Minister, who would in future be known as "Jennifer, the Cookie Monster".

As I mentioned in respect of drugs, there are many delicate areas, health being one of them, and financial restrictions must be applied with a great deal of care if they must be applied at all. A constituent of mine has written to the Minister and she sent me a copy of the letter so that I could make sure that the Minister gave the matter as much attention as possible, because my constituent was not sure that the letter would find its way to the Minister's desk. This constituent is someone who is in a financial situation where she can afford the best of medical care, yet she was concerned about something that happened to her. The letter to the Minister of Health, dated 21 August 1980, is as follows:

Dear Minister, Today I had the great misfortune to spend seven hours at the Royal Adelaide Hospital where I was transported from a private hospital for a bone scan. I wish you could experience, first hand, the kind of non-treatment I experienced, but of course if you were a patient you would get V.I.P. treatment all the way; therefore you cannot understand fully what thousands of people go through each year. I would like to itemise some of the facts relative to my personal situation.

- (1) I was not spoken to by anyone except the porters who wheeled me from the ambulance.
- (2) At no stage did anyone approach me to enquire of my comfort or lack of. (I was in a fair bit of pain.)
- (3) I was left in corridors alone for periods of one-half hour at a time, frequently.
- (4) No-one attempted to explain the procedures involved, and I was extremely anxious, as I knew I was having radio-active material injected into my body, and

was totally ignorant of its effects. It was only after my pleading for information and need for reassurance that I was able to glean any facts.

- (5) I was wheeled to a ward for lunch and fed by a nurse—the only positive human contact during by seven-hour episode.
- (6) I was then left alone in a corner of a ward with no means of calling for attention, for example, no buzzer. In three hours, only twice did anyone initiate any comments my way which would not have mattered in most cases. But in my case I was totally helpless and unable to get out of my bed. Thank goodness I was able to exercise control over my bladder.

What I objected to most of all during the whole horrible episode was the dehumanising attitude of the entire hospital system to me. Individual nurses and radiographers were pleasant enough, but gave no recognition to my anxiety or helplessness. I also objected to being left in corridors alone, and when crying in pain: I had no idea of how to gain someone's attention.

I would like you to know that I interpret this impersonal, humiliating and dehumanising lack of service to be directly related to the current political practice to reduce the funding of service-delivery areas. With insufficient numbers of staff their inattentive treatment of the public must follow as a natural consequence.

In Parkwynd Hospital where I have been staying (thank God), I have never been left alone when distressed; my needs are attended to and usually anticipated, and I am treated here as a whole person, not just a "back" or "scan".

I do not know if this letter will ever get to you personally, but I wish to make a plea for some humanity from the system (not individuals within it) for the poor, sick, frightened and helpless people who have nowhere else to go but the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I shudder to think what it must be like for those who have no other alternatives. I hope you think about our plight, and I wish you would give me your views.

The Minister has also spoken recently, particularly when questioned from this side of the Chamber, about the future of the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital. I am particularly interested in that hospital because two of my three children were born there in difficult circumstances. Both might not be alive today were it not for the excellent care provided within that institution. Indeed, had they been born elsewhere in those circumstances, the other hospital would have had to rush them into the Queen Victoria as the only hospital where the fine quality care that was given to my children was available.

I am concerned about the semantic gymnastics of the Minister when questioned about whether there is any definite proposal in the wind for a closure at this hospital. I am concerned that members of the community may not quite have the sophistication of the Minister to draw such a fine line between closure and relocation.

If the Health Commission does have plans to close the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, perhaps it is because the majority of the commission members are men and, as such, are not in full empathy with the problems of women. I am also concerned at the way in which the Minister seems perpetually to reflect upon the sincerity and integrity of the group known as the Friends of the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital.

The lack of enthusiasm with which she defends the hospital casts doubt upon her proclaimed status as a "friend" (with a small "f") of the hospital. With a friend like the Minister, the Queen Victoria Hospital really does not need any enemies. In the past, I have noticed that the Minister's mind seems to operate along strange lines and, in order to illustrate that point, I will refer to some of the

material that appeared in her column in the *Adelaide News* prior to the election that saw her unexpectedly elevated to the Ministry.

The first report to which I refer comes from the *News* of 13 September, an article by the Minister referring to a so-called loss of freedom if the previous Labor Government was returned, although the same article also demanded reduced freedom for members of the community in the area of personal morality. This fear of a loss of freedom seems strange to me, coming as it does from a member of a political Party which conscripted young men to die in Vietnam and which apparently favoured secret police files on innocent citizens being kept by the Special Branch. Yet, the Minister, at that time an Opposition back-bencher, referred to power and privilege becoming:

... so entrenched under this socialist Government that the very political air we breathe has become tainted by a loss of freedom.

The Minister went on to say:

When a man will help a Liberal candidate "in any way that isn't public," because his firm depends upon Government contracts, there is a loss of economic freedom.

Yet the Minister of Health recently did not hesitate to threaten a photocopying firm which depended on Government contracts. The then member for Coles went on to state:

When a doctor will pay for an advertisement but won't authorise it because "my unit depends on the Minister of Health for funds" there is a loss of political freedom.

What about the loss of freedom of Dr. John Coulter, whose unit investigating carcinogenic materials was shut down? He was sacked as a flow-on of this Government's, and the Minister's, lack of interest in carcinogens and its obsession with uranium profits. The then member for Coles went on to say:

When a public servant is to frightened to sign a petition, "in case the Government checks off the names", then loss of freedom has gone too far.

Public servants now are more worried about their livelihood, as the Government seems to have declared war on the Public Service because of its obsession with the public sector. Until the guidelines issue was properly discussed in this House, public servants giving evidence to Parliamentary Committees looked for a while as if they were going to be kept on a leash, a subject, it seemed, on which the Premier, knowing how low his Government's standing is among public servants, was very sensitive. When I questioned the Premier a couple of weeks ago in Question Time, he threw a fit of synthetic apoplectic rage as a diversion to avoid answering what was obviously a very embarrassing question.

I return to the column of the Minister; as the recent election last year came closer, the column became continually sillier. On 6 September the member for Coles accused the former Premier (the member for Hartley) of trying to incite a revolution, when she wrote:

Mr. Corcoran showed himself to be motivated by undiluted prejudice and a determination to dredge up among his ethnic audience that most dangerous and loathsome of political weapons—class hatred

She went on:

He is using the old, old tool of the political extremist. Generate enough class hatred and you can achieve conditions for revolution. You can take by force what people have earned.

She also referred to people who stood behind him in the "shadows of the left", and went on expressing her own hatred of trade unions. It was obvious that much of the Liberal Party's campaign, of which the Minister was part, was based on a hatred of workingmen's groups, the so-

called militant unions, the so-called left-wing unions, and the so-called Trades Hall march on North Terrace. There we had hatred of a class nature expressed by the Minister of Health. It is still class hatred even if it is daintily done with a plummy accent.

On 30 August the Minister used the words "left-winger" very loosely. I was not quite sure what it was supposed to mean when she said:

After this election, into Parliament on an armchair ride in safe Labor seats go some of the roughest, toughest left-wingers in the business.

Who are the roughest, toughest left-wingers in the business? By definition, having survived a landslide, I suppose the six new A.L.P. back-benchers on this side of the House are incumbents of what, in the current electoral fortunes, would have to be described as moderately safe Labor seats. Which of us did she mean? Did she mean the mild mannered schoolteacher, who is now the member for Salisbury, or did she mean the mild-mannered former lawyer, who is now the member for Norwood? Did the Minister mean the honest, hard-working member for Peake? Did she mean the member for Albert Park, who gave so much of his own time, unpaid, to serve as President of his union when he was a guard in the railways? Or did she mean the member for Florey, a former Party Secretary who was elected to that post on consensus? He, by definition, would have to be a man of the centre.

By elimination, I guess that the Minister must have meant me. I did not realise that I was one of the roughest, toughest left-wingers in the business. One learns something new every day! Amongst other things, the Minister's column of 30 August contained reference to the promised Eldorado of uranium when she talked about the development of Roxby Downs and stated:

... the development of Roxby Downs, one of the richest copper, uranium and gold mines in the world and a project which, if developed, promises spectacular gains in employment and prosperity for South Australians.

I contrast that statement with what the Minister had to say in a letter to the Directors of Advertiser Newspapers accusing them of profiting from printing undesirable literature. The letter from the Minister was reported in the *Advertiser* on 22 August last year.

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

Mr. TRAINER: This letter from the Minister of Health, (as member for Coles), was reported in the *Advertiser* on 22 August 1979 and was also quoted in full by the Minister in *Hansard* on 21 August of that year. She said:

Whatever the cost in financial terms, I urge you to cease publishing pornography. Arguments about diminished profit and employment opportunity within Griffin Press are spurious if they use pornography as their justification. Such arguments imply that any means can be used to achieve economic ends.

Directors may say that, as long as the company is operating within the law, supplying a demand and making a profit, they are meeting their obligations. Many South Australians believe there is more to your obligations than that, otherwise we would be operating under the law of the commercial jungle ... surely conscience must decree that its publication is indefensible on any grounds.

What a contrast that expression of economic morality is when one considers the view of members opposite regarding uranium. Like other Ministers in this Government, the Minister of Health has castigated the Labor Party for its concern that profiting through uranium dealings is not to be undertaken until 100 per cent safety

can be assured in every stage of the nuclear fuel cycle. The eyes of members opposite glitter with dollar signs at the Lasseter's lost reef of uranium riches.

Uranium is an area of genuine concern where there are justifiable grounds for caution. Nuclear hazards to human health are indeed well documented. To completely overlook, ignore and by-pass those concerns, for economic ends, is wrong. Indeed, to paraphrase the Minister, arguments about diminished profit and employment opportunity are spurious if they use hazardous nuclear materials as their justification; such arguments imply that any means can be used to achieve economic ends. The Minister does not seem very concerned about the dangers of uranium. She shows very little concern about the physical hazards or the plight of those who are not wealthy and powerful or those who do not benefit from the *status quo*.

I now turn to the recently opened Constitutional Museum, whose opening many members attended on 31 July. This building alongside Parliament House is a masterpiece of restoration and a credit to those people who planned and arranged that restoration work. Indeed, it is a memorial to the workmanship of the Public Buildings Department employees on whom it sometimes seems the Minister of Industrial Affairs has declared war. An editorial in the *News* on 1 August stated:

All those associated with the project, including the absent Don Dunstan who inspired it, can take a bow.

However, in the speeches at the opening of the Constitutional Museum, no tribute whatsoever was given to the person whose brainchild it was. On that occasion, the Premier said:

Today, with the opening of this constitutional Museum, we are again expressing that sentiment [a desire to preserve our historic heritage] in a visible and lasting form, one of which the entire community can be proud, and one for which a debt of gratitude is owed to everyone concerned.

On 1 August, the Premier was quite quick to hop on to the band wagon of the Constitutional Museum and bask in the reflected glory of its opening. However, his attitude had been somewhat different when the project was announced. For example, in the *Advertiser* on 15 September 1977 an article referring to the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tonkin, stated:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tonkin) said last night that the last thing South Australia needed was a political museum.

He referred to it as:

A memorial to our past politicians.

He also said:

The latest announcement shows that the A.L.P. is completely out of touch and barren of ideas.

Further on in the development of the Constitutional Museum, the Premier also said, on 28 June 1978:

The South Australian Government should defer indefinitely plans to spend \$1 000 000 on a Constitutional Museum in Adelaide. The project should be the first step in cost-cutting measures needed to return South Australia to a sound financial footing. Monuments to past politicians are the last thing the community wants at present.

He then went on to say that the proposal was ludicrous in the present economic climate. Don't things change? Other members of the then Opposition were quite critical of the proposed Constitutional Museum, and I refer to the Legislative Council debate on 8 March 1978 when the Hon. Mr. Hill expressed doubts and said:

I wonder whether in this section that will be called "Your Government Today" there will be emphasis on members of the Cabinet rather than on the members of Parliament.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: There will be a lovely

photograph of the Premier under a spotlight.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The proposal relates to Parliament as a whole; it is a constitutional museum closely related to the history of the South Australian Parliament, and not of one Party as against another and not of one specific Government that may follow another Government.

However, at the conclusion of the audio-visual display—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park has the floor.

Mr. TRAINER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection. At the conclusion of the audio-visual display, we were presented with a gigantic rogues gallery of the gang of thirteen. It seems that the attitude towards giving some sort of prominence to the Cabinet is no longer as strong amongst members opposite as it was when they were in Opposition. The Hon. Mr. Cameron also expressed doubts when he said that he was interested to see how the final concept turns out. As reported in *Hansard* on 14 March 1978, he said:

I trust that we will not see yet another propaganda outlet for this Government . . . with glowing neon lights out front stating, "This is your present Government and Parliament at work." I trust, too, that this museum will be what it is supposed to be: a constitutional museum and not one that will be used to promote existing Governments.

He then criticised the cost, as did the then Leader of the Opposition, and said:

I will be interested to see what the final outcome and costs are. If ever there was a time when we could have put aside a proposal temporarily, this surely would be it. As I have said earlier, considerable financial problems are arising in this State, and I would have considered this to be a project that could have been set aside temporarily.

However, he was another Government member who was quite happy to be part of the opening procedure and bask in the reflected glory of the opening. An attempt was made by Government members in another place, when in Opposition, to force an amendment to expand the frame of operation of the Constitutional Museum to include local government to a greater extent. That amendment was eventually withdrawn, but when it was defeated the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, in another place, said:

I am keen that this should be included. If the amendment is not carried, I want an undertaking from the Government that it will consider the setting up of a constitutional museum dealing with local government in South Australia, because the State has a record of which it should be justly proud.

There is nothing wrong with that, except that there seems to be a bit of a divergence of thought there. One moment the Premier, backed up by Mr. Cameron and Mr. Hill, is saying that it is an outrageous expense, and yet Mr. DeGaris is saying that even more should have been spent to make it a museum of local government as well.

Since coming into Government, the Liberal Party has shown a little bit more enthusiasm, even though its interest seemed to lapse on the project during 1979. The only reference I was able to find was a Question on Notice from the now Minister of Industrial Affairs on 31 July who wanted to know something about the cost of the chandeliers. After taking Government, the Minister of Arts seemed to have a marked lack of enthusiasm for the project. On 31 October last year and 5 March this year, he seemed to want to cut the project back further. It is unfortunate that the section that was to have been entitled, "Your Government Today" was not able to be developed to its full potential. However, now that the museum is open, Liberal members are chasing all the credit they can get.

