

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 October 1980

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Company Take-overs,
Gas Act Amendment,
Pipelines Authority Act Amendment,
South Australian Gas Company's Act Amendment.

DEATH OF SIR EDRIC BASTYAN

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: By leave, I move:

That this House expresses its profound regret at the recent death of Lieutenant General Sir Edric Montague Bastyan, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.B.E., C.B., K.St.J., Former Governor of South Australia; offers its deepest sympathy to Lady Bastyan and family in their sad bereavement, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished service to this State; and, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Lieutenant General Sir Edric Bastyan was a most distinguished servant of South Australia. Before his appointment to the Viceregal office in 1961, Sir Edric had a distinguished career in the British Army, serving as Chief Administrative Officer of the Eighth Army in 1943, Major General in charge of Administration of Allied Land Forces in South East Asia, 1944-45, Chief of Staff Eastern Command, 1949-50, and Commander of British Forces in Hong Kong from 1957 until his retirement in 1960.

During his military career Sir Edric was honoured by Her Majesty with the awards of O.B.E. in 1942, C.B.E. in 1943, C.B. in 1944, and K.B.E. in 1957. Sir Edric was appointed Governor of South Australia in 1961, and in that capacity he won the confidence of all South Australians to the degree that he was invited to serve a second term as South Australian Governor until 1968. From then until 1974, Sir Edric also served as Governor of Tasmania. In 1962, Sir Edric received the honour of K.C.M.G., and in 1963 the knighthood of K.C.V.O., which is awarded personally by the Sovereign. Sir Edric's love of South Australia was no better signified than by his choice to spend his retirement from 1974 living in this community.

One legacy of that era is the fine collection of drawings and paintings of South Australian scenery which Sir Edric prepared in these final years. He became a familiar and well-respected figure, particularly in the village atmosphere of North Adelaide. He will be remembered with affection by all his friends in South Australia. I am sure every member joins me in extending to Lady Bastyan and to Mr. David Bastyan the condolences of all South Australians.

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide)**: I second the motion, and on behalf of the Opposition I join the Premier in speaking with some feeling about Sir Edric, the last in a long line of senior British servicemen to represent the Crown in South Australia. After Sir Edric moved on to become an equally distinguished Governor in Tasmania, this State then turned to Australian-born Viceregal representatives. I trust that we will continue that policy. A

preference for Governors who come from our soil is no reflection on the faultless performance of Sir Edric. As a soldier, his career was distinguished. He rendered valuable service in the Second World War in Africa, Italy and South-East Asia. Our sympathies go to Lady Bastyan and Sir Edric's son, David. They have every reason to feel proud of his life's work, not the least of which was devoted to the service of the Crown in South Australia for seven years.

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley)**: Briefly, I would like to add to the comments already made by the Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It would be true to say that the member for Mitcham and I would be the only two members in this House currently who had the honour and distinction of serving on Executive Council with the late Sir Edric Bastyan. He was a delightful personality, a very easy person to talk to, a person who took a very great and keen interest in every aspect of life in South Australia and he was one, I am certain, who will be remembered fondly by the people of South Australia as a very good Governor. I would like to add to those condolences already expressed to Lady Bastyan, and I hope she will be spared good health to live with us for a long time to come.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)**: The member for Hartley is quite correct. He and I, I think, are the last two surviving Ministers from the time of Sir Edric Bastyan's Viceregal appointment in South Australia. He left just a few months after I became a Minister and, therefore, a member of the Executive Council. I certainly support what has been said by the Premier, by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Hartley. I came across Sir Edric and knew him in other ways besides his being the Governor of this State. Indeed, even now, in my electorate office I have a photograph hanging of a group of us in camp in 1965, I think, when, as honorary Colonel of the 10th Royal South Australian Regiment he came to camp with us, and one of the happy recollections I have of that camp is of the few days he spent with us. I admired him tremendously as a man. He fulfilled his Viceregal duties with great distinction. He was a very popular figure and, after his return to Adelaide to live with Lady Bastyan, as the Premier has said, he became a well known figure who was regarded with great respect and affection by all of us. I mourn his passing.

The **SPEAKER**: Before asking honourable members to stand and carry the motion, I would not want to reflect on any of the statements which have been made by members from either side, statements which are perfectly true and give true testimony to the very keen interest that Sir Edric had in South Australia and the very keen interest that South Australians had in him.

Members would be appreciative of the fact—and I know of my own knowledge—that he was particularly keen in matters associated with returned servicemen, attending their functions right across South Australia, and giving counsel to their needs. He will be remembered over many long years as the author of the quaint South Australian flower, the great Australian daisy, which reflects a very pithy and a very knowledgeable understanding of the ways of men, particularly of those who have been in the services. I ask members on both sides to stand with me in a tribute for one minute's silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.11 to 2.20 p.m.]

PETITIONS: MEAT TRADING

Petitions signed by 46 518 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose any changes to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by the Hons. D. C. Brown, W. A. Rodda, W. E. Chapman, D. C. Wotton, J. D. Corcoran, R. G. Payne and Messrs. Gunn, Evans, Langley, Becker, Oswald, Mathwin, Crafter, Glazbrook, Ashenden, Schmidt, Max Brown, Hamilton, O'Neill, Abbott, Millhouse, Trainer, and Plunkett.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SCHOOL BUS SERVICES

A petition signed by 60 parents of children attending Echunga Primary School and child/parent centre praying that the House urge the Government to amend the regulations under the Education Act to reduce the distance requirement for school bus services was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

A petition signed by eight 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. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran.

Petition received.

PETITION: FLAGSTAFF HILL BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 739 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to improve and extend the bus services to the Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park areas was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: BUS FARES

A petition signed by 179 parents and friends of children at Port Adelaide Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the recent increase in bus fares was presented by Mr. Abbott.

Petition received.

PETITION: FIRE BRIGADES ACT

A petition signed by 134 residents of South Australia praying that the Houses urge the Government to withdraw

its Bill to amend the Fire Brigades Act was presented by Mr. Hemmings.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard: Questions on the Notice Paper*, except Nos. 4, 81, 172, 282, 308, 309, 311, 324, 357, 358, 371, 385, 388, 389, 393, 432, 437, 461, 479, 492, 504, 505, 507, 527, 528, 536, 543, 550, 553, 557 and 564.

H. C. MEYER

In reply to **Mr. PETERSON** (23 September).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The dredge *A. D. Victoria* is on bare boat charter to the department of Marine and Harbors as a replacement for the *H. C. Meyer*. Under the terms of the agreement, the charterer is required to 'man, operate, victual, fuel, repair, maintain and supply the dredge' and is obliged to return the vessel to its owners at the end of the charter period in a condition similar to that at the commencement. That is the standard form of 'bare boat' charter agreement.

Maintenance has been carried out in accordance with the agreement and to keep the dredge in serviceable condition to pursue the department's dredging programme. Wearing parts such as bushes in the links connecting the dredging buckets have had to be replaced regularly, which is normal for a dredge of this type. The dredge has now been in service for seven months and no dredging time has been lost due to either mechanical breakdown or routine servicing.

It is incorrect to say that "substantial maintenance and replacement have been required to keep the dredge in operation" and that "the *A. D. Victoria* could be returned to its owners in much better condition than when it was hired". It is expected that the *A. D. Victoria* will not be in any better condition overall when returned to its owners than when received.

RADIO-ACTIVE MATERIALS

In reply to **Mr. LANGLEY** (17 September).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Within the Adelaide metropolitan area the following premises are those at which cores containing uranium ore are known to be stored and/or processed: Department of Mines and Energy Core Library, Frewville; Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, Frewville; Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, Thebarton; Western Mining Corporation Ltd., Lonsdale; Esso Australia Ltd., Wingfield; A.C.S. Laboratories Pty. Ltd., Unley; Comlabs Pty. Ltd., Mile End; School of Metallurgy, Institute of Technology, The Levels, Pooraka.

The people responsible at these places for the handling of uranium cores are subject to the Radioactive Substances and Irradiating Apparatus Regulations, 1962-1979, under the Health Act. The premises are inspected by officers of the South Australian Health Commission to ensure that the standards required by the commission are being met.

With regard to the firms indicated as having an address of 50 Mary Street, Unley, McPhar Geophysics ceased to exist in 1975, Geoex Ltd. does not handle or process low grade uranium ores and A.C.S. Laboratories Pty. Ltd. are inspected and meet the standards established by the South Australian Health Commission.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

In reply to Mr. **BLACKER** (18 September).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: A review of a draft indenture between the State and the Redcliff Petrochemical Company Limited, dated November 1974, reveals that there were no clauses specifically related to protection and restitution for the fishing industry, except for the protection of rights of persons at common law.

If Dow proceeds with development, they will not be immune from legal action by the State, the fishing industry or other affected bodies resulting from environmental damage due to the company's operations.

Costs incurred in cleaning up oil spills can be recovered by either prosecution or reimbursement through the National Plan for Combating Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which is funded by levying shipping interests. It is accepted that legislation covering the shipment of hazardous materials will be required to enable recovery of costs resulting from spillages. As it may be necessary to take action against the owner, agent or master of the ship once any material has been loaded, the indenture between the State and Dow is not considered to be suitable for the recovery of costs resulting from any clean-up operations. The company will, of course, be subject to all State and Commonwealth environmental laws which are in force.

NATIONAL PARKS

In reply to the **Hon. R. G. PAYNE**.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: In my letter to the Hon. J. R. Cornwall of 7 July 1980, the staff numbers quoted to Dr. Cornwall were as follows:

Salaried officers	84
Weekly paid staff	113
	197

To these figures the Auditor-General has added:

Trust Officers (Cleland)	3
and 2 weekly paid employees employed at the time on a short term (6 weeks) project.	

The total as per the Auditor-General's Report was then 202.

STATE SECURITY

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (7 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The allocation of manpower and costs for the provision of State security is as follows:

	Revenue	Manpower
	\$	
**Administration (Special Branch)	29 000	2
*O.P.S.U. (Operational Planning and Support Unit)	47 000	3
Special Branch	65 000	3
Government House	104 000	7
Parliament House	17 000	1
	\$233 000	14

*The involvement of this group relates to the preparation of orders and is a part-time requirement only. The bulk of their work is related to preliminary inquiry and preparation of orders for a variety of significant police operations in the uniform sphere.

**The two persons shown in this category consist of the inspector-in-charge and a clerical assistant (typist).

OFFICER REMUNERATION

In reply to Mr. **J. OSWALD** (7 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Deputy Auditor-General has asked me to correct a statement he made before the Estimates Committee relating to two positions of administrative officer classification being made available for audit investigations within the increased numbers quoted in the programme document. During 1978-79 seven officers were released for duty in other departments. In anticipation of the return of some of these officers, salary provision was made in the financial estimates and the total number of officers was shown under "Audit Investigations". One officer (EO-1 classification) returned on 29 September 1980 and it was anticipated that two officers (EO-1 and CO-5) would return in October 1980. Resulting from a departmental reorganisation, four officers (AO-1, CO-5, CO-4, CO-2) were allocated recently for full-time investigation into A.D.P. systems.