There are other areas I would like to touch on briefly in

relation to the Constitutional Museum. It is obvious that we have to make far better efforts than has been the case up to now to try to preserve our past. We have to pay more attention to oral history, the method of tape recording interviews with outstanding citizens, so that, when they are long gone, their reminiscences will still be there as part of our historical record.

It seems to me there is an inadequacy in history texts on South Australian history, and that insufficient attention is given to Australian and South Australian history in our schools. It is the same cavalier attitude to history that was displayed with the formation of the sesqui-centennial committee for our 150th anniversary in a few years time, and the only historian on that committee is the person nominated as the Opposition representative on it, the Hon. Don Hopgood, member for Baudin. Apart from him, there is a minimum of historical expertise, and one would think that there should be a great deal of that on such a committee.

I am disappointed that the "Your Government Today" section was not able to be developed to its full potential, so that visitors to the museum, on their way out, would have been able to go out into a section where the electorates were listed, along with maps, and indications of who their local member was, and so on. That would have been helpful. There is obviously ignorance in the community regarding current as well as past political affairs. There is a great deal of confusion between Federal and State matters, and surveys regularly show that people have little awareness of the State or Federal district they are in, the name of their local State and Federal members, and so on. That section would have helped to alleviate that problem, and also it would have drawn the attention of visitors to their absence or presence on the electoral roll for their district, and perhaps would have assisted the Electoral Department in its operations.

There are a few other issues I could touch on—for example, the threatened closure of the Sturt College of Advanced Education. Like other members on the southern side of the city, I have received much correspondence on this.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think it will happen.

Mr. TRAINER: I do not think it will. I trust that the Minister of Education will reject any TEASA proposal that comes down in favour of the closure of Sturt C.A.E. as economic lunacy and a potential social and political disaster for the southern area. Many of the citizens in the area have expressed their disapproval. I am sure that the member for Glenelg, like me, would have received much correspondence in this matter, as would have the member for Brighton and the member for Mawson.

Mr. Mathwin: I support them, too. I think we can all get together on that.

Mr. TRAINER: I think we have a certain amount of common interest on that issue. The member for Glenelg was present at an education meeting at Sturt C.A.E. the Monday before last, and we found a certain unanimity of interest on another issue there.

There are other issues of interest that I have come across in recent weeks that I could refer to, such as the issue of the ongoing constitutional farce in Queensland, the latest chapter in this saga in the League of Rights State, the home of the LILAC League (Ladies in Line Against Communism), being the nomination by Bjelke-Petersen of his wife as a candidate for election to the Senate. It is a historical fact that the Emperor Caligula appointed his horse a Consul of Rome, but there appears to be no historical precedent for conferring senatorial rank on the old grey mare.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Eva Peron? She did all right.

Mr. TRAINER: She was not a Queenslander. Is the honourable member trying to tell me that Eva Peron is alive and well and living in Queensland?

I could comment, in the context of recent revelations, regarding the role of the Liberal Party members in the scurrilous Ryan and McEwen book. I could comment on an interview given by the Premier to Greg Kelton of the *Advertiser* on 17 May 1978, shortly after the events relating to the promotion of the gossip and rumour about that book took place. The then Leader of the Opposition said at that time:

People in the Liberal Party have also learnt, and it has been a bitter lesson for some, that rumors are not going to destroy the Government.

That was the then Labor Government of this State. He said:

There is no way that rumours which attack the Premier or the Government are in fact going to destroy it because 99 per cent of them have no basis in fact. We have been preoccupied with rumours.

Why did he say something like that at that time? Was he trying to distance himself from the activities of some of the "boots and all" people in his Party? I will not comment on those issues; they can wait for another occasion.

I could comment on an appalling article on teacher salary cheques published in the name of Stewart Cockburn in the *Advertiser* on 7 August. What a farrago of bitchy gossip and *non sequiturs!* I hope that I could find some unanimity of interest with the member for Mawson, as an ex-teacher, on this. It was a disgraceful attack on the teaching profession. This combination of cattiness and diarrhoea of the typewriter suggested that the author suffered from feline enteritis. I am sure he could use some professional assistance from you, Sir, and the Hon. J. Cornwall to alleviate the pudendal misery conjured up by his name.

The response of sections of the teaching profession was quite vehement, and justly so. It is obvious that Mr. Cockburn had no awareness at all of the details involved in the payment of salary cheques to teachers. I can recall, many times, not quite knowing what my salary was from one week to the next, because the computer people, understaffed as they were, operated in strange and mysterious ways, and mysterious sums would appear in columns without any explanation about why the salary had gone up or down. It was difficult, given that we were busy teaching at school, to communicate with the Salaries Branch to find out what it was. With implicit faith in modern technology we accepted it as correct.

Mr. Ashenden: They were understaffed in the previous Government's day?

Mr. TRAINER: Possibly at that time, too, but certainly the problem has not been alleviated by the current Government.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. TRAINER: One response that Stewart Cockburn received to his scurrilous column was a letter which appeared in the *South Australian Teachers Journal* on 20 August from Mr. Ron Pratt, President of the Primary Teachers Association, as follows:

It was with incredulity that I read Stewart Cockburn's article (*Advertiser* 7/8/80) in which he attacked the ethics of teachers. When an experienced journalist (particularly one who has previously been attached to a leading politician's staff) relies on hearsay and undocumented evidence one suspects his motives for abandoning objectivity.

I wonder, too, about Stewart Cockburn's motives in writing that column and the way in which he relied purely

on gossip and unsupported evidence to make an attack on the teaching profession.

Earlier in the course of my contribution, I referred to the unfortunate failings of the Address in Reply system, saying that far too much time is taken up with 35, 36 or more members each speaking for an hour. I said it would be far better if the same amount of time could be made available during the Parliamentary session for us to have more frequent 10-minute contributions, to bring up more topical matters of more interest. As a token gesture, to indicate my sincerity in that statement, I shall wind up with four minutes still remaining, and not use the 60 minutes allotted to me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I agree with the member for Ascot Park. This debate is becoming a waste of time, and the member for Elizabeth said the same thing. The fact that the practice has grown in this House (something absolutely unknown a few years ago) of constantly having to call for a quorum to get enough members present shows that. One thing that struck me in the past few days was that it used to be regarded as very bad form to call for a quorum when one's own member was speaking, because it showed that no-one was interested in what he was saying. However, I notice that the member for Napier is doing that all the time. I do not think it will be very long before this debate is scrapped and, while I do not agree entirely with the suggestion by the member for Ascot Park, I think we have to do something better than waste three weeks's time at the beginning of each session.

However, this debate is useful to get over a few points, and I have a few things to say. First, I want to say something about the Government generally, and then something generally about the Opposition, such as it is. Then there are three or four specific matters that I propose to raise, if I have time. A few weeks ago, I circulated to electors in my district, as I do every few months, a letter, in which I asked myself how the Government was getting on, and the answer that I gave was, "Not too well." I said (and this is my assessment of the situation) that it had made a number of quite serious blunders, none of them of great magnitude, although to those concerned they were. I felt that the Government was not doing too well. I got only one reaction that was unfavourable. A man called Harley Hooper wrote a most unpleasant letter to me, and said that I should confine myself to issues that really mattered. When I wrote back asking him what the issues were, I did not get a reply. That is still my view of the performance of the Government, and I propose to deal with one or two matters—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: After that break, let me turn to the members of the Labor Party, of whom there are now three in the Chamber. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition has a rather cold personality. That is not his fault. I know that he is doing his best to try to put himself over to the public, but so far he is not succeeding very well. If I may say so, the tactics of the Opposition in this place are absolutely deplorable. It is missing opportunity after opportunity to attack the Government. It seems to have no idea of what opposition is about and I suspect that, whenever I suggest an attack on the Government on any specific matter, the Opposition goes the other way, rather than give me any supposed kudos for having raised the matter. We had that occur over Yatala, the mutagen-testing laboratory at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and so on.

The Opposition may well be right in saying that it can sit

back and wait for the Government to make mistakes, and office will then fall into the Labor Party's lap again. The Opposition may well be right in saying that, the way things are going, but that is playing the Party game and putting the Party ahead of the interests of the State. We are here not in our own interests or those of a Party but in the interests of the community, to raise matters of controversy, thrash them out, and try to improve conditions in this State. Let me say to the Labor Party something that may not please it very much. I have heard the so-called Deputy Leader of the Opposition call out to me, "Robin, we are not going to co-operate with you but you can co-operate with us, if you like". That has been typical of what has happened, with a few exceptions. There was one exception today, and I give the member for Stuart full marks for that. However, what I have said has been the attitude of the Labor Party by and large.

I should like the four members of the Labor Party who are now present to take this message to their colleagues: perhaps, unlike them, my colleague the Hon. Lance Milne and I act as a team. We are the Australian Democrats in this place, and the Hon. Lance Milne watches what goes on down here. If the Labor Party wants his sympathetic support in the Upper House for what it is doing, it had better have regard to what it is doing down here, so that on appropriate occasions we can all co-operate for the good of the State. I give the Opposition that warning and suggest it take it to heart.

Let me give the Labor Party another warning. Only today the results of the last Gallup poll, digested and analysed, were sent over to me by the Democrats from interstate. This was put out on 15 August. Members of the Labor Party realise, I suppose as well as any of us do, that the standing of their Party federally (as is the case with all Parties) depends very much on the way its members perform in a State Parliament, because by and large that is the yardstick that people use. Members of the Labor Party may be interested to know that, in the latest Gallup poll, their support in South Australia is shown as lower than that in any other State. Let me give the figures. I blame the Party in this place and another place for the results shown by this latest poll. The break-up of figures for South Australia shows that the A.L.P. received 33.7 per cent; the L.C.P., 43.7 per cent; and the Australian Democrats, 11.1 per cent (which was the highest figure of any State in Australia and which was exceeded only in the A.C.T., where our support is 14.1 per cent).

Members of the Labor Party may be interested to know the break-up between the metropolitan area and country districts. In Adelaide, which used to be an A.L.P. stronghold, the A.L.P. vote is 37.5 per cent, whereas in the country it is down to 23.3 per cent. The L.C.P. has 40.5 per cent in Adelaide and 52.6 per cent in the country. We have 8.9 per cent in the metropolitan area and 17.2 per cent in the country. The A.L.P., if it is going to do very well in the forthcoming election for the House of Representatives and the Senate, ought to pull its socks up and start giving this State a bit of opposition, with the numbers it has. To reinforce what I have said about co-operation, I read the following comment:

The second preferences of voters for the Australian Democrats, now 8 per cent over all Australia, would be a vital factor in any election.

I leave it at that. Members of the Labor Party may laugh. Of course, they have to laugh it off here, but they know the parlous situation in which their Party finds itself 12 months after the latest State election.

Let me say something more about the Government before I get on to specific matters. At the moment, I have 83 unanswered questions on the Notice Paper and, of the

first 36 questions that went on in the first week of the session, 25 are mine and they are unanswered. They include a couple about Yatala, of which I gave notice to the Chief Secretary on 27 July, telling him that I would be putting those questions on the Notice Paper. He replied on 15 August, saying that he noted the matter. However, it is nearly four weeks since the session began and well over a month since I gave him the questions in the form in which they appear on the Notice Paper, and are unanswered. That is an index of the difficulty that this Government is having in giving an account of itself to us in the Opposition and to the people of South Australia. I suggest that the Government pulls up its socks over this matter.

I will now refer to some specific matters, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Health is here. I had planned to speak in the Address in Reply yesterday, but when I saw the tactics that were used to filibuster this debate to ensure that there was no private members' business today, most of which was in the name of the member for Flinders and me, I decided to delay my speaking so that no-one could say that I had spent an hour yesterday that could have been saved, and I am damn glad that I did, because today I received a letter from Dr. Anthony Clarkson about the renal unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I have Dr. Clarkson's permission to quote this letter to the House, and let me tell the story behind it. I wrote, in response to a constituent's complaint, to the Minister of Health on 26 May and I stated, in part, the following:

I have been approached by a constituent asking that I register the complaint about the lack of staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are only three technicians for kidney machine patients compared with 15 at the Queen Elizabeth. The constituent who approached me is a dialysis patient at the Royal Adelaide and is on a kidney machine many hours per week.

I received a reply from the Hon. Jennifer Adamson, Mrs., on 9 June, in which she gave some figures, and stated, in part, the following:

It was my pleasure to visit the renal unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital recently and speak with its Director, Dr. T. Clarkson.

"Tony" is his shortened name; "Anthony" is his real name. The letter continued:

I am sure that, if any difficulties were being experienced at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, then Dr. Clarkson would have brought them to my attention.

Let the honourable lady listen to what Dr. Clarkson has written to me now. I replied to her on 5 July, pointing out that the figures that she had given to me were inaccurate, and I stated:

I am further informed that your visit to the renal unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital was merely a P.R. exercise to hand over a cheque from the Kidney Foundation. You did not even go into the second room of the unit.

I had an acknowledgement of that letter, which was dated 5 July, and having heard nothing I wrote to the Minister again on 15 August and suggested the reply. My office then received a telephone call from a Mr. Haines (I think the name was), who said the Minister had taken up the matter with the board of management and it would be some weeks before I received a reply. Next, I received this letter this morning from Dr. Clarkson, and I will quote most of it, because it is about time something was done about the Royal Adelaide Hospital, about its board of management and about the Health Commission, which is in charge of it and which is answerable to the Minister for what is done.

I may say that I had a number of complaints about the way the Health Commission is working. I am not suggesting that all of this is the responsibility of this

Minister, but she has done precious little about it. I can see the Premier peeking around the door; I know that he, too, has received a complaint from a kidney patient at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He also knows about these things, but neither he nor the Minister has done a thing about it. Dr. Clarkson's letter, dated 22 August, stated:

I am enclosing a report I wrote at the request of our Medical Superintendent to be forwarded to the Minister of Health—

I may say that that report, in answer to my letter, was dated July, but I still have not had a reply—

in response to a question posed to her by you. Enquiries by me have established that a complaint was made to you by a patient under my care at Royal Adelaide Hospital, Mr. George Boundy.

In my opinion, his complaints are fully justified, yet, despite repeated requests, finance cannot be made available by the Health Commission for improvements in facilities or staff.

Receipt of the projected budget for Royal Adelaide Hospital for 1980-81 wherein a further reduction of \$2 200 000 is proposed serves only to increase the anxiety and frustrations of my staff, who have to deal with the patients and their problems.

Such complaints by a patient of mine are embarrassing personally but I assure you that the problems are very real. The honourable lady may care to give an explanation. I proposed to ask her a question this afternoon about the matter and, if the Minister of Industrial Affairs had not spent the last 10 minutes of Question Time with a footling answer to a question, as you, Mr. Speaker will recall, I would have asked the question.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And flash Ted, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the Minister of Agriculture before that. However, I will give the Minister a chance tomorrow to come down with an answer to my question, and it had better be a good one. I suggest that she had better do some work in her department and try to make her weight, so much as it is, felt.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have the so-called, self styled shadow Minister in front of me. Let me turn to another matter, quite different from that to which I have referred. Both Parties involved must share the blame, because this matter was started under the Labor Government and has been continued in precisely the same way by the Liberal Government: I refer to the outrageous and scandalous proposal to build a vast shopping complex at Salisbury. I have spoken to the member for Salisbury about this matter, and he knows that I intended to raise it tonight. I have had correspondence with him. I do not blame the honourable member personally in this matter, although his responsibility lies in his being a member of a Party that initiated this project when it was in office, and he has the difficult—

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Napier had better listen, because this matter affects the city of Elizabeth, of which he was once the proud Mayor, as much as many other parts of that area. The member for Salisbury has to talk his way out of the fact that his Party started this mess, but—

Mr. McRae: He is not supporting it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, he is not supporting it but, if the previous Government had not encouraged Myers, there would be no problem.

Mr. Hemmings: It didn't encourage Myers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me give my side of the story. I was approached in this matter, as I am so often approached when people become absolutely desperate

because they can get no help either from the Liberals or from the Labour Party. I see examples of this every week. For example, I refer to the Ferryden Park school council, in the district of the Leader of the Opposition. The members of the council do not want to go to him because they know that he will not help them, as his Government started that mess in the Education Department and the Department for Community Welfare. Messrs. Wing and Pilmore came to see me some weeks ago about the Salisbury matter and, as a result, I wrote a letter on 22 July to the Premier, in which I pointed out that the Government was hand in glove with the Salisbury council, which is hell bent on destroying the heart of old Salisbury and putting in a vast shopping complex. I quoted in my letter to the Premier a minute of the Salisbury council, which shows quite clearly that the Government is implicated. The minute states:

The Chairman [of the council] informed the members that, due to a Cabinet decision which had been made that afternoon, the Education Department land was to be put up for public tender. Mr. Jim Cox of Myer Shopping Centres Pty. Ltd. had therefore decided not to attend the meeting.

It is vital to that project that the Government sell some Education Department land to Myers so that the land can be used for this shopping complex, and the Government has agreed. The irony is in the fact that the next day two of the Ministers denied knowing anything about it. That started that thing off. I had a reply to my letter of 22 July signed by—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will come to the Minister of Environment in a minute. I had an acknowledgement of my letter, signed by the Premier personally, on 28 July, in which he said:

Thank you for your letter . . . concerning proposals in the Salisbury city council area. I am having the matter examined. As far as I know, he is still having the matter investigated, because I have not had a further reply. I then received a letter from St. Augustine's Parish School protesting, and so on. I then had correspondence with Mr. Arnold, who told me of some remarks he made in the last session of Parliament about this matter. I am a little disappointed that he did not raise the matter in the Address in Reply debate, because I would have thought it was easily the hottest issue in his district.

Mr. Hemmings: Why not quote the letter—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Pray allow me to continue. On the 20th of this month, the Hon. Mr. Milne and I went out to Salisbury.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the laying on of hands permitted in this place?

Mr. Millhouse: I had to do something to shut him up.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, but demonstrations of affection are not permitted in the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With the utmost respect, Mr. Speaker, heaven forbid! Lance Milne and I went out there a week ago today and had a look around Salisbury. We called on the Town Clerk.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No fear, he has not. I think he will, but he has not yet. He invited us to get the council's side of the story, and the Hon. Mr. Milne spoke to him today. From what he relayed to me, nothing that I am about to say is changed. I think the council is absolutely and utterly wrong on this matter. Already some publicity has been given to the minutes of the 24th council meeting of 24 March. I have read out one part of it: that because of the Cabinet decision, Mr. Cox was not coming. I will read one other step to be taken in this process as follows:

It informs the State Government, by way of a deputation, of its decision, and asks for favourable consideration to be given to the urgent sale of the Education Department land between Ann Street and Mary Street for retail purposes to Myer Shopping Centres Proprietary Limited to achieve an overall retail development plan acceptable to council for that area bounded by Wiltshire Street, Commercial Road, Park Terrace, and part Mary Street.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Are you suggesting that the council has made its final decision?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am suggesting that the council is absolutely bent on this—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Has it made its final decision?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister will allow me to continue, I will satisfy him on that matter. I have a timetable for the council's procedures, which will show pretty clearly that they made up their minds. I will quickly go through some notes that were prepared on behalf of the Parabanks Shopping Centre management on this matter. They set out the facts very well (and I want them to be known) as follows:

John Street, Salisbury, contains approximately 31 000 square metres of retail space, and this serves a population of less than 90 000 people.

One of the problems is that Salisbury has ceased to grow at the rate of about 10 per cent per year and it is down to a growth rate of 1 per cent or 2 per cent. But that will not be taken into account. The report continues:

Adjacent to Salisbury is, of course, the Elizabeth Regional Centre, which has an area of 42 500 square metres and this is only about 5 kilometres from Salisbury. Obviously Elizabeth relies a lot upon the population of Salisbury for its trade.

The Salisbury Council in conjunction with Myers are proposing to rezone sufficient land for Myers to erect a centre of approximately 30 000 square metres, thus effectively doubling the retail size of the town centre. The subject land over which Myers have options is only 100 metres from the major Parabanks Centre which has about 26 000 square metres of space. To get this into perspective, the Marion Shopping Centre has an area of approximately 35 000 square metres and serves a population, in the case of Marion, in excess of 180 000 people. In other words, the Marion Shopping Centre is half the size of the retail area proposed for Salisbury Town Centre but serving double the amount of people.

Yet, they are going on with it. The report continues:

The Salisbury Council commissioned Brian Turner and Associates in September 1977.

I know Mr. Turner, as he lives in my electorate. The report continues:

Brian Turner recommended that the Salisbury Town Centre could possibly be extended by up to 13 500 square metres by the year 1990.

That was based on population projections which are now seen to be exaggerated. He did, however, advocate a shopping centre at Parafield Gardens, but Myers was not interested in that, and that will become, as the Minister knows, a casualty if this centre is built in Salisbury.

Then, Mr. Noel Taplin was commissioned by the Salisbury Council to make recommendations. He recommended that an area be rezoned, and it has transpired that Mr. Taplin bought some of the land which he said should be rezoned and which will be needed for a shopping centre. I say no more about that.

I now come to the Minister. We may remember that, in the last session, there was a good deal of controversy about a moratorium on shopping sites. There were conferences, and so on. In regard to this matter. Mr. Cook, of Collier, Duncan and Cook, wrote:

There is as you know a retail moratorium in effect at

present and during this period it is obviously totally against the intent of the moratorium to allow councils to rezone land for shopping purposes. This deficiency in the Bill was pointed out to the Minister but seems to have been deliberately left open to allow the Salisbury Council and Myers to pursue this course of action. There is no doubt that the Government has given tacit support to the Myer proposal even though it totally contradicts the moratorium and also the recommendations of the Retail Consultative Committee.

He then emphasises what we already know: that the matter has been shrouded in secrecy and everything has been done to keep this from the citizens of Salisbury. He points out that the council stands to gain \$150 000 per annum in rates if the Myer proposal proceeds. I also have a copy of the Salisbury District Centre study prepared by Hassell Planning Consultants this month. In part they state:

Study area generally:

It is considered that the study area generally has a slight over-provision of retail floor space. In particular, there is a reasonably greater amount of floor space for comparison shopping goods than the theoretical demand indicates is required. This suggests that the Myer Shopping Centres Proprietary Limited proposal which would substantially increase the amount of comparison goods based floor space is unwarranted and could have a significant detrimental impact on existing traders.

The report continues:

It is clear that any substantial increase in the provision of retail floor space, especially comparison goods based facilities, at this time, would significantly affect the economic viability of retail facilities in the John Street District Centre, other centres in the existing trade area of the John Street Centre and the regional and neighbourhood centres in the Elizabeth local government area.

It was pointed out that Parafield Gardens would go, and there would be no chance of a small shopping centre there.

The report goes on to state:

Similarly, the regional role of the Elizabeth Town Centre as defined by the Metropolitan Development Plan would be placed at great risk in retailing terms.

We know that the Housing Trust objected to the Salisbury proposal. No wonder; it owns most of the Elizabeth shopping complex. The report further states:

Consequently, to allow this possibility, the Salisbury Council and the State Government would be acting contrary to:

- (a) the findings and recommendations contained in the Salisbury Centres Study Report;
- (b) the policies, guidelines and intent of the Salisbury Supplementary Development Plan—Centres and Metropolitan Development Plan;
- (c) the independent professional advice concerning the need for retail facilities as described in this report.

Finally, they say that the results of a survey they did both in home and in centre show that the overwhelming majority of people in Salisbury are happy with what is going on with what they have now. I have here a document from the council which shows that so far as the council can make out, about 286 people are in favour of the proposal and 8 612 are against it. That is the position that exists.

What have we got to now? The Minister says that they have not made a final decision. I will see whether I can find something which shows pretty well that they have made a final decision on this. It has gone a bit awry, but I have here a document called "Expansion of Salisbury Town Centre—Position Paper—4 August 1980". What did that provide for? On 25 August 1980 (two days ago) it states, "Council considers objections and resolves to proceed." That was written in advance and that is what

they said on 24 August that they were going to do—last Monday night. It states, "Council considers objections and resolves to proceed".

They cannot do that, because Messrs. Gunn and Davey, their efficient solicitors, have pointed out that they have not complied with the Planning and Development Act and they have to readvertise. That has put a spoke in the wheel for two months. As the Minister will know (and it is this morning's paper) that is a small thing for Salisbury Council, which is hell bent on doing this in its area. What is the explanation for this? That was the first question that I asked myself. The answer seemed to be this: from the viewpoint of the Salisbury Council, it is jealous of Elizabeth and always has been, and has always wanted to have a large department store in Salisbury.

The only way the council can get a large department store in Salisbury is to allow Myers to put a Target store there and, hopefully, a department store—that is the only thing that it is looking at. It wants a big department store in Salisbury. It does not matter what it is going to do to the present traders at Parabanks, or what it is going to do to Elizabeth—it has to be as good as Elizabeth. What about Myers? Here I have to say that I have to declare an interest. I have some shares in Myers. About 20 years ago I put £200 into Myers. It is one of the best investments I ever made, but it has not influenced me on this matter at all. I know from reports I get that Myers complain that Colonnades is a financial disaster and that it is not doing well at all down there. I could not put the two facts together, but the answer is that Myers, realising what is going to happen in the future, is desperate to get in anywhere before all the shopping development sites disappear and it is not allowed to put in any more stores. Myers is prepared to go anywhere and accept losses for a very long time so that it can get in. It is prepared to accept losses at Salisbury so that it will have a presence there. It does not matter what happens to the other traders; so long as Myers is there, it will be able to carry the losses until it throttles everybody else and has got the business for itself. That explains Myers's action, and I accept that explanation.

Why have successive Governments done this? Well, the explanation which has been given to me (and a member of the Labor Party can deny it if he likes) is that Myers was treated absolutely scandalously by the Dunstan Government over the Queenstown proposal; there is no doubt whatever about that. That is one of the worst things that the Dunstan Government, and these men who are in the Labor Party now, did. The Labor Government, and particularly the Hon. Mr. Hudson, of happy memory in this place, I suppose, wanted to make it up to Myers, and the Government encouraged Myers to look at Salisbury because there was an opening. There is no doubt whatever that this all started well over 12 months ago. It is not new; it is not this Government that started it, but it was the Labor crowd who started it, and that was the reason—to try to make up to Myers for what it had done to Myers down at Queenstown.

This crowd, which came in unexpectedly on 15 September 1979, is so bent on encouraging private enterprise, and especially its big patrons, at any cost, that it has been prepared to carry on with Myers in just the same way as the Labor Party did. That is the explanation which I suggest is the right one. I will be very happy if either a member of the Labor Party, or the Minister, who is so deeply implicated in this matter, gets up to deny this or to explain the real facts. I have, and I do not know whether every member was sent a copy, a letter from Donaldson and Murdoch Investments, written to the Mayor and all councillors of the City of Salisbury as late as

19 August. Any member who has not seen this letter is welcome to look at it. This letter really sets out better than I have done what I have been saying, and on page 8 states:

Finally, let there be no misunderstanding between council and ourselves.

These are the Parabanks people. I was amazed when I saw the size of the Parabanks centre now, and it has only just been extended in the past few months. It is going to take the traders operating in those extensions years before they make any money out of that centre—I am sure that is right.

An honourable member: Quite right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, of course it is. That letter continues:

We will fight this massive rezoning proposal at every stage, and with every legal means available to us. We will not submit to compulsory acquisition of our property in Salisbury, unless it can be demonstrated that the land is needed for essential public purposes which are in the public interest. If that can be demonstrated, compulsory acquisition will not be necessary.

The council is even going to acquire the land compulsorily for Myers if it cannot get it in any other way. I think it is about time that this was brought out into the open, and that is why I have spoken on it tonight. I think that those who are fighting for their economic lives, the traders of Salisbury, deserve a bit of help, and from all of us. I hope that the Labor Party will now speak up and support the honourable member for Salisbury in his opposition to this matter, even though they are responsible for the situation which has arisen.

Let me turn now to another matter. It concerns the Yatala Labour Prison. I am sorry that the Chief Secretary is not here, but perhaps he will come in and listen later. Early in July we had the scandalous situation of men apparently (people), breaking into Yatala one Friday night to get out a Mr. Tognolini, who was there on remand and due to come up in the District Criminal Court on the following Monday. I knew because I was contacted immediately about this matter on the Saturday morning, but the Chief Secretary knew not a thing about it down at Naracoorte, or wherever he had gone for the weekend, when the media got in touch with him. No-one had bothered to tell him what had happened at his principal gaol in this State. From there on, to use the words that I tried to use in a no-confidence motion on the honourable gentleman, which was not supported by members of the Labor Party, he has been shown what can only be described as bumbling inactivity over this matter.