BICYCLE TRACKS

In reply to Mr. **SCHMIDT** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Applications by councils to the Bicycle Track Committee for financial assistance with regard to bicycle facilities are assessed and, if approved, the Bicycle Track Fund meets two-thirds of the cost with the remaining one-third being met by the council. In 1979-80 the Government made the following payments to councils for bicycle facilities approved by the Bicycle Track Committee:

Council	Project	Amount
		\$
CC Adelaide	LeFevre Terrace	20 667
CC Adelaide	Bartels Road	1 115
CC Glenelg	Sth. Esplanade, Pier Street, Moseley Square	2 800
CC Kensington and Norwood	Cross-overs and cycle racks	2 370
CC Mitcham	Northern Valley Track	12 000
CC Mitcham	Shepherds Hill Road	5 423
CC Noarlunga	Reynell Road-Doctors Road	2 210
CC West Torrens and Norwood	Burbridge Road-Tapleys Hill Road	10 133
CT Moonta	Area School-Moonta Bay	1 091
CT Naracoorte	Stewart Terrace	4 915
DC Barossa	Lyndoch Valley Road	1 883
DC Meadows	Linemarking-Happy Valley	17
DC Meadows	Coromandel Connector	10 660
DC Murat Bay	Ceduna-Thevenard	5 733
DC Snowtown	Area School-township	426
DC Streaky Bay	School cycle track	1 377
DC Tatiara	Mundullah-Padthaway	714
DC Waikerie	Lawrie Terrace-High School	2 400
DC Yankalilla	Main South Road	772
		86 706

The list includes funds provided for projects carried over from 1978-79, as well as projects approved for 1979-80. The council contributions are not included. With respect to 1980-81 funding, the only approval to date is for CC Woodville-works on Collins Reserve which are estimated to cost \$5 000, including council's contribution. The Bicycle Track Committee is making a detailed investigation of candidate projects submitted by another 17 councils. The funds sought exceed those available and appropriate allocations will be made once the committee

has completed its assessment of the priority of each project.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

In reply to the **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The estimated number of passengers to be carried by the State Transport Authority this year (1980-81) is 74 675 000. This represents an expected increase of 2 per cent over the number of passengers carried during 1979-80 (73 210 000). The percentage growth of passengers carried by the State Transport Authority for the year 1979-80 over the previous year was 4 per cent. At the present time revenue obtained by the State Transport Authority for the fare box represents 23 per cent of the authority's total operating costs including interest and depreciation. As at 30 June 1980, the Highways Department owned 850 residential properties which have been acquired in connection with proposed roadworks. During the financial year 1979-80 a total of 21 houses were sold as a result of becoming surplus to departmental requirements. The Highways Department is continuing to dispose of surplus residential properties as they become available. The precise number to be disposed of during 1980-81 is not known at this time but is expected to be greater than the total disposed of in 1979-80.

UNICYCLES

In reply to **Mr. HAMILTON** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Chairman has now advised that inquiries both here and interstate do not indicate that unicycles are in general use on public roads, although two local retailing outlets questioned have a small number of such vehicles available for sale. Unicycles seem to make spasmodic appearances on public roads for specific events, for example, the National Heart Foundation Cyclethon. The unicycle is a pedal cycle under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act Regulations. However, it would appear that it does not conform to the regulations covering braking requirements for pedal cycles. Because the pedal is part of a fixed wheel system, in order to stop the cycle, the rider would be required to exert muscular force in the reverse direction to the forward movement of the pedals.

It is considered that unicycles would not be compatible with other vehicles on public roads because of the lack of control, particularly in a hazardous situation. In discussions with the Police Department, it appears that the police would be likely to take action to stop persons riding unicycles on public roads in the interests of road safety. It seems that no further action is required at the present time to introduce a specific regulation banning the use of unicycles. Such vehicles are usually designed as "fun machines" and should only be ridden in off-road areas. Used in this manner there appears to be no reason to ban their sale. It is apparent that retailers should not advise members of the public that unicycles can be used on public roads.

ROADWORKS

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Such treatment was designed primarily for engineering reasons to stabilise the earthworks and minimise erosion and, secondly, to present an aesthetically pleasing appearance. It was

certainly not simply cosmetic treatment. Both factors are an essential part of freeway construction as practised worldwide.

Where bridgeworks are involved, a higher degree of slope protection is necessary to protect the abutments, while at the same time again choosing a treatment which is complimentary to the structure and aesthetically pleasing.

At short notice specific meaningful costs cannot be produced from the voluminous detailed cost records covering the entire project, bearing in mind that the construction of the freeway extended over approximately 14 years, involving segregation into a number of sections of differing characteristics. While the costs are segregated under various cost codes, it is of significance that the earthworks costs include stripping and stockpiling of topsoil for late use in covering batter slopes for landscaping, and detailed analysis would be required to establish accurate costs.

Total costs over this period of 14 years would be virtually meaningless unless indexed to current values, as the road price index rose by approximately 275 per cent in this period. Approximate costs could be extracted and indexed over any particular relatively short section if required.

Contractors have carried out a large proportion of the landscaping works which comprises the spreading of topsoil on cut and fill batter slopes, hydromulch seeding, and initial maintenance.

Where the departmental hydromulching machine was used, the topsoil was transported from the stockpiles by hired contract trucks and some hired earthmoving equipment plant was also employed in the operation. In the case of the bridges, the slope protection works were carried out under contract, with only one exception.

Currently, and in the anticipated future, tree planting and maintenance is being undertaken for the department by the Woods and Forests Department with personnel based in the Monarto area and upon that department's request. Estimated costs were submitted, assessed and approved as reasonable and economical prior to accepting the services of the Woods and Forests Department. It would be difficult to justify offering this work to contractors and unemployed action groups at the expense of providing necessary employment for trained Government workers.

Sand and earth cuttings in the White Hill area had not been covered with topsoil during the 1979 winter as part of the South-Eastern Freeway construction works because of inclement weather. It is normal practice to spread topsoil over such batters to encourage growth and reduce erosion.

The ideal time to spread such topsoil is in the autumn season to enable as much growth as possible to be established before summer. Accordingly, topsoil was spread over the batters commencing in February and proceeded intermittently (as workload and weather conditions dictated) until July. The material used was topsoil stockpiled during the freeway construction specifically for this purpose, which was not seeded, as it was considered that the seed already contained in the particular topsoil would be adequate.