I suspect that there were two reasons why Labor Party members would not join in with me when I invited them to do so. First, they did not want me to appear to take the lead. I am sorry that the Leader did not hear what I said earlier in the evening. Secondly, they know that this mess started under a Labor Government. They had a succession of weak Chief Secretaries, and the present man is only carrying on the tradition. That is the position. Labor Party members have to take as much blame for what is going on at Yatala as the present Government does. The only difficulty the present Government has is that it happens to be in the saddle at the moment.

I suggested a no-confidence motion in the Chief Secretary, and I do not repent. I believe that that is what should have happened. I believe he should have resigned over such a scandalous situation, but there was no go. However, having said what I did immediately about the matter (and the Labor Party was very silent for a number of days; there was no comment from the Party for quite some time on this matter), I was given, quite properly, a copy of the Cassidy report.

Mr. McRae: Ah ha! Another one!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was the first person given a copy of this report, actually.

Mr. Max Brown: There are more leaks to you than there are from Fraser.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe there are. I got the Cassidy report—

Mr. Becker: Where from?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to say from whom I got it. The Crown Law Office sent an investigator to see Mr. Cassidy to ask him whether he had given it to me. The Government was so incensed about this matter that it tried to find out how I got the report. It did not find out, but it embarrassed Mr. Cassidy.

I got the Cassidy report, and I felt it my duty to make it public. It is absolute nonsense, as every member who has seen that report knows (and I do not think the Chief Secretary has read it even yet), to say that by making that report public there would be any danger to whatever security there is at Yatala. It is absolutely absurd, but that was the only thing the Chief Secretary or the Premier could say. Do they think that the blokes out there do not know what is going on in the gaol? They must be living in cloud cuckooland if that is the case. Of course, they had nothing else to say in answer to the revelations of the Cassidy report. That report, which is called a "report", not "remarks" or "an assessment", as the poor Chief Secretary has tried to say in this place to cover his mistakes, was made in February, and it was on security at Yatala. Mr. Cassidy was asked to make a report on the security at Yatala.

I do not want to go into that now, but, because of what I said, I had a number of other approaches from people about this very matter, and I propose to make them public. Again, I have the permission of those concerned to do so. The first letter is from a Mr. John T. Hall, of Campbelltown, who wrote to me as follows:

In February this year, I retired from the Correctional Services Department, after serving 24 years. I commenced work as a prison officer in 1954 and retired as Deputy Superintendent, Yatala Labour Prison, after being in that position for 10 years. I feel that I must write to you and explain the situation as it was in February, this year—the month in which Cassidy made his report—

Some of the main problems at Yatala Labour Prison are as follows:

1. Shortage of general duty officers.
2. Too many prison industry officers.
3. Lack of security at night.
4. Prisoners allowed to spend too much on indulgences (money sent in, etc.).
5. All staff should be in one union or all staff should be called correctional services officers.
6. Not enough gaolers conferences (gaolers and departmentals only).
7. Manning strength.
8. Lack of basic training by senior staff.

He goes on to elucidate all those things. Anyone is entitled to see this letter, as I have this gentleman's permission to make it public. I do not have time to go right through it.

Mr. Mathwin: Does he claim that there is no basic training?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; let me read that out. I happen to be looking at that page. The letter continues:

Some of the senior staff from the Director down have not been through the ranks. This precludes them from knowing the job, including the lurks that the general duty officers learn from fellow officers. Six senior members, including the Director, have not been through the ranks (this is not the

case as in the Police Force); therefore, their lacking of job training does not help in the security of the prison.

The member for Glenelg may be satisfied with that. Mr. Hall finishes in this way:

I have mentioned only but a few of the many problems which are occurring at the Yatala Labour Prison, and I would only be too happy to discuss this matter with anyone to assist in a better approach to security at the many institutions throughout the State of South Australia. For information I have also sent similar letters to the Premier and the Chief Secretary.

Of course, he also sent a letter to me. That letter was written by Mr. Hall, who is, I suggest, as entitled to express an opinion as anyone else, Mr. Cassidy included.

Mr. Mathwin: Did he send it to you or to the Leader of the Opposition, Robin?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He might just as well have done that. On 7 July, I received a telephone call from a prison officer at Yatala who asked me not to give his name. This is the story that he told me of an incident that occurred there:

Approximately 10 days ago a key which opens barriers of wings within the gaol was lost. Search—didn't turn up. When it was reported—nothing done. Union wanted locks changed. According to my note, he then stated that it had no link with Tognolini. The story continues as follows:

Staff meeting on Friday—why locks not changed.

Superintendent said key not lost at all; yesterday key found by a prisoner in a rubbish bin.

He then went on to make an allegation of the grossest dereliction of duty against one of the senior men in the gaol, but I will not mention that. He then stated that the lack of leadership, security and discipline at the gaol was the problem there. I also received a telephone call from the wife of a prison officer. The note regarding the telephone call is as follows:

Prison officer's wife rang (would not give her name). Says to tell you that you are on the right track. No good sacking Rodda, as the heads would still remain, and they are the ones who should be sacked. She knows of one officer—

and gives the name—

who has the reputation of being an alcoholic. Towers not staffed at night, and no chiefs on duty—only duty officers.

Another man told me that he was told by Mr. Cassidy (and Mr. Cassidy has not told me this) that he spent six weeks out at the gaol looking at the place before he made his report, and during that time Mr. Stewart did not go out there once. He contrasted that with old Mr. Jimmy Allen, who many remember as the man in charge, whatever he was called in those days. He was the head of the department and was out there every Friday, as well as doing spot visits.

Mr. Keneally: The comptroller.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. That is one of the keys to the problems at Yatala. Anyone who has had any experience of an organisation like the prison service, Army or the Police Force knows that the commander, or whoever it may be, must see and be seen. He cannot leave it to subordinates to do his work for him. He must be there and see what is going on for himself. Under the present regime, that is not happening.

I do not know what this Government is doing about Yatala. We have heard not a thing. There has been no revelation about Tognolini or what has happened in that respect. There has been absolute silence from the Government on that and on what it is going to do about it. This is a scandalous situation. I cannot judge between the allegations made by the member for Elizabeth and the denials that the Chief Secretary has made this week about the matter. I do not know whether or not that is right.

However, I did receive one letter which I have not read but which mentioned one murder in the gaol. There is no doubt about that. We want to know, and the community is entitled to know.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Are you saying there is no doubt that you received the letter or that there is no doubt that there was a murder?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The letter stated that there was at least one murder. It may well be in the letter that I read out; I cannot remember. I have seen it in the last hour amongst the mass of paper that I have here. We must know what is happening at Yatala because not only is there no security there (or it is laughable) but also enormous amounts of money and resources are being wasted on the place.

The final thing that I say about this matter is that a Mr. L. Eddie sent me on 7 July a research paper that he had done, entitled "Sources of stress amongst prison officers at the Adelaide Gaol". Mr. Eddie states:

In view of the recent publicity given to Yatala, and to the Cassidy Report, you might be interested to examine the attached report. It makes similar observations concerning staff morale, as does the Cassidy Report. In addition, there are a number of other areas which you might find of interest.

Please avail yourself of the report . . .

It seems to me (and one would expect this: why should it be different at Adelaide?) that there is an equivalent problem at the Adelaide Gaol. The Labor crowd cannot escape responsibility for this. They were in office for more than nine years and, during that time, on the information that I have received, the situation at Yatala went down and down and down, and the present Government inherited it. This Government's problem is that it has done absolutely nothing about it. It is obvious that the Chief Secretary is under the control of his officers and is incapable of doing anything, except what he is told to do, and that is why in my view he should not have remained, pleasant man that he is, as Chief Secretary.

I come now to the last matter with which I wish to deal this evening, namely, the guidelines for the Public Service. I noted that some honourable members were a little surprised this afternoon when I allowed to go off the Notice Paper the motion that I had down for today.

Mr. McRae: We weren't surprised at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Playford would be up with me, but I doubt whether any other honourable members were. Of course, by allowing it to go off the Notice Paper when I was effectively blocked by Liberal members from moving the motion today (despite a letter that I had received from the Premier stating that he was ready to debate the matter at any time—and I will read it out in a minute if I have the chance), I could canvass the matter tonight.

There are two aspects to this matter. First, in my view, the guidelines are totally and absolutely unnecessary. There is absolutely no reason to have them at all, and I bet that the Premier bitterly regrets having put his signature to a document that he could not possibly have understood; otherwise, he would never have signed it. There is no need for the guidelines, because the public servants of this State, no less than Federal public servants who have been subjected to this sort of thing for 10 years now, are well able to look after themselves at Select Committee meetings or other committee meetings. All they must do (they have the sense to do it; I have heard it myself, because I have at one time or another been on nearly every committee in this place, although I am not on them now) is to say, "I am not sure that I have the answer to that today. Will you please allow me to come back tomorrow with it?" or, they can say, "I am not certain

whether that is in my brief. Will you allow me a little time to get instructions?"

That is all that they must do to get out of any sticky position and, if they are not good enough to do that, why are they sent down by a department to give evidence at all? Presumably, these people are in responsible positions and, if they cannot handle a mob of members of Parliament on a Select Committee, they are not too good (and I say that advisedly, from my experience). There is no need to have the guidelines at all. The whole thing was just a waste of time and is now a disaster for the Government.

I suspect, as I have said publicly, that it was done because the Government was told by its public servants, "Look, we have to do something about this new procedure for consideration of the Budget. We can't divulge everything there; it would be very embarrassing." That was the genesis of these recommendations.

I suggest that one of the best summaries of the relationship—and this is very relevant to this matter—between Ministers and public servants is contained in a paper, which was presented in 1976 by the present Ombudsman, Mr. Robert Bakewell. I know that there has already been some reference to it in the newspaper, because the *Advertiser* people are pretty alert and they remember these things. Mr. Bakewell, in that paper, sets out the relationship that there should be. Let me read out what he states under the heading "Recapitulation":

(1) Given the expanded role and responsibility of Government departments it may no longer be realistic to expect the Minister to be solely responsible for all departmental actions and policies.

The second one is an increasing tendency, especially by Federal Ministers, to pass the buck and blame their public servants when something goes wrong. Mr. Bakewell continues:

(3) Adherence to the principle of Ministerial responsibility may lead to excessive secrecy about Government policies as public servants will try to maintain confidentiality about the decision-making process so as to protect the Minister from criticism about departmental actions of which he may have no personal knowledge.

(4) The traditional anonymity of public servants has become increasingly difficult to preserve.

(5) Government secrecy restrictions which apply to public servants are being questioned. The argument is that this denies public servants a basic civil liberty . . .

(6) The distinction between policy and administration is not longer clear cut.

(7) The expanded role of the senior public servant in modern Government has meant, in some cases, that he has attained too much influence resulting in a situation of Ministerial dependence on his senior advisers.

If I may say so, with respect to all of us, we have in South Australia really only a tin-pot little Government. There are only 1 300 000 people, and we are small beer. But the same principles apply here as apply in other States and Canberra, and as apply in the United Kingdom, and the United States with some qualification. One can see—anyone who has been a Minister knows this—the exact same tendencies are here in our little Government as there are in the biggest ones. What Bob Bakewell has said there is absolutely correct. There has been a changing relationship, and it is no longer possible or desirable, if Parliament is to have any control over the bureaucracy—over Government—to allow public servants to hide behind in some cases—and I say this with the utmost deference to those on the front bench now—nitwits of Ministers.

Yet that is what these guidelines would in effect allow to happen. I hope and believe that the guidelines will be

quietly forgotten (that is, if the Government is allowed quietly to forget them; I do not know whether it will be). It was bad enough to bring in the guidelines at all and just table them without a word being said. There was no explanation or suggestion to the effect, "We would love to know what you think of them." The Premier used the word "submissions", and not a thing was said. They were tabled without an explanation, and it was just luck that later in the afternoon I found out about them and had a look at them and saw what they were like. The next day I gave notice of the motion that was due for today.

Mr. Bannon: The member for Playford spoke on them that very night.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The member for Playford spoke on them that very night. I am not trying to detract from the member for Playford for one minute. He is one of the few in the Labor Party with much initiative or go. There is no doubt about that. Of course, he is a barrister, and it is not surprising that he is as good as he is. Let me say what is the most serious side of this. It is the way that the Premier has handled the matter which is the serious side of it, and it does cast doubt on his ability and reliability in other matters. He has twisted and turned on this matter in a most reprehensible way. First, he brings the guidelines in, and they have the word "must" in them. He sticks to them and makes that statement on 12 August in *Hansard*, giving not one hint of any resiling from them, or any request for submission about them. It was merely a defence of the guidelines, and they were going to stand.

Now, the Premier has said, "They are only guidelines, anyway", 'must' should be 'may'. He has told us, "I would love submissions," and said what are we going to do. Everyone has told him—the Public Service Association has told him, I have told him and other people have told him—"Withdraw the damn thing. You don't want any submissions on them, get rid of them, forget them and let us go back to what is a sensible situation," but he will not do that. He is now saying that he asked for submissions when he did not ask for submissions.

He is saying that he said at one stage he had consulted the Public Service Association about it, and that was obviously not true. It was just not true, the P.S.A. has said so, and he has had to admit that what he consulted it about was something quite different from the document that he brought in. That is crass incompetence if nothing more, and no member can gainsay me in saying that. That is all I propose to say about this, except for one last point, which I nearly forgot to raise.

The motion of which I gave notice today mentions several points, as follows:

That this House strongly disapproves of the "Guidelines for Public Servants appearing before Parliamentary Committees" approved and tabled by the Premier on 6 August; and upon the principle of open government which he has claimed to espouse—

of course, this is one of the phrases he parroted before the election—open government: we were going to know what was going on, following many complaints about the fact that we did not know under the old Government what was happening—

calls upon him to withdraw the guidelines immediately—that is my submission to him—

and affirms that in any case it is the members of Select and Special Committees of this Parliament who decide the questions to be answered by witnesses whether those witnesses be public servants or not.

Having read that out, let me remind members of what Erskine May says in the nineteenth edition at page 174. There is nothing in our own Standing Orders about this, and we follow the procedures of the House of Commons.

This is what he says, and there is no doubt about the last part of the motion that I had on the Notice Paper:

Where, however, it is manifest that an offence has been committed, and the offence is of such a nature that no explanation the offender might offer could extenuate it, as, for example, where a committee reports—
and this is a report of the committee to the whole House, the House of Commons—

that a witness has been guilty of prevarication, or has given false evidence, or refused to answer questions, or that a person summoned as a witness has evaded all attempts to secure his attendance before the committee, or that it appears, on evidence taken before the committee that certain persons have prevented the attendance of a person summoned as a witness—

and Ministers had better be careful if they will not let people come—

and have given him money to induce him to abstain from giving evidence before the committee, the House may proceed at once—

and so on. There are the examples set out of the sort of offences which are reported by a committee to the House. I suggest to members that they read the whole of that section (no doubt you are familiar with it, Mr. Speaker), headed "Procedure where breaches of privilege or other contempts are reported by committees". There is no doubt about the powers of Parliament. It is Parliament, not the Ministry, that makes the decisions on these matters because I remind members opposite that this place is not run for the benefit of the Government. This is Parliament, and it is distinct from the Government, even though the Government depends on it politically. We should be, as I said this afternoon, very jealous to preserve our rights as members of Parliament, otherwise the institution will suffer and the whole of our governmental system will suffer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I join with the other members of the House in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I, too, join with members who have expressed condolences to the relatives of the late Maurice William Parish, who was a member of this House about 65 years ago. I had not intended to enter into the Address in Reply debate, particularly at this late stage, but a number of matters cropped up last evening which demand some response, and also I believe that one or two of the matters raised by the member who has just finished speaking, the member for Mitcham, are worthy of brief comment.

I must admit that when I heard the honourable member offering his support to members of the Opposition, I thought that they were very strange bedfellows, when the A.L.P. and the Australian Democrats Party are aligned together. I believe that the honourable member was almost prostituting his vote. I suppose it is quite possible that he will be introducing a Bill to legalise that in the near future. However, it does not behove him too well to be debating such issues without at least considering their merit as far as they concern the future of South Australia. In fact, he has told the A.L.P., "If you support me down here, then my fellow in another place will support you." There was no mention at all of votes being taken on the basis of merit; it was scratch my back and I will scratch yours. When the honourable member patted himself on the back, it reminded me of the letter the honourable member sent around to his electors. I read a copy of that letter, because my family resides in his electorate. Very little constructive criticism was contained in that letter in relation to the Government or the Opposition. What struck

in my memory was the first two paragraphs which expressed tremendous surprise on his part at being returned at all. He said that he was still in a state of euphoria at being present and representing his electorate in the House. As I have said, there was very little else memorable in that letter, which he refrained from quoting as an afterthought. In relation to the Salisbury land, the Myer company has expressed very definite interest in that land.

Mr. Millhouse: That's putting it mildly, isn't it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is, euphemistically speaking, I admit, but as the Government has said repeatedly—and as I said in one of the earliest press releases on this issue—the Education Department, which is the main owner of land in that area, had not been formally approached with an offer for that land. Its immediate reaction was that, should the land ultimately be disposed of, it would be put up for sale by tender. That attitude is supported by Cabinet and the Government. In fact, the issue still rests, despite the honourable member's alleging that decisions had already been made, with the Salisbury council in view of the fact that there are legalities still to be observed, and it is quite unable to pre-empt those decisions because of those legalities. Until the Salisbury council reaches a decision, this Government will not be directly involved with the sale or any other negotiations regarding that particular land. In the meantime the Government has been given assurances that the areas subject to national trust consideration could and would in fact be protected should future development take place on that site.

Mr. Millhouse: You are in favour of the development, aren't you?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have not said that in any way.

Mr. Millhouse: You have not denied it, either.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My sole concern in this issue was that the land in question was occupied by a Department of Further Education property, which is still being used very effectively. In order to obtain that property, the Department of Further Education would have to be rehoused. That was the only public comment I have made; it was the subject of a press release and it is still most relevant as far as the Education Department is concerned.

The gratuitous insults offered to the Chief Secretary followed a quite reasonable explanation that he gave to the House many days ago when he stated quite clearly that he was as concerned as any Chief Secretary could be about security at Yatala. In fact, he stated that, while the unfortunate escape was taking place, the Government had been in the process of deciding upon improved security measures. When one considers the age of the Yatala institution and the fact that the Chief Secretary is being pilloried for something that he inherited from a previous Government (which, after all, had been there for 10 years without achieving very much in the way of additional security), I do not believe that the criticism is at all just. The Chief Secretary has stated that he is taking remedial steps, but, of course, one can hardly reasonably expect him to give the details; nor would it be sensible for him to offer those details, because such information would probably be of tremendous help to anyone else who wished to know how to take the unusual step of first breaking into and then breaking out of such an institution. The Chief Secretary is among the most hard-working members of Cabinet. As such, he is to be commended for the steps he is taking in relation to security in South Australia's prisons.

Another issue that was raised by the former Minister of Education last night related to the position of Women's

Adviser in the South Australian Education Department, and the intended position in the Further Education Department. There was a relatively small but slightly prolonged rally on the steps of Parliament House this evening, and I was privileged to have been invited to address that group first. I spent 25 to 30 minutes with those ladies—

Mr. Millhouse: Is that when we had a division this afternoon?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, I was going to carry on and say, in relation to the women of South Australia, I hope they recognised that the Minister had his priorities in the right place, because he missed what could have been quite an important division in the House. I did not really appreciate the sense of humour of one member opposite who came by me shortly after that division singing, *The Bells Were Ringing for Me and My Gals*. I accept the honourable member's humour for what it is worth; fortunately no harm was done.

Mr. Trainer: There is another verse.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not know any more; that is all he said. He has a fine sense of humour. The fact is that Government members have a serious regard for women's advisory matters in all Government departments. Some blatant lies have been told by members of the Opposition, both in this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As Winston Churchill would have put it—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the term "lies".

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that term unreservedly. As Winston Churchill would have put it in identical circumstances, they were terminological inexactitudes. I do not know whether that precedent is contained in Erskine May, but it is certainly contained in the House of Commons, London. The inexactitudes are quite deliberate, in so far as the Minister has been accused of abolishing the women's advisory positions in the Education and Further Education Departments. That is simply not so, and that was made quite clear about two or three weeks ago in a Ministerial statement in this House.

Those positions are in fact being removed from Ministerial whim. The previous Minister made the women's advisory position in the Education Department a Ministerial appointment; it was not a permanent position. The new position within the Further Education Department was also at Ministerial discretion. I have been criticised for having the temerity to interview someone in San Francisco earlier this year. I remind the House that, since the position was at Ministerial discretion and since I had been asked to sign a travel voucher for about \$2 000 to enable an interviewee to travel to South Australia and back to America (successful or unsuccessful), I felt quite justified, because I was in America anyway on a personally financed holiday, in at least interviewing that applicant and deciding whether it was worth while for the department to invite her to South Australia. In fact, when I arrived in America I learned that that lady had after all intended to come to South Australia whether or not she was invited. Subsequently, she did attend an interview for the position and the matter has resolved itself. I felt justified in attempting to save the State some money when there was a possibility that she may not have even qualified for a final round of interviews.

Since then, it was put to me by my Director-General of Education that the women's advisory position in the Education Department, which position was due to be terminated at the end of this month, should be

reconsidered and possibly renamed, and expanded slightly as far as duties are concerned. That expansion was to involve minority groups as well as the large majority of employees within the Education Department, the womenfolk. The minority groups are, of course, the Aborigines, the disabled, ethnic communities, and sundry others, and to suggest that there would be a vast additional work load as a result of that specified expansion of duties is to ignore the fact that the present Women's Adviser most surely would be attending to the needs of women in general, whether members of the majority employees within the Education Department or those minority groups also involved within education.

The real anathema to a small group of lobbyists is the fact that a Women's Adviser would be expected to deal with a few men in minority groups. I suggest that that is really no argument at all. The fact is that the Women's Adviser positions, now to be renamed Equal Opportunity Officers, are two in number, where before there was only one. They will be able to co-operate with the number of departments, not only in education and further education, but in other Government departments currently effectively handling problems associated with minority groups. To that extent, I believe that the work load of these two new appointees, these two new women, will not be anywhere near as additionally heavy as has been envisaged.

In any case, the Treasurer, who is expending the finance, and the Minister of Education have consulted, and it has been decided that, since the Public Service Board has requested that the positions be made permanent, this will be done and that, therefore, in future we can have workload studies. Should these two appointees be able to convince the Government and the Public Service Board that the work is increasingly heavy, the Government would be happy and willing to consider making available additional assistance.

That was clearly stated in previous announcements. It was ignored so that the matter could be stirred up by various people who have been addressing letters to the press and writing articles and addressing rallies, and I would suggest that the future of women's advisory positions in South Australia is assured. The two positions are permanent; they are career positions. They will be staffed at a level very close to that enjoyed by the previous incumbent, Miss Denise Bradley.

Mr. Trainer: And a very good one she was, too.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I agree with the honourable member. I do not often respond to interjections, but I gave Denise praise for the work she has done over the past three years. At the same time, during the rally this afternoon, I acknowledged that I had heard Denise herself publicly express thanks to the officers within the Education Department, those officers who are still there, who helped her to achieve what she has—people such as John Steinle, who instructed his other officers to give co-operation wherever they possibly could, and people like Colin Laubsch, who has been of inestimable help in delegating people to assist. There are plenty of them in the deputy, and I do not propose to name them. They are still there and still willing to help the new appointees. I cannot over-emphasise that the work still to be done within the women's support groups within the department is still to be supported, just as it has been in the past, by the Government and by staff members.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To conclude that topic, I prefer to be judged less by the speculative comments that have

been made about my intentions in the press, than by the positive discriminatory action which I took in October or November of last year, to the extent that we passed through the courts a measure to enable the Education Department to discriminate in favour of women on the deputy heads promotion list, so that they could be selected from lower down the list in order to staff our secondary schools in South Australia where it was necessary to discriminate in such a way as to ensure that there were sufficient women in high positions to attend to the needs of girls in the school communities. That was a positive action which I am sure will benefit our schools in future years.

There were other issues raised by the member for Baudin. One of them disturbs me to some extent, in that the Ceduna Area School matter has not been allowed to rest. This is a matter in which you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been quite vitally interested. The school staff, I admit, have repeatedly expressed their dedication to their students. They have said that their actions were the result of that dedication. Your actions, Sir, were the result of your dedication to your electors and to the children in your electorate. Both parties had similar motives, but different means of achieving them.

Here we have a case of one school denying the transfer of a Demac unit to another school which was in need. We had unions saying that they would picket the school to prevent the removal of the Demac unit. We had the Minister of Education pledging as an alternative the transfer of a Demac unit from Leigh Creek to Ceduna, but somewhat later than the Ceduna people would have liked. As an interim measure, I undertook to provide five single classroom units to Ceduna within a relatively short time, and I was concerned when, after having promised that those units would be transferred by the end of this term, that action was first questioned by the staff at Ceduna, who said that it was incapable of achievement, and then, when the units began to arrive at Ceduna school well ahead of time, the staff threatened to strike because they had not had time to reconsider their position.

I was somewhat disturbed, too, to read in the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal a few days ago, on the front page, a small article referring to the Ceduna issue which suggested that, if people were prepared to lobby, to threaten, to go on strike, they could achieve anything. That is not so. What has been achieved has been by negotiation, by compromise, and the fact that that small article was undersigned by the Acting President of the Institute of Teachers is a denial of what happened in the education offices when, under threat of strike, I advised the Ceduna school staff that that was our best offer, that five units would be transferred and would arrive in time, that the Leigh Creek Demac unit would be transferred probably by the end of the first term in next year, that we would look at future school accommodation requirements, and that we advised against any strike action, but that, should a strike take place, we would not be able to do any better than that.

The comment from the Acting President of the Institute of Teachers was that the Minister had done as much as was humanly possible and that the situation appeared to be quite reasonable. I assumed, therefore, that the comments on the front page of the *Teachers Journal* may have been written as part of editorial policy and countersigned by the President. They certainly did not reveal the full facts of the matter, by any means. They were quite unilateral in approach and did not indicate the extent of negotiations that had taken place, nor did they indicate that, in fact, the school staff and school council were perilously close to serious dissent. In fact, the school council had written to me, as you read out in a grievance debate, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, expressing support for my actions. That, too, was not revealed by the institute journal. I hope that the actions that have been taken as a compromise, in a spirit of negotiation and co-operation, in recognition of the devotion of that school staff to their students, will have a happier ending than seemed possible, and that other schools will not take it for granted that they can bully and threaten to go on strike to achieve their ends. That is just not on as far as this Minister and this Government are concerned.

There were other implications in what the member for Baudin did last night. He read to the House a copy of a letter from the Institute of Teachers, addressed to the Premier. That letter was also forwarded to other people around the State, other members of this House. I would suggest that for a professional body to negotiate in that manner is quite unprofessional, and I have no intention of producing other letters written to me by senior members of the Institute of Teachers that I would say give a somewhat different slant, in the long run, on the proceedings that took place at about that time, because for me to do so would be breaching confidence, and that is something that I certainly do not intend to do.

I say that I was particularly hurt to think that, at the same time, letters were being hand-delivered to the Premier from people who were in my office negotiating on, supposedly, a range of institute matters, people who spent an hour negotiating on teachers' salaries, a matter which was, I admit, quite justifiably being negotiated, but which was the sole issue. For that sort of thing to happen without the Minister's having been advised personally by the person who wrote the letter that such an action had been taken was unprofessional. I would say that the relationships between the Education Department, the Minister, the Government, and the Institute of Teachers are on a much better plane, that differences have essentially been ironed out, and that we have the children of the State as our common heart-felt interest.

Mr. Peterson: Tell us something about Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not have to do that. That is one of the best represented districts in the State, and results speak for themselves. The honourable member's Government recognised that by spending \$36 000 000 there in four years, and this Government will make sure that that Government's promises are honoured.

I would also say that allegations that a number of letters written to the Education Department and the Minister had gone unanswered were also found to be largely incorrect. Copies of those letters were quickly produced and it was found that there had been a delay of some six weeks in obtaining a reply from the South Australian Institute of Teachers on one matter that had been referred to. There were problems on both sides. The member for Baudin said that the Minister of Education should spend more time defending the teaching profession. I point out to the House that repeatedly over the past 10 or 11 months I have made plain that I hold the teachers of South Australia in very high esteem.