The cuttings were reshaped with graders before treatment with topsoil, to fill scoured areas, and areas of naturally regenerated growth were left undisturbed as much as possible. A certain amount of topsoil that had been placed was washed away during an exceptionally heavy downpour, with 70 mm of rain falling in the White Hill area in a period of 30 minutes. The work carried out in the White Hill area is considered to have been good engineering practice.

No significant changes were made to the Department's

designs for the South-Eastern Freeway as a result of pressure group activity.

At the White Hill interchange, local groups raised issues which were given consideration jointly by the Department for the Environment and the Highways Department. The implementation of the final scheme was at no additional cost to the Highways Department.

The various questions have only been answered in a somewhat general manner. If the honourable member requires further detailed information or explanations on particular sections or specific operations, the Commissioner of Highways would be pleased to arrange a joint inspection with him and the former Senior Project Engineer to pinpoint precise areas where this information is still required.

RECREATION AND SPORT

In reply to **Mr. KENEALLY** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: During the 1979-80 financial year the Recreation and Sport Division directly assisted country sportspersons as follows:

Under the Sport Scholarship Scheme the following each received \$1 500.

Jenny Osmond, Mount Gambier
Louise Marsh, Port Pirie
Dianne Price, Mount Gambier
Sharon Sanders, Whyalla
Andrew Rumbelow, Streaky Bay

Under the Country Junior Development Grants Scheme the following each received \$300.

Grant Baker, Port Augusta
Tammy Heneker, Port Augusta
Taryn McLean, Port Augusta
George Spartalis, Port Pirie
Peter Mitchell, Mount Gambier
Cathy Pitcher, Bordertown
Craig Staude, Bordertown
Julianne Arthur, Cleve
Amanda Bell, Maitland
Peter Carter, Nuriootpa
Richard Murray, Whyalla
Andrew Fielke, Loxton
Sonia Arthur, Orroroo

In addition, Dianne Appelby of Kimba received \$100 under this scheme.

I regret that it is not possible to provide the honourable member with a listing of sportspeople from country areas who have benefited from the division's many assistance schemes as grants are made to associations and not to individual participants. The funds granted to associations under these programmes are disbursed to participants proportionately by the associations. If country people are involved, they would no doubt receive their allocation. Exact amounts, participants' names, dates of payment, etc., would only be available from the respective associations.

All sporting organisations are eligible to apply for assistance to send State teams to compete in National Title events. They are also eligible to apply for assistance under the Junior Sports Coaching, Talent Coaching and Equipment Subsidy Schemes.

In regard to the Sports Medicine Centre, I am able to advise you that consideration is currently being given to extending the area occupied by the Centre at 70 South Terrace. Any modifications to the building resulting from such consideration would need to be undertaken by the Public Buildings Department.

At the time when the Government amended the Regulations to provide for the registration rebates for electrically driven motor vehicles, there were 39 electric vehicles registered. The annual registration fees for these vehicles amounted to \$1 088 with the resultant 50 per cent rebate being \$544.

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (2 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reply is as follows:
COMMUNITY FITNESS NETWORK PROGRAMME

1. Instructor Training:

A sum of \$10 000 is allocated for physical fitness instructor training for the 1980-81 financial year. Three courses operate on a regular basis; these are:

- (1) The general instructors' course
- (2) Keep fit for the elderly instructors' course
- (3) Keep fit for the disabled instructors' course

An instructors' course for "Running Instructors" was also held in March to May 1980.

The Instructor Training Accreditation Scheme is unique in Australia. South Australia is leading Australia in the development of the Community Physical Fitness Project and the Instructor Training Accreditation Scheme.

Officers from equivalent Government departments in other States and Territories (specifically New South Wales, Victoria and the Northern Territory) have expressed a great deal of interest in the Instructor Training Accreditation Scheme and appear to be looking to the division for assistance in developing instructor courses in their own States.

2. Programmes Grants:

The community physical fitness network is proving a considerable success, and is a positive step forward in the development and promotion of physical fitness in South Australia.

To date, \$10 874 has been allocated for programme grants in the 1980-81 financial year. These funds have assisted the initiation and development of some 80 physical fitness programmes, involving more than 1 300 people in various areas throughout South Australia. A further \$6 000 is allocated for anticipated expenditure on programmes to begin in February, 1981.

PROPOSED COMMUNITY PHYSICAL FITNESS NETWORK BUDGET 1980-81

Allocation \$50 000.

Expenditure approved.

(A) Training Expenditure	\$
(i) General Instructors Course (March, May 1980)	1 922-00
(ii) General Instructors Refresher (March 1980)	453-30
(iii) General Instructors Refresher (July 1980)	411-27
(iv) Keep Fit for the Elderly Instructors Courses (August 1980)	1 050-00
(v) Accreditation Register Cards	7-90
(vi) Certificate seals	15-00
(vii) Presentation of certificates evening	320-00
(viii) General Instructors Course advertisements	220-00
(B) Programmes Already Funded	
(i) Katuni Activity Centre	320-00
(ii) Midway Road Community Centre	225-00
(iii) The Box Factory	45-00
(iv) Distance Runners Club	154-00
(v) St. Corantyns Clinic	109-00
(vi) Tea Tree Gully City Council	1 221-00
(vii) The Parks	1 030-00
(viii) Salisbury Baptist Community Centre	117-00
(ix) Payneham City Council	90-00
(x) Y.M.C.A. Southern Areas	213-00

(xi) Women's Electoral Lobby	630-00	
(xii) S.A.W.K.F.A. Promotions	218-70	
(xiii) Y.M.C.A. Central Promotions	450-00	
(xiv) S.A.W.K.F.A. Brochure	625-00	
(xv) Maesbury Community Centre	780-00	
(xvi) Thebarton Community Centre	333-83	
(C) On-going Network Expenditure		
(i) Co-ordinators (2) Salaries and Payroll Tax	25 000-00	
(ii) Network Promotions—Brochure	800-00	
Expenditure approved: Total	<u>36 761-00</u>	
2.1 Suggested Expenditure Estimate		
(A) Training		
(i) General Instructor Course	2 425-35	
(ii) Presentation Certificate for Disabled and Elderly Instructors' Course	350-00	
	<u>2 775-35</u>	<u>2 775-35</u>
(B) Programmes		
(i) September to December 1980		
1.1 S.A. Women's Keep Fit Association 556/80	1 865-00	
1.2 S.A. Women's Keep Fit Association 556/80	744-65	
1.3 Y.M.C.A.—		
Central 563/80	210-00	
1.4 Mandala House 901/80	120-00	
1.5 Y.M.C.A. Southern Areas 578/80	202-00	
1.6 Institute for Fitness Research and Training 544/80	916-00	
Total amount of subsidies approved is	<u>4 313-65</u>	
(ii) February-May 1981	5 500-00	
	<u>9 813-65</u>	<u>9 813-65</u>
(C) Other Expenditure		
(i) Film—"A Game Plan for Survival"	650-00	
Total expenditure proposed	13 239-00	
Total expenditure for 1980-81		
(i) Approved	36 761-00	
(ii) Proposed	13 239-00	
	<u>\$50 000-00</u>	

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

There are several factors which collectively account for the estimated reduction of \$68 000 appropriated for administrative services in 1980-81 which are:

1. A projected reduction in the operating deficits at both the Sports Administration Centre and the South Terrace property (formerly owned by the National Fitness Council) following revised management procedures. \$12 000-00
2. During 1979-80 the division purchased two information processors, a document printer and other small items of equipment for a total outlay of \$34 786. This year the major expenditure relates to the purchase of two magnetic card 82 typewriters which had formerly been utilised by the division on a rental basis. The 1980-81 appropriation on

this line is \$8 000. Taking into account the savings which have resulted from the termination of the rental agreement, the total reduction approximates \$29 000.	\$29 000-00
3. Six motor vehicles were replaced in 1979-80 at a total cost of \$36 785. For the current year, four vehicles will be replaced at an estimated cost of \$24 000.	\$13 000-00
4. Expenditure was incurred during the early part of 1979-80 which related to the employment of personnel who were either temporarily engaged on short term projects or redeployed following the disbandment of the former Department of Community Development.	\$12 000-00
5. Reapportionment of an officer's time from the Divisional Support Services Programme to the Administration of Legislation Programme, resulted in a reduction of \$2 000.	\$2 000-00
Total reduction	<u>\$68 000-00</u>

GRAHAM'S CASTLE CONFERENCE CENTRE, MYLOR AND PARNANGA RECREATION CENTRES

1. Graham's Castle Conference Centre—		
Goolwa		Estimated Expenditure 1980-81 (Minister of Public Works Loan Funds Appropriation)
Dormitory block		
New dormitory block to accommodate 22 persons in twin rooms. This will increase dormitory capacity to 66 persons. Estimated completion date—November 1981.		
* Total cost \$220 000		\$150 000
Indoor recreation area		
At present no recreation area exists. Planned to provide facilities for:		
* T.V. viewing		
* Reading		
* Table tennis		
* Pool table		
* Bar facilities		
* Toilet facilities		
It is also planned to provide basic cooking facilities for family groups in this building.		
* Total cost \$160 000		\$80 000
Landscaping and tennis court		Estimated Expenditure 1980-81
The proposed tennis court will provide a badly needed outdoor recreation activity for the centre users. It is included with the overall landscaping of the centre which will allow for better utilisation of the facilities.		\$
Total cost \$35 000		34 000
†\$1 000		
2. MYLOR RECREATION CENTRE		
Sewage treatment plant		
The present efficient system is polluting the Onkaparinga River which is part of the Mount Bold Reservoir catchment system. The only answer to the problem is to install a sewage treatment plant.		
Total cost \$65 000		65 000

	Estimated Expenditure 1980-81 \$
Tennis courts	
It is planned to construct four tennis courts which can also be used for basketball and netball and provide a residential facility for Sports Coaches Courses run by this Division as well as further recreation facilities for other groups.	
Total cost \$80 000	80 000
Water supply—fire protection	
The supply of potable water at Mylor is non-existent. The supply which is available is inadequate and supplied through an existing bore. At the same time the storage of water for fire protection is insufficient. It is therefore proposed to allow for the catchment of rain water by connecting gutters and downpipes to holding tanks and reticulating this throughout the site. At the same time sprinklers will be installed to the gutters to provide fire protection to the buildings.	
Total cost \$66 000 †\$6 000	60 000
3. PARNANGA RECREATION CENTRE	
Landscaping and car parking area	
At present the site does not adequately provide for outdoor recreational activities nor does it provide car parking facilities. This project will remedy this.	
Total cost \$72 000 †\$5 000	67 000
4. OTHER	
This project is for the provision of sealed internal roadways at Mylor and has in fact been completed. It is included in the Loans Programme for 1980-81 because payment to the contractor was not made in the 1979-80 financial year and is due in this financial year.	
Total cost \$32 000 †\$6 000	26 000
TOTAL:	\$562 000

*Balance of expenditure 1981-82

†Difference in funds already approved and expended in the 1979-80 financial year

5. MYLOR FIRE DAMAGE

Dining room-kitchen

Work has commenced on the replacement of this building which was lost in the Ash Wednesday fire. Funds will be obtained from the Government Insurance Office, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Total cost \$135 000

Youth hostel

This building was also lost in the fire. It will likewise be replaced with funds from the Government Insurance Office in the 1980-81 financial year.

Total cost \$50 000

Sports Medicine Centre

A proposal to extend the area occupied by the Sports Medicine Centre at 70 South Terrace is under consideration. Any modifications to the building resulting from such consideration would need to be undertaken by the Public Buildings Department.

BUSHLAND

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (8 October).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Native vegetation areas, particularly those proposed for clearance, will be assessed for their environmental significance. Where it is considered desirable (for environmental reasons), the co-operation of landholders will be sought to leave uncleared certain key areas. Co-operation will be encouraged by the offer of incentives, including relief from local government rates and/or management advice and assistance. The landholder would enter into a heritage agreement to retain the vegetation areas set aside.

Regarding the rate of payment for the land, incentives will relate only to the area of land subject to a heritage agreement. Rate relief on this land will be paid on a per hectare basis. The rate relief payable will be determined in accordance with the relevant local council's set rate in the dollar and the value per hectare of scrubland determined by the Valuer-General for the local council area.

The tenure of the area is secured by a heritage agreement. A landholder cannot be assisted monetarily for the preservation of land and then sell his land so that funds spent would be wasted. The heritage agreement may run for a fixed term or perpetuity, but in any event will bind the landholder's successors in title. This will ensure that the intentions of the agreements are not adversely affected by a change in ownership of the land.

The Department for the Environment will be making regular inspections. In most cases the land would need to be fenced to allow the exclusion of farm stock. A subsidy for part of the fencing costs would be paid by the Government. (At this stage it is proposed that the Government contribute the cost of materials and 30 per cent of the labour costs for such fencing.)

SAND

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (8 October).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The honourable member's suggestion is a practical one, and is already being investigated as part of the forward planning for the continued protection of the metropolitan Adelaide coastline. Because of the high costs in shipping time, sand would need to be obtained from the nearest suitable location. Deposits at Outer Harbor have been proved, and investigations are continuing into the possibility of there being a suitable source closer to Brighton. The practicality of combining necessary port dredging work with beach replenishment is also being investigated. Transport costs would preclude the shipping of sand from Eyre Peninsula. Investigations have necessarily been confined to closer sources.

PIPELINE

In reply to Mr. O'NEILL (8 October).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is estimated that the study would involve three man weeks of work, costing \$2 500, allowing for overheads, operating expenses, supervision, etc.

FISHERIES RESEARCH

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (7 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Department of Fisheries currently provides funds for research into the hatchery production of spat of the Pacific Oyster *Crassostrea gigas*. This work has been carried out at the I.C.I. Lease at Dry Creek under an agreement whereby that company

provides facilities and the Department of Fisheries provides a Research Officer. The Department's contribution to costs for 1980-81 has been estimated at \$29 000.

Some of the spat produced at the hatchery has been transferred to Coffin Bay for growth experiments and the results from these experiments are quite promising. At present, spat of *C. gigas* is not available from any other source in Australia and I.C.I. advises that it is not yet able to sell spat to outside organisations because all the spat produced is needed for I.C.I. operations. The hatchery technique has now been proven and adapted to local conditions and the next stages in research will be directed to increasing production.

HELICOPTER

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (7 October).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Treasury officials have now advised that fees recouped for rescues effected by the State Emergency Helicopter Services are to be credited to the line:

Part 11—Public Works and Services and other receipts—
Other Departmental Fees and Recoveries—
Miscellaneous—
Chief Secretary—
Sundries.

The first payment received under this heading was credited to the line on 14 October 1980.

DISSOLUTION OF INSTITUTES

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I point out to the honourable Leader that it is difficult to be precise because of the time factor involved in the dissolution process. However, the following Institutes have or are expected to dissolve this financial year: Penola, St. Peters, Clare, Orreroo, Grange, Thebarton, Victor Harbor, Waikerie, Aldgate, Westbourne Park, Mount Gambier.

HOUSING TRUST ALLOTMENTS

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There are 184 allotments in the following areas:

	Allotments
Corporation of the City of Salisbury	92
Corporation of the City of Elizabeth	35
District Council of Munno Para	57
Total	184

Of the 35 allotments in the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth there are many with impediments such as easements which restrict building on them.

Approximately 40 single unit allotments are currently being developed in Elizabeth North, and the Trust is negotiating for some additional sites at Elizabeth East. There is also a substantial area of broadacres known as Elizabeth Heights, but within the boundaries of the District Council of Munno Para, development of which has been deferred pending clarification of major transport routes.

EMERGENCY HOUSING OFFICE

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: From 1 October 1979 to 30 September 1980, 4 104 households, that is, approximately 17 000 persons, were assisted by the Emergency Housing Office. This assistance included rehousing in the private sector, advice and advocacy to assist persons to remain in existing accommodation, and allocation of emergency housing with voluntary organisations.

LAND TAX

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Treasury Department has advised me that, when the special levy on land tax in the metropolitan area was first levied in 1971-72, the amount expected to be raised was \$600 000 and specific appropriations were made to allocate \$300 000 of that sum for the acquisition of public parks and \$300 000 to the planning and development fund for the acquisition of open spaces. Over the years, two things have happened. The first is that the amount of money yielded by the levy has increased, and the second is that the specific identification of the levy with acquisition of land has disappeared. In more recent years, it has been the practice of the Government, at the time of framing the Budget, to look at other aspects of planning and development and associated matters and to allocate funds according to priorities rather than to take the amount of the special levy and apply it to acquisition of land.

In 1979-80, the sum of \$2 300 000 was raised from the levy.

The removal of land tax from the principal place of residence will have the effect of reducing the amount yielded by the levy by about \$700 000.

At the request of the Treasurer, Treasury has been discussing with the officers of the Minister of Environment and Planning the question of how funds for national parks, acquisition of open spaces, development, maintenance and other associated matters such as public parks, recreation areas, etc., might be planned over periods as far as five years ahead. Part of those discussions cover the cessation of semi-government borrowings and their replacement by appropriations from Revenue Account and Loan Account.

As the appropriations for open spaces, public parks, national parks and their development and maintenance are not determined by the amount of money raised by the levy, the reduction resulting from the lifting of land tax on the principal place of residence will have no effect on appropriations for these purposes.

ETHNIC ORGANISATIONS

In reply to **Mr. GLAZBROOK** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The policy guidelines of the Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee are as follows:

1. The members of the Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee shall be: Chairman, the Ethnic Affairs Adviser or his deputy; Executive Officer, a representative of the Ethnic Affairs Branch; Three persons appointed by the Minister for the period ending 30 June 1981; Three persons appointed by the Minister for the period ending 30 June 1980. Subsequent appointments shall be for a two-year period, renewable after that time. The committee shall have the power to co-opt non-voting members as it deems necessary.

2. The committee shall consider all applications for grants for projects to assist ethnic groups with a maximum grant per project of \$5 000 and recommend allocation of

funds reserved for this purpose.

3. Members are assumed to be competent to deal with ethnic grants recipients in a sensitive way, that does not interfere with integrity or freedom, whilst ensuring at the same time what the stated aims and objectives of the recipients are, as far as is possible, properly achieved.

4. Members must not be recipients of grants, and must disclose an interest if serving in any capacity with an organisation that is an applicant for assistance.

5. The Ethnic Affairs Branch is to be considered the controlling body within the Government's ethnic grants policy, responsible for day-to-day achievement of Government policies and objectives to the Minister, through the permanent head of the department. The Minister may accept or reject advice from the Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee and/or the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the department, as appears necessary to him at the appropriate time.

6. The committee shall advise the Minister, the permanent head, and the Ethnic Affairs Branch on matters regarding co-ordination of assistance to ethnic groups.

7. The committee shall act as a clearing house of information regarding funding of ethnic groups from Government sources.

TRUST MEMBERS' FEES

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As from 1 July 1978 the fees payable to trust members are as follows:

Non-Public Servants		
		\$ p.a.
Chairman	6 850	
Deputy Chairman	3 800	
Members (5)	3 300	
Total Fees	27 150	
Public Servant		
		\$ p.a.
up to	4 300	
	3 000	
up to	2 700	

Prior to 1 July 1978, the fees were as follows:

		\$ p.a.
Chairman	6 850	
Deputy Chairman	3 100	
Members (5)	2 750	
Total Fees	23 700	

The current fees were approved by His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council on 31 August 1978 to be applied as from 1 July 1978.

The variation between the years ended 30 June 1979, and 30 June 1980, referred to in the Auditor-General's report arises from the fact that the higher level of fees applicable from 1 July 1978 was not, in fact, paid to members until December 1979. Also, it should be noted that the differential rate of fees for Public Servants applied to a trust member prior to the appointment of the present board in January 1980.

ETHNIC FESTIVALS GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The membership is as follows:

Mr. H. Siliakus
Mr. K. Conlon
Ms. I. Krumins
Mr. I. G. (Mick) Mykyta
Mr. F. Schaffer

BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The membership is as follows:
Chairman: Mr. S. B. Hart.

Members: Dr. D. S. Brooks, Mr. P. G. Boros, Mr. W. A. Phillips, Mr. S. Ralph, Mr. H. M. C. J. van der Pennen.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIBRARIES

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Libraries Board has decided that 5 per cent of the subsequent bookvote for 1980-81 should be reserved for foreign language materials, hear-a-books and such like materials for the disadvantaged. On this year's figures this amounts to \$43 620, which is matched by local government contributions to a total of \$87 240.

The materials selected will be held at the Public Libraries Division and made available to libraries on request. In this way only those libraries in need of such material will be supplied, and further, the material can be changed frequently to provide fresh stocks to meet the limited but very intensive demands. Up until now this material has been provided to libraries on a semi-permanent basis and the limited titles have been read out very quickly. The modified proposal should overcome this.

I believe that the sum of money allocated is adequate to meet both the demand from borrowers and the limited range of material produced in these fields. It is often forgotten that the range of books and recordings published in these fields is quite small compared to normal English language publishing.

ARCHIVES

In reply to **Mr. BANNON** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The State Library has been forced by lack of space in the Archives to reduce its annual intake of records over the past two years from 2 000 metres/year to 390 metres/year. As a result, at the present time about 2 800 metres of documents are being stored by departments because the Archives cannot house them. It is estimated that 8 500 metres/year of documents will need to be added to the Archives over the next 10 years to cope with both current and accumulated backlogs. Once this target is achieved it is estimated, on the current rate of growth, that provision for a further 2 500 metres/year annual growth rate will be necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The current vacancies within that part of my portfolio dealing with local government, including the Public Service Act positions within my Ministerial office, number four. These positions and their appropriate classifications are as follows:

1. Senior Administrative Officer.
(Personal Secretary)—Ministerial Office A.O. 1
2. Administrative Officer C.O. 6
3. Steno-Secretary, Grade III—Ministerial Office M.N. 4
4. Clerk—Ministerial Office C.O. 2

The reply given to the honourable member on 7 October

1980, referred only to positions in the main administrative section of the department and did not include two Public Service positions in the Ministerial Office.

(8) The committee, before recommending grants, shall have regard to grants and assistance available and emanating from other sources including the Commonwealth Government, the Department of Community Development, the Department of Community Welfare, and the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

(9) The committee shall be entitled to refer questions of a financial nature about applications under consideration, to the Finance Advisory Committee for advice.

(10) The committee shall have regard to the fact that, wherever possible, Government assistance shall serve the whole State, and that the needs of country areas require special attention.

(11) In recommending grants, the committee shall take into consideration the limited financial resources available to smaller ethnic groups and under-privileged sections of larger groups.

(12) The committee shall have the power to recommend grants for all costs associated with a project, preferably restricting to a once-only basis grants associated with the establishment of an office and partial salaries of office staff.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ETHNIC GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The committee:

- (1) Shall be available to the Minister, his department and the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the department to advise and recommend appropriate action on those matters which are referred to the committee for such attention and particularly: the funding of projects which involve the collection and dissemination of information in ethnic languages through publications and the media; free interpreting and translating services; voluntary ethnic information services; conferences, seminars and workshops sponsored or organised by ethnic groups; ethnic cultural centres (other than ethnic schools); research into migrant problems and aspirations; community education (other than through schools and tertiary institutions) on issues concerning the development of a multi-cultural society; projects which promote better community relations.
- (2) Shall consider all applications for grants or subsidies for projects and such matters as are referred to the Committee up to a maximum of \$5 000 per annum for each project and recommend allocations of funds available for the applications.
- (3) Shall consider such applications for subsidies and grants as may be referred to the Committee for advice and recommendation by the Minister, his department and the Ethnic Affairs Branch thereof.
- (4) Shall report to the Minister through the permanent head, and function within policy guidelines determined by the Minister from time to time.

CONSULTANT SERVICES

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The services provided by Mr. M. J. Edmonds, consultant, have included Chairmanship, Working Party on Information Services and the

presentation of a report of the Working Party; assistance with the implementation of the Government policy in respect to the formation and operation of community development boards in South Australia; and a major report on the Local Government Act review study. This consultancy is for a period of one year terminating on 13 November 1980, at a fee of \$14 290.

INTERPRETER SERVICES

In reply to **Mr. GLAZBROOK** (7 October).

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There are between 25 and 30 assignments for contract interpreters a week. Each contract interpreter works an average of three hours per assignment.

DENTAL CARE

In reply to **Mr. RANDALL** (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Accurate costs of dental services to schoolchildren, pensioners, indigents and Aborigines are not available. However, it is estimated that services to schoolchildren in 1979-80 cost \$6 300 000 including costs of services provided by the Dental Health Service and the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

The cost of dental services provided to pensioners and indigent persons in 1979-80 is estimated to be \$220 000. This figure includes the cost of services provided at The Parks Community Health Centre, Gilles Plains Community College, Flinders Medical Centre, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Southern Domiciliary Care Service. It does not include the cost of services provided by the Royal Adelaide Dental Hospital which is estimated to have cost between \$3 500 000 and \$4 000 000 in 1979-80 and provides a significant proportion of its services to pensioners and indigent persons.

Dental services to Aborigines under the Aboriginal Fee for Service Dental Scheme cost \$160 000 in 1979-80. In addition, people of Aboriginal descent received dental treatment under the School Dental Scheme, etc., but the occasions of service and costs are not separately identifiable.

In reply to **Mr. GLAZBROOK** (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The figure of \$9 543 000 shown on page 576 of the yellow book relates to the "dental care programme" and includes an estimate of \$6 192 000 as the operating payments in respect to dental care provided by the School Dental Health Service. In addition to this, the Dental Health Service made payments in respect to training of \$813 000 which has been included under the "training programme". Together, these figures total the \$7 005 000 shown on page 10 of the blue book as the 1979-80 payments of the Dental Health Service.

On page 313 of the Auditor-General's Report the operating costs of the Dental Health Service are shown as \$7 005 000, which, together with capital payments of \$515 000, gives the figure of \$7 520 000, to which reference was made.

In reply to **Mr. RANDALL** (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Regarding the cost to the South Australian Health Commission of administering funds for the Aboriginal dental care programme, it is not possible to identify direct costs to the commission of administering this programme. A number of officers in the Dental Health Branch are involved for a very small

percentage of their time with the administration of the programme. The cost is estimated to be less than \$5 000 per annum and since the officers involved are part of the Dental Health Branch, the costs are shared with the Commonwealth on a 50:50 basis under the School Dental Scheme.

COMMUNITY NON-PROFIT HOSPITALS

In reply to Mr. HEMMINGS (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The following is a list of community non-profit hospitals that furnish a financial statement to the commission:

- Ashford Community Hospital Inc.
- Blackwood and District Community Hospital Inc.
- Glenelg District Community Hospital Inc.
- Hindmarsh Memorial Community Hospital Inc.
- Keith and District Hospital Inc.
- Northern Community Hospital Inc.
- North-Eastern Community Hospital Inc.
- Stirling District Hospital Inc.
- Western Community Hospital Inc.
- Memorial Hospital Inc.
- LeFevre and Port Adelaide Community Hospital Inc.

ANGASTON HOSPITAL

In reply to Mr. HEMMINGS (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The initial budget allocation for the Angaston Hospital in 1979-80 was \$715 700 and during the course of the year claims for budget variations totalling \$41 271 were approved, bringing the final budget allocation to a total of \$756 971. The claims approved were:

	\$
Annual increases	15 726
Terminal leave	11 232
Relief staff to enable cooks to attend catering school	1 500
Introduction of imprest drug system	2 400
Emergency replacement of water softener	3 000
Allowance for increased medical fee for service and pathology payments	6 913
Increased superannuation contribution	500
	41 271

HEALTH COMMISSION

In reply to Mr. BECKER (8 October).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There are six officers currently employed within the central office of the Health Commission who have been identified as surplus to requirement. The surplus positions are: one Medical Officer MO-8; one Clerical Officer CO-4; one Clerical Officer CO-2; one Clerical Officer CO-1; one Catering Officer CK-12; and, one Leading Hand Operator WFF-9.

SAND PROTECTION

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (8 October).

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

Groynes operate by causing local sand accumulation and by causing realignment of beaches towards the dominant wave direction. When successful, this results in wider beaches to dissipate wave energy, and in a reduction of the alongshore movement of sand.

However, if groynes are to be successful, they must be filled with sand, either by natural accumulation or artificially. The groyne field must also have at its leeward end an expendable length of coastline where erosion can be permitted. Erosion always occurs when groynes are constructed. The metropolitan Adelaide beach system does not have a significant