Mr. Slater: But the feeling isn't reciprocated.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not really worried about that. I do not have to enter into character denigration. I am simply saying what I think, and what other people think is judged by results in the long run. We have had enough of that sort of character assassination. There is a little bit going on in the Upper House with a question asked about me and my teaching experience, and I will answer that in the proper place. That question was asked by one of the honourable Opposition members. The fact is that character assassination in any place is an undesirable feature of Parliamentary life, and I am certainly not going

to enter into it, but I will repeat my praise of the teachers of South Australia and the praise of other Ministers of Education, including the Minister in New Zealand, when they have said that not only South Australian teachers but the Institute of Teachers were extremely reputable, reliable, and the type of people they would like to have staffing their schools.

Mr. Trainer: You don't agree with Stewart Cockburn, then.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will deal with that issue, because that, too, was referred to by the member for Baudin. This journalist is held in high repute not only in South Australia but in Australia and overseas, where he has spent time working for world-class newspapers. There were allegations that improper actions had been performed by a member of my Ministerial staff. In truth, what really happened was that a press release was given to the *News* in response to a request by that newspaper some few days before Mr. Cockburn took up the issue.

It was revealed by no other than the Auditor-General that there had been quite considerable over-payments made by the Education Department to staff members. Part of the defence, as one of the previous speakers said this evening, is that staff members were often paid rather belatedly for work done, for other increments that they may have expected. Often the comments on staff pay cheques were cryptic, occasionally in what appeared to be the wrong square, and that teachers not infrequently were unaware of what they would precisely receive. When we consider the 15 500 teachers and 6 000 ancillary staff and work out the number of potentially small errors, it is understandable that over a period an amount may become as appreciable as \$400 000 or \$500 000.

When it is considered, too, that this Government inherited a new automatic data-processing system that was quite massive and centralised, that the Education Department will take considerable time to transfer all its departmental records on to that computer system, and that the Education Department gets only one day a fortnight on which it can perform essential tasks on programming, that means that problems confronting the Education Department pay-roll officers are quite substantial. This problem, too, is being addressed. It is an inherited problem, as I have said, but we are looking at it, and it will be several months still before all pay-roll records are transferred to automatic data processing.

I am not sure that one should blame the computer all the time. The staff are under pressure, and it is a new maxim that a good tool always blames the workman. In fact, I think all professional tradesmen have said that it is an inferior workman who blames the equipment. My pay-roll staff have been working overtime many hours at different times of the year to make sure payments have been made to staff on time.

Staff members are to be complimented on the efforts that they have put in. Mr. Cockburn, having selected that line from the Auditor-General's Report, and as a journalist he can justifiably select public property for public comment (there is no muzzling of the press in South Australia and there will certainly be no muzzling of that journalist, who is very outspoken, and rightly so), approached my Ministerial staff for advice. He said, "Where can I learn information relevant to this allegation by the Auditor-General?"

My Ministerial staff member did the right thing: she checked on who within the Education Department had released the earlier press report. She consulted a very senior officer within the Education Department who, in turn, advised her that the report had been compiled by two officers who, in all probability, would be the best people to

advise Mr. Cockburn. That advice was given to him, and there should be no suggestion that my Ministerial assistant entered into any private negotiations or obtained information from the Education Department that was not readily available to the public, because that just did not happen. I got that in *Hansard* by way of interjection, but I believe that a full explanation has now been lodged in *Hansard*.

Mr. Trainer: What did you think of the finished article?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He reported things as he saw them; I have explained the facts as they are. You have my comment; I have given both sides of the argument and I hope that the matter will be laid to rest, as the honourable member attempted to do, but not quite adequately, this evening. He did not have the full facts, and it is incumbent on me to defend any Ministerial officer or public servant who is maligned. I was requested to do so by the member for Baudin last night.

The honourable member also referred to a couple of questions that appear to have taken me a year to answer. Question No. 43 has remained on the Notice Paper and referred to Question No. 69, which asked when I would reply to question No. 43. Of course, Question No. 69 has been off the Notice Paper for several months, so I assumed that Question No. 43 was superfluous and was a vestigial relic of the previous Parliament and would be written off by my officers. It was neglected, and so this evening I will give more background. It would be difficult to find question No. 69 because it was on the Notice Paper last year. It stated:

What would be the cost to the State in a single year of (a) providing 10 per cent non-contact time for teachers in all primary schools?

The answer is, "\$1 900 000 per annum". A report that was recently handed to me indicated that primary school teachers throughout the State average between 7 per cent and 8 per cent non-contact time. The question continued:

(b) the cost of reducing all class sizes in primary schools to a maximum of 25 pupils?

The answer to that is as follows:

A survey of junior primary and primary schools has indicated that there are 2 389 classes with no more than 25 pupils and 2 888 classes with more than 25 pupils. On the assumption that 50 per cent of the latter can be reduced to a maximum of 25 pupils, by their being amalgamated with smaller classes, it would be necessary to employ an additional 1 400 teachers—

we work on about \$1 500 000 for each 100 teachers—
to ensure that no class exceeds 25 pupils. The cost would be \$18 760 000 per annum.

The question further asked:

(c) what would be the cost of reducing all class sizes in high schools to a maximum of 20 pupils?

We assume that all variables are constant in each case. The annual cost would be \$21 000 000. Therefore, we are looking at about \$40 000 000 additional expenditure in order to comply with those conditions. Question No. 43, which has remained unanswered on the Notice Paper for some time, can be answered now. It states:

1. Has the Minister access to a survey carried out in five or six high schools detailing their staff deployment patterns and, if so, will he now answer section (c) of question No. 69 of the last session on the assumption that the staff deployment pattern revealed therein is typical of high schools generally and, if so, what is the answer?

2. As he now has much more time in which to answer 69 (a) and (b) will he do so and what is the answer?

Those questions have now been answered. The answer to part 1 of the question is "Yes". In fact, the survey covered 12 high and area schools, and an analysis of the data

collected in those schools indicated (and I will soon provide the statistics by way of an official answer, so I will not ask that they be inserted in *Hansard*) that there were only two or three subject areas out of about 20 subject areas in which the average class sizes in secondary schools are a little over 20 pupils. I apologise for not having recognised that that question was lying around, but my defence is that I assumed that Question No. 69, being off the Notice Paper, the answer to Question No. 43 had been contained in that much earlier answer.

I refer now to a letter which was printed in a newspaper and which was written by a person with either the real name or the pseudonym of S. F. Adams. I admit that I read the article with more mirth than seriousness. The point of view was so extreme that very few people would have taken it seriously. South Australia's educational budgets are not built around such anonymous comments made in newspapers.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a perfectly proper name.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Had the honourable member been here last night and heard the possible—

Mr. Millhouse: I did hear it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If one heard the variations, one would have to admit that there are possibilities. The member for Baudin commented on that in some depth.

Mr. Trainer: Why do you think the *News* changed the initials between editions?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I noticed that. I thought the second edition was probably a misprint, that the first edition was correct, and the letter had been written tongue-in-cheek.

Mr. Trainer: What if it was the other way around?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That was my assumption. I treated the letter with more levity than a lot of other people did. Certainly, some members of the Education Department took it as a gratuitous insult and tried to find out where Mr. Adams lived.

Mr. Peterson: He doesn't live in Semaphore.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister does not need assistance with his address.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I refer to another serious matter—the issue of teacher's rentals. The member for Baudin said that I had been surprisingly quiet or inactive over the past several months in regard to Teacher Housing Authority rentals, particularly in view of the fact that the Government had committed itself at the last election to reducing these rentals. He said that we would have to do much better if we were to convince the teaching fraternity that there had been a reduction in rents. I know that the former Minister is brighter than his comments last night would lead us to believe.

One would assume that he was in the slow learners class in mathematics if he did not realise the following facts: other people's rents were put up in March this year, and there is firm indication by the South Australian Housing Trust that a flow-on will be transmitted to the Teacher Housing Authority and to all other housing authority houses of a rental increase in September. If such increases are applied to all other citizens in South Australia and the Government decides not simply to defer but to defer permanently, that is, to absorb within Government finances, the cost of those increases, and one realises that that cost is about \$400 000 to the Government, that surely is a reduction in the cost of Teacher Housing Authority rentals. If everyone else is paying more and if rentals are pegged, the increases are absorbed by someone else. If that is not a reduction, I must be convinced about what is.

I am quite sure that the member for Baudin must surely have realised that the Government had effectively reduced

Teacher Housing Authority rentals for the present year and that this reduction, by being absorbed, was a permanent reduction. Not only that but also the percentages worked out by the Teacher Housing Authority—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You reduced them by not increasing them—is that what you are saying?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Surely. This is quite an intriguing argument because, if my argument is incorrect, one can only assume that the argument currently being put forward by every trade union in Australia at a time when a Federal election is imminent is equally incorrect and specious. Everyone is arguing that, because their wages have not been increased as much as the cost of living has been increased, they have achieved an effective reduction in spending power. The same argument is applied to the Teacher Housing Authority rentals and surely is just as valid. One spends less in rent and therefore has more money to spend in real terms. If honourable members cannot see that, they will have a lot of trouble understanding the Budget.

Several criticisms were addressed towards the Budget, but I cannot reply to those. That will be part and parcel of tomorrow's business of the House, and I do not intend to breach confidence at this stage, despite the fact that there were some alleged further Budget leaks put out by the member for Baudin last night that coincided fairly precisely with the information released to the *News* last night or this morning. I believe that tomorrow, when honourable members see the Budget, they will realise that, although there have been several leaks, little truth has been contained in them.

Mr. Trainer: If it is not factual, it is not a leak.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They are alleged leaks—furfies, as we used to call them (I do not know what members opposite call them). In any case, it will be seen that the Government is not downgrading education, as was alleged last night.

Several other issues of a relatively minor nature were raised by the member for Baudin. I think we have other business coming before the House this evening, and I do not wish to detain members any further. In relation to the question of teaching experience, I repeat that I did spend about 16 years as a registered, qualified and accepted teacher within the South Australian Education Department. I was in fact a senior master within the high school staffs of the Education Department when I was rather peremptorily called into this place when the House was dissolved from the steps of Parliament House in Canberra by the former Opposition Leader in this place in 1975. I was enjoying teaching and was on the senior staff—

Mr. Trainer: Are you saying that the Opposition Leader in 1975 called an election?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No. The former Premier was on the steps of Parliament House in Canberra when he called an election. Within two weeks I was in this place, but previously I was on the senior staff of a South Australian high school. There seems to be some doubt in another place as to whether or not I was. I will enlarge on that at some length in the reply that I will give in that place. That is to allay any fears that the members in this House may have.

Mr. Trainer: Did you always know what your salary was?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I did not question my pay then any more than I do now. I always used to accept my pay and did not quibble. I do not know whether I was overpaid or underpaid, and it was something that I left to the Auditor-General to find out. Had it been found that I was substantially overpaid, as an honest citizen I would have

expected to be mulcted one way or the other for arrears, just as had I been underpaid I would have expected to be paid by the department. Fair play is fair play. That is an aspect that I might have entered into at some length.

Mr. Trainer: Don't you think that the general thrust of Cockburn's article showed a lack of charity towards the teaching profession.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I cannot remember what he said, as I have not spent much time analysing any reports made on any matters in the newspapers recently. Ministerial duties command 150 per cent of my time. So, I will not go into an analysis of a report that I have not read in great detail. That probably assesses the importance that I attach to it. I am a reasonably fair-minded fellow. I will conclude my remarks so that the business of the House can proceed.

Motion carried.

THE BANK OF ADELAIDE (MERGER) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 August. Page 616.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill facilitates the merger between two banks. It is described as a merger but one could rather see it as a takeover, a takeover which was imposed, in a sense, on the Bank of Adelaide partly arising from the financial problems of that bank's subsidiary finance company and partly, we would contend, through the last minute inability of the State Government to provide the right guarantees and support in order to ensure that the bank survive. It is certainly an odd situation for the Labor Party to find itself in a position of supporting the Bank of Adelaide and lamenting its demise. It is odd because I do not think that the bank or its directors or its policies have in any way been sympathetic or supportive of the Labor Party and what it stood for in the long period of that bank's history as a major institution in South Australia. The close similarity between the bank's directors and members in another place closely connected with the Liberal Party and the Adelaide Club is one that has been remarked upon and historically written about on many other occasions.

Nonetheless, we do lament the demise of the Bank of Adelaide because it really marks the continuance of a trend that has accelerated in the past 12 months since this Government, with its philosophy of getting out of the way of business, has come to office in this State. The mishandling of the Bank of Adelaide issue was, I believe, the first example to the South Australian public of the Premier's tendency to make grandiose statements of intention and then fail to back them up with some positive concrete action. It has always been our contention (a contention that has been ably borne out in other proceedings in this House by the member for Hartley, who was the Premier at the time that the bank's problems commenced) that the bank could have been saved for South Australia.

We consider that the bank's existence as a separate entity could have been preserved; that it would not have joined those companies which, under this policy of getting out of the way of business, seemed to be moving inexorably eastwards so that, in fact, the Adelaide business establishment would have at its disposal, in addition to the State banks, a private bank with its headquarters in South Australia and with a financial base here. Unfortunately, it has been lost, and this Bill, so far as the Parliament is concerned, is the last rites for the Bank of Adelaide. All that remains is to amalgamate these

business undertakings, and this Bill seeks to facilitate that.

So far from the sort of Bill that I would have hoped we would have been presented with by the previous Government, we are, in fact, being presented with a Bill that demonstrates this Government's failure to do anything. This is to be the principal Act, which will be supported by supplementary legislation for other Australian States. By this process, the South Australian Government will not lose financially in the sense that stamp duties would be avoided on individual transfers. A lump sum is to be paid. We understand that that, based on figures as at 30 January 1980, will amount to approximately \$816 000.

Let me briefly recount this sorry saga of the final dissolution of South Australia's only private trading bank, the only bank, indeed, outside of the two financial capitals of Sydney and Melbourne. The Government, when in Opposition, made its attitude quite clear and, in fact, made a large number of promises which were typical of the many extravagant promises made to the business community and now sadly found to be absolutely worthless—as worthless as the Government's promises in some other areas, such as education.

The present Deputy Premier, as Acting Leader of the Opposition, stated on 11 July 1979 that the best option in terms of the problems of the Bank of Adelaide would be one which retained that bank as a South Australian identity with its head office in South Australia, with maximum benefits for local shareholders and promotion opportunities and security for bank staff. We certainly did not quarrel with that at the time, nor do we now. The Deputy Premier went on to say, "I am not saying that there is anything wrong with the A.N.Z. offer, except that some of these advantages will not be available." That was the beginning of a series of statements that got more and more firm so far as the then Opposition's attitude to the Bank of Adelaide and the role that the South Australian Government could play in preserving it was concerned. Of course, in the period from that initial statement from the then Acting Leader, an election had been called, and as the election campaign advanced the then Leader of the Opposition made a large number of statements. I will just cite one of his statements, as follows:

A Liberal Government—

he said that on September 14, the day before the election—

would support the retention of the Bank of Adelaide as the only Trading Bank with its headquarters in South Australia. He said that the South Australian Liberal Party had kept close to the problem and had been fully briefed on the available options before making submissions to both the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, and the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Howard. Immediately after his election (in fact, the Premier's Party had been elected but he had not been sworn in as Premier), Mr. Tonkin was reported as follows:

"We would be prepared to have talks with any groups on counter proposals relating to a Bank of Adelaide." Mr. Tonkin was reaffirming his previously stated policy that a Liberal Government would do everything possible to support the continued independent existence of the bank. Mr. Tonkin said the Liberal Party had a firm belief South Australia should retain a trading bank with its headquarters here. This would be in the best interests of the State, business, and the bank's staff. The Liberal Party was not averse in any way to overseas interests participating in investment in the bank, he said. Last Friday, Mr. Tonkin pointed out the bank's future rested with its shareholders and he was confident they would recognise its value to the State. He said the South Australian Liberal Party had kept close to the problem and he had been fully briefed on the available

options before making submissions to both the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, and the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Howard.

That statement is well worth noting. A phrase from that statement is worth even more note, because some time later (in fact, only a few days later), as the Premier began to cool off from the hard decisions necessary to provide support for one of the other options, he resorted to an excuse that it was only since becoming Premier that he was really able fully to understand the position and the difficulties with these options. He conveniently forgot that, both before the election and immediately after, he had constantly stressed to the public of South Australia that he was fully briefed and that he was not just expressing a pious hope or some form of intent that might or might not be fulfilled.

The Premier was expressing a firmly stated policy that something could be done, based on the full briefing which he had had. He said that he knew the position, knew the value of the various options, and that he would be taking action. So there was some, I think, considerable feeling among members of the business community that action would be taken by the new Government in support of the Bank of Adelaide. Certainly, they were happy about what had been done to that date by Premier Corcoran and his Government. Among other things, Premier Corcoran had had meetings with a number of top level businessmen who were formulating a plan to save the bank. He commissioned a special report from an accountant, a report which he never saw and, indeed, which nobody has ever seen except Government members, because the Government has constantly refused to release that report. There are obviously clear recommendations and financial workings in that report which would make it very embarrassing, indeed, for the Government if that report was made public, because, despite an initial suggestion that he might be releasing that report, the Premier has constantly refused to do so and, indeed, his colleague in another place has also refused to do so on a number of occasions. That is just one aspect of this situation.

On reaching office, the Premier reaffirmed his view that he would be able to take action to save the bank. Within eight days he had changed his mind—he had gone from a position where he said a Liberal Government would do everything possible to support the bank as a separate identity to a position where he was happy to see the bank submerged into the A.N.Z. group. At the time he announced his about-face, a number of South Australian businessmen, who were absolutely dismayed by the way in which the Government they thought would be acting constantly on their behalf (and who believed some of the rhetoric, no doubt, that the Premier had spouted before the election that his was the Government that would be supportive of the private sector and private business in South Australia), now coming face to face with the reality of the situation, publicly attacked the Premier saying that they could not understand his attitude, or sudden change of mind. I think, too, that they were having problems in gaining access to the Premier to speak directly with him. Mr. Meyer Solomon was one of those who pointed out that, while the Premier had called on industry and union leaders to find ways of boosting employment in South Australia, he had placed 1 400 jobs in the Bank of Adelaide and the F.C.A. group in jeopardy. Mr. John Scammell said on the same day:

If the South Australian Government is not prepared to do everything to help the bank, it is a sad and sorry day for the State and for all South Australians.

So there was a change of mind, a change of heart, by the Premier. In the face of these attacks by the business men,

the Premier seemed to shift his ground again. He said that, if someone had a definite proposal to save the bank (and I stress "if someone had a definite proposal to save the bank"), he wanted to hear about it, because he was anxious to do everything he could to help retain the bank's separate identity. We have heard that sort of fatuous statement from the Premier on many occasions and about many issues since. He is very anxious to do something: if somebody comes up with an idea, he would be happy to receive it; he is waiting for submissions.

This is typical of the attitude of a Government that is not prepared to do anything. What was needed was not for the Premier to sit and wait for propositions but for him actively to pursue and develop those proposals which were already being formulated, which had been put before the former Government, and which were being investigated by Mr. Allert, the accountant, on commission from the former Government. But, no, the Premier was going to sit back and wait to hear whether someone, undefined, had a definite proposal to save the bank. On 27 September, the Premier is quoted as saying:

I have had lengthy and involved discussions regarding the Bank of Adelaide and more are planned. As I said on Tuesday, I intend thoroughly examining any other proposals if they are put to the State Government. The sentiments that I expressed before the election still remain.

One should note that, although they were policies before the election, they had then become sentiments. Before the election, they were policies and statements of intent, firm and definite, but they became sentiments in the intervening period from the Premier's election to his examination of the problem. So, various plans were indeed formulated, and much publicity was given to them.

A group of Adelaide business men, including Mr. Allan Scott, Mr. Solomon, and Mr. Robert Holmes a'Court, the Western Australian magnate, and others, were involved. Indeed, the Premier went to Canberra to see Prime Minister Fraser, following up the approach that he had made earlier, saying that overseas financial groups should have the same opportunities as Australian banks to gain control of the Bank of Adelaide, and he hoped that the Commonwealth Government would open the door to participation by a foreign bank. He was sent packing there.

However, the fact remains that there were within Australia people who were capable of raising capital not overseas but here in order to support the bank, provided they could get some assistance and some clear indication of support by way of guarantee from the Government. On 11 October 1979, the Premier made a Ministerial statement, which he said was to clear the air before the shareholders' meeting on the following Monday, 15 October, to consider the ANZ offer. The Premier ostentatiously outlined various options but, if one reads that statement, one sees that the Premier made quite clear that he believed that the ANZ option was the only viable one open to the bank's shareholders. If I was an ordinary shareholder, however committed I was to the continuance of the bank and however unhappy I was about the trend of affairs, and I had read that statement by the Premier, I would be in no doubt whatsoever that the Government had abandoned the bank, that it was paying lip service to other options that involved some concrete proposition of guarantee from the Government, and that it was really doing no more than that. The only option that one could have if one's money was to be safe and one was to get any kind of financial benefit would be to support the ANZ option, which was, in effect, being held at the head of the bank like a gun.

In this place on 17 October, after the ill-fated meeting

that had met with this weak statement from the Premier, the Opposition questioned the Premier at length about the implications of the take-over and the attitude that he had taken. I will look briefly at some of those questions. The Premier was asked why he had rejected the proposal by a group of leading South Australian business men, including Mr. Uhrig, Mr. Kean, and Mr. Hayes, all substantial men in business with proven records of success in finance and business affairs, for the retention of a separate identity for the Bank of Adelaide.

The Premier simply dismissed those proposals. He tried to suggest that he was previously putting the options before people, and that it was a decision to be taken by the shareholders. The Premier could not resist a cheap crack about the Opposition's wanting to intrude into the business of public companies and into matters that are properly the province of shareholders, and indicated that he would not be a part of that. I say that that was a cheap crack because we will enter into areas in which we believe that the interests of the South Australian community should be protected. However, this will not be an intrusion: we will be acting on behalf of the public, in the public interest. We have had a classic example of that today. Can one imagine the uproar and outrage that would come from the Premier if he was Leader of the Opposition and we had tried to introduce legislation to protect the South Australian Gas Company along the lines of the Bill that was introduced today? That legislation is proper and important, and the Opposition supports it. However, the Government was indeed tardy in introducing it.

The Opposition believes that this is typical of the sort of intrusion that is often needed by the State and the Parliament on behalf of the South Australian community. This was another example, and it was not very fitting for the Premier to suggest that this was a matter that could be dismissed with a cheap attack along those lines.

The Premier was then asked whether he would release Mr. Allert's report so that we could properly judge what his assessments of the options were. Again, the Premier dismissed the request, and would not make the document available. He criticised the Opposition for trying to politicise the issue. Indeed, the Premier took time off to cast a few insults, but his basic statement was that the report was prepared for the Government's guidance and would not be released publicly.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. BANNON: The next question asked about F.C.A. and corporate affairs investigations into breaches of the trust deed would, the Premier said, be examined and the report would come up. However, we have not heard much more about that. So, the questions went on: what had been done; what was the Government's intention; and why had it apparently neglected to take action for the benefit of the people of South Australia. In all his answers, the Premier sought to avoid the fundamental question of precisely what the Government had prepared to do and to guarantee.

For the shareholders, the problem was that at no time, however much the Premier talked of options and alternatives, did he lay down specifically and precisely what his Government's involvement would be and what the financial implications thereof would be. At no time did the Premier try to present any of those options as at all attractive or feasible to the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide, because the Premier had decided, having come

to office, that he was not prepared to do much more than pay lip service to the survival of that bank. As I said earlier, it was the first hard lesson that the business community learnt about the falseness of the Premier's rhetoric.

I do not wish to go further into the questions that were asked of the Premier on 17 October. However, I suggest that, when the history of this sorry business is written, those questions and the totally unsatisfactory answers that were given will throw a lot of light on the way in which the Government behaved over this issue.

My colleague the member for Hartley, faced with the challenge of the Premier as to what we would do, had made quite clear the sort of action he was taking. He has outlined (it is on the record, both in the press and the journals of this House) the situation in which he found himself and the prompt action that he took at all times, including supportive action to try to assist the Directors of the Bank of Adelaide and ensure that the Finance Corporation did not collapse, bringing with it financial ruin not only to many South Australians but to others interstate. He was at all times standing ready to discuss and actively promote alternative propositions, and indeed it had reached the stage where some viable propositions were being put together.

As I say, it was something of a shock, I imagine, to my colleague that when the new Government came in, a Government which had been so up front in talk of preserving the Bank of Adelaide, it hardly looked at those options. It certainly did not come to the fore and present them in a way that would make them appear attractive or viable to the shareholders who had to make their decision.

This Bill concerns the shareholders less perhaps than the depositors, because it is a way of ensuring that all the deposits simply move into the merged or amalgamated banks. Of course, that group of people, the depositors, most of them in South Australia, and many of them with family traditions of banking with the Bank of Adelaide and with considerable emotional as well as financial commitment to that institution, have been sadly let down.

It is just as well that a Bill of this sort is being passed by the House because, if each and every depositor had to be approached and asked specifically whether or not he or she wishes their deposits to be transferred to the new merged bank, I would imagine that many of them, committed as they are to South Australia and South Australian institutions, would not be looking very favourably at the ANZ Bank in its amalgamated form but may indeed be taking their business elsewhere, perhaps to the two State Banks, the last banks that have any South Australian headquarters and State-controlled input in them.

However, that choice is not going to be presented to them in those stark terms, and no doubt many of them regretting the demise of the bank will continue banking with its successor, the newly-enlarged ANZ Bank. It is odd for the Labor Party in this State to be expressing regret, but we are expressing regret, because we believe that the loss of this bank, its headquarters activity and its financial base in this State, will be grievously felt over the next few years, if we are attempting to advance industrial development and if, as the Premier said, we are to be open for business, when we find that increasingly the business decisions that affect South Australians are being made elsewhere. The loss of this bank has left a large financial institution gap that will be difficult to fill just at a time when it was becoming increasingly important. It is interesting that in the aftermath of all this business there has been some turn-around of the fortunes of not only F.C.A. but also the Bank of Adelaide itself in its separate

entity until these final amalgamations and mergers take place. It is remarkable in this day and age, even in the current economic climate, that a bank can be put in jeopardy, but it has happened, and I think that when the history is written we will see that it happened because a new Government came into power which one would have thought would offer a continuance of the policy of maintaining and preserving that bank but which, in fact, when it came to taking action, was found to be wanting. It is a great pity for South Australia and South Australians.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not want to speak long in the debate but, having listened to the unfortunate speech of the Leader of the Opposition, there are one or two matters of fact that should be corrected. I can excuse him, because he obviously does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Bannon: Get on with some facts.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I did not interrupt the Leader, and I would like him to listen to me now.

Mr. Bannon: I didn't patronise you.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not patronising you: I am trying to make excuses for you, which is more than members of your own Party are doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I make excuses for the Leader because he obviously does not know the facts.

Mr. Bannon: We can do without them, thanks. Just state—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I realise that you can do without the facts, because you have been well away from them for most of the speech. It is rather disgusting that the Leader should use an occasion such as this, which is of concern to everyone in South Australia, for playing sheer blatant politics. He does not know what he is talking about; in fact, he has been talking a whole lot of rot and rubbish, and I am going to put him right. The point is that I am making excuses for him, because he does not know the facts. If he knew the facts, he would not be committing himself to such a load of garbage.

Mr. McRae: Where was he wrong? Tell us that, for heaven's sake.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have indicated to the House that the Premier has the call.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The eminent Perry Mason of the House can rave and rant all he likes, but I am going to go my own way and tell him what I am going to tell him. There were, it is true, various proposals to save the bank. They were all based on a calculation which involved the asset value of F.C.A. That asset value was variously costed. It came into the calculations of a number of consortia and groups. When the proposals were examined we found—and I must pay a great tribute to the Treasury officers who spent such a long time and many, many hours investigating this whole matter—

Mr. Bannon: For nothing.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —that none of these proposals was viable. I do not agree with the Leader when he says that the Treasury officers spent their time for nothing. They laboured not in vain, because there was a real prospect that the Bank of Adelaide could have gone to the wall; it could have gone into liquidation, when the depositors' funds would have had to depend on the backing of the Reserve Bank as a lender of last resort. At least we were saved the prospect of a run on the bank. If the Leader thinks that that is not worth while then I have even less respect for him than I had before.

We found that none of the propositions that were put forward were viable: none could stand up to close

examination. Indeed, there was a great misconception in the community that the asset backing of F.C.A. and its capital value was far higher than the true situation proved to be. The proposals involved either overseas capital coming in or a Government guarantee of various amounts with local funds.

No-one is in any way doubting the sentiments and good intentions of the Adelaide businessmen of various groupings who sincerely wished to save the Bank of Adelaide. Indeed, I think we all had a strong desire to do what we could to preserve the integrity and individuality of the bank. There is a strong feeling in South Australia that it is a local bank and a bank of great tradition. But the point was that there was no way that we could find whereby that aim could be achieved. I certainly did go to Melbourne (not to Canberra, but to Melbourne) and I spoke to the Prime Minister, because some of the proposals involved the injection of overseas capital. Honourable members will know that until the results of the Campbell inquiry are known there will be no decision on allowing overseas capital into the Australian banking system.

It was a matter which the Prime Minister considered very deeply, and I had discussions both with him and with the Federal Treasurer. It was decided that it was not possible to make an exception in this particular case until the committee had come down with its findings. It seemed quite clear and obvious to Treasury officials, to me and indeed to everyone who knew the full facts, that the ANZ Bank option was indeed the only option. In the breakdown of it, we are particularly fortunate that the ANZ Bank took the steps it did and made the offer that it did.

One of the strongest proponents for maintaining the integrity of the Bank of Adelaide was Mr. Allan Scott, of Mount Gambier, who would be well known to most members. He decided to challenge the merger in court, as members would know. He was most concerned to ensure that the Bank of Adelaide was preserved, but after very long and intensive discussions, even Mr. Scott found that, for all his enthusiasm and concern for the Bank of Adelaide, he was not able to continue with his efforts to save the bank.

Without going into any great detail now, because what is done is done, the whole point is that the F.C.A. situation was far worse than anyone had dreamt. People had great expectations of what might be achieved from realising and continuing to trade in F.C.A. It was thought that that would be the one factor that would be the backbone of the whole operation that might bolster up the bank's operations. However, the Government found that the expectations that everyone had were totally misplaced. Indeed, the value placed on the shares through the offer made by the ANZ Bank was in fact almost generous, although there was a lot of criticism of that figure in the time before. Based on asset value, it was almost a generous offer.

I am aware that the previous Premier felt as strongly as I did that something should be done and I know that he offered to guarantee certain sums. This Government also made it quite clear in this House that it would guarantee certain limits. Unfortunately, when it came to the assessment of how much would be required, that sum was totally beyond the resources of any Government to guarantee—even a socialist Government which would not in any way be averse to State ownership of yet another bank. There was no way that my Government could do that. Following advice given to me, I found that I could in no way recommend to Cabinet with any honesty and with any regard for taxpayers' funds any guarantee of sufficient

size to guarantee the outstanding debt.

The point that convinced the Government and the parties to the action before the court at that time was that F.C.A. would not be able to continue operating for longer than a matter of days if the ANZ Bank offer was not accepted. That was the advice given to the Government. That advice was checked, and that was found to be in fact the situation. So, no matter what happened, if a guarantee had been given it would have undoubtedly been called on in a large quantity, and the taxpayers of South Australia would have been asked to support a debt of up to \$40 000 000. That is just not on.

No responsible Government with a Budget the size of ours could possibly undertake such a guarantee in view of the facts presented. I repeat that the parties to the action were also convinced of the fact that nothing could be done and that the situation was beyond redemption. There has been a turnaround in fortunes—I agree with the Leader. Fortunately, F.C.A. and the Bank of Adelaide have perhaps turned the corner and are certainly looking much better than they were. The fact is that the ANZ takeover (the merger) has restored the necessary capital backing. The Bank of Adelaide has met the debts that were incurred by the consortium of banks that guaranteed the original situation. The necessary capital backing has been restored for its operation, and it has restored confidence because of that.

The only solution to this very sad episode, an episode which is not an occasion for politicking, was indeed the merger we are now considering. I very much regret the demise of the Bank of Adelaide. I do not believe there is a member in this Chamber or a person in South Australia who would not share in that regret. However, inevitably, facts are facts, and we must face them squarely. That is the situation that applied, and that was the decision that was taken. The best thing of all is that out of it all the shareholders have been protected and, more particularly, the depositors' funds have been entirely safeguarded throughout the entire unhappy affair. The only possible course of action that could have been taken by anyone has been taken. I am very pleased indeed that the matter has come out as well as it has, considering all the circumstances.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting this Bill I do so as a former employee of the Bank of Adelaide. It is a sad day as we now witness the passing of the Bank of Adelaide, bearing in mind that it was established in this State in 1865 and that it served the State very well indeed. The Bank of Adelaide pioneered many parts of South Australia, particularly the Murray River area and Eyre Peninsula. One can look back at the conditions that the former staff had to work under in those pioneering days, when the branches were situated in dug-outs, and the conditions that were endured by those officers in building up what became and was known as a great South Australian institution. Many South Australian companies that have now disappeared benefited from the financial assistance provided by the Bank of Adelaide at quite advantageous rates of interest and on many occasions with no security at all; such was the confidence of that bank in the State and the people who operated that organisation.

There is no doubt that the Bank of Adelaide was used to develop and pioneer South Australia. I am very sad to see that the final nail is now being placed in the coffin through this type of legislation, which we came to accept in the past when the E. S. & A. Bank merged with the ANZ Bank. I recall early in my career when the Australian and New Zealand Bank came into being through the merger of the Union Bank of Australasia and the Bank of Australasia. It

always seems to me that the weak has taken over the strong and, of course, the ANZ Bank is now one of the largest banks in this country.

I was very despondent to think that any effort that was made could not save the Bank of Adelaide as a purely South Australian institution. I still believe that we owe a debt of gratitude to the many fine general managers and members of the board who served in the best interest for a retention of this bank. It is a wellknown fact in financial circles that Melbourne and Sydney consider that they are the headquarters of economics in this country. However, I still believe that South Australia had the right to have its own free enterprise independent bank. This legislation simplifies the merger in relation to the stamp duty agreement and the provision in relation to the pension fund. I spent many years trying to sort out what I thought was an ultimate agreement of the Bank of Adelaide provident fund for former employees of the bank.

The bank was never obliged to do more than any other employer did, and that was to make provision for a provident fund. The bank, through the generosity of the board, provided pin grants for those who retired and who, through their early contributions, were not able to receive a sufficient pension to survive without having to rely on the age or social security benefits. The bank made those grants available to its former employees so that they would not be on the breadline for the rest of their lives. I hope the ANZ will continue with that generous arrangement. There is no guarantee in the legislation that it will, but I think the Australian and New Zealand Bank has done extremely well out of this takeover, and I hope that it will carry on the traditions established by the Bank of Adelaide.

From my own personal experience, I have grave doubts at this stage, but I hope the management of the ANZ Bank will convince me that it will consider the people of South Australia and the business connections built up over many years. I worked hard for the Bank of Adelaide for 20 years, and had great delight in the early days in taking accounts from the ANZ Bank, but now I have to see my friends forced to go back to the bank from which I induced them to transfer. It is important to South Australia that we have a banking system that will continue to support the rural industry. That has been extremely important in the past, in helping that development, and I hope that the ANZ Bank will guarantee that in future.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I, like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reluctantly support this measure. I support everything said by the Leader of the Opposition, and I condemn the first part of the Premier's reply. The Premier's speech, as honourable members will have noticed, was divided into two sections. The first part was fatuous and patronising and quite insulting, not just to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Opposition in this House and the whole Parliament, but to the people of South Australia. The second part of the speech was far more responsible and the Premier did address himself to the real issue, as did the Leader of the Opposition.

Everything the Leader of the Opposition said in recounting the history of this matter is totally relevant to this Bill, because it is a sad last winding up. Every day now we see in this State the evaporation of State-owned organisations which are being taken over by interstate or overseas organisations. It is extremely worrying. In the case of the Bank of Adelaide I am sure that a number of remedies were open to save it, had the Federal Government been so minded, but, as the member for Hanson indicated, Sydney and Melbourne regard themselves as the banking and commercial headquarters

of this nation, and I consider that to be one of the reasons why the Federal Government was not prepared to step in and come to the aid of the bank. I, like the member for Hanson, and unlike the Premier, believe that the ANZ Bank got a very good deal, a very favourable deal out of all this. I have seen some of the F.C.A. land near Glen Waverley, in Victoria, and I would be amazed if, over the long term, that land did not return a considerable profit.

I am speaking only briefly, and the points I am making are these: I reluctantly support the Bill; I condemn the Premier for the first part of his speech, which I thought was quite fatuous and insulting to the House, and in particular to the Leader of the Opposition; and I condemn the Federal Government for its inactivity in the matter. I think the Campbell Report has nothing to do with the case. This was an urgent matter, and this valuable State institution could have been saved without the main aims of the Campbell Report being destroyed.

Finally, there is one question I want to pose to whoever is going to reply on behalf of the Government, whether it be the Minister of Education or the Premier, and that is in relation to the safeguards of the employees of the Bank of Adelaide. You will know, Sir, that in many country towns in South Australia there exist side by side a Bank of Adelaide, as we knew it, as an independent organisation, and an ANZ Bank. It is straining anyone's credulity to suggest that that could go on in the new merged sense. Obviously, as it was before, there was in each case a manager, an accountant, secretaries, tellers and the various other people who made up the staff of the bank. I know that you, Sir, as a person who represents more than half of the State, will be particularly concerned by this aspect of the matter. I want an assurance, not from the ANZ Bank, because I have heard too many assurances from trading organisations in the past that have not been honoured. I want assurances from the Government that there have been careful negotiations that will ensure that continuity—

Mr. Whitten: Why would they be honoured?

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member who interjects is not in his seat, so I cannot comment on what he said. What I want—and I will develop it when we come to clause 10—are definite assurances that, in return for what is now being legislated and for the very favourable deal that the ANZ Bank has got (make no mistake about that), we are not going to see a loss of South Australian jobs. I want to know what precise preparation has been done. I do not know whether the Minister of Education is to reply. It seems that he is. I should like to know precisely what discussions have gone on between his Government and the ANZ Bank which will ensure continuity of employment of employees of each of the banks in situations in particular where they are in direct competition in branches at the moment.

I want to know what the Department of Labour and Industry has done about the matter. What precise agreements have been entered into? What arrangements have been made between the Government and the Australian Bank Officials Association? I want direct answers to those questions. Unless we have direct and clear answers, I do not think the Committee will be very satisfied. I do not want to buy into an argument on the function of the Committee and the second reading process. I shall leave it at that. I most reluctantly, in line with the member for Hanson, support the second reading, but certainly in Committee, in particular in relation to clause 10, I will want to know a lot more.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I have listened with some concern to comments which were

probably the result of some misunderstanding and which alleged that there was some considerable acrimony in what passed between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier.

Mr. O'Neill: Are you an expert on banking as well as on education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member is awake again.

Mr. O'Neill: I am more widely awake than you are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The fact is that I think there has been a little testiness, because members on both sides are expressing some regret that neither Party was able to come up with what would have been the ideal solution, namely, the perpetuation of trading by the Bank of Adelaide in South Australia. Perhaps the historical events that have been related by the Leader of the Opposition did neglect reference to some 4½ months before the election on 15 September last year.

In fact, the former Government was negotiating for some 4½ months. It was approached in April last year by representatives of the bank for assistance and advice, and during that period of 4½ months, apart from professing to wish to support the Bank of Adelaide in its bid for survival and calling for, as I recall a report that became available at a time very close to the date of the election, no workable concrete help was offered.

This Government had one month from the date of the election (the previous Government had had 4½ months to the date of the election) to the date when the shareholders decided as to the future of the Bank of Adelaide. Both Governments were trying their hardest to find a solution which was not only workable but which also could be afforded by the Government of South Australia and would be acceptable to the Federal Treasurer.

I am sure that it was with some reluctance that the former Premier, in his negotiations, was unable to come forward, before, during or after the election, with a concrete workable solution, and it was with reluctance that our present Premier was unable to come forward with a scheme of arrangement whereby the bank could be preserved as a South Australian identity. Both Parties know what we would have liked to achieve. In the debate tonight on the legislation, in the passing of the Bill in the other place, and in the Select Committee on this legislation, we have come to grips with reality. The previous Government commissioned a report that became available at about the time of the election, but since then neither the Government nor the Opposition has been able to come up with anything more positive to assist the bank to survive as a South Australian identity. The present Premier examined the situation extensively with interstate and South Australian business men. He was in consultation frequently with the Federal Treasurer, and in a Ministerial statement on 11 October last year, the first day of the sitting of the new Parliament, the Premier came to public grips with the situation, when he said:

One other thing is quite certain; there is no point in the shareholders of the bank choosing to vote against the merger with the ANZ unless an alternative fall-back arrangement is available. By an alternative fall-back arrangement I mean an arrangement which has been thought through in detail and which is administratively workable.

Most of the schemes which have been suggested require Commonwealth Government approval either in relation to foreign ownership of the bank (which the Commonwealth will not contemplate) or in relation to foreign ownership of F.C.A. The Commonwealth's foreign investment guidelines are very much more stringent with regard to foreign

investment in financial institutions, including finance companies, than for manufacturing or primary industry. As I see it, three possible courses of action are open to the bank, should the shareholders choose to reject the ANZ scheme on Monday. Members will realise as I explain these courses of action that they are not alternatives to the ANZ scheme. However, it is a reasonable and responsible approach for interested parties to take to consider what could be done should the ANZ offer not be accepted.

The Premier made clear that, because the creditors were required to vote on the scheme of arrangement so soon after we came into office, the responsibility for determining whether or not the ANZ scheme should be accepted was a matter for the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide, and that, if the shareholders decided that the ANZ scheme should not be accepted, there was a fall-back proposal that involved Government guarantees. But the Government was not prepared to step in and purchase the

Bank of Adelaide or take such drastic action in the face of the responsibility that the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide were being asked to exercise. In fact, I think that the Leader of the Opposition would recognise, as we do, that the sheer vastness of expenditure that would have been involved for the State Government precluded any positive action by the State in acquiring either of those two institutions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 28 August at 2 p.m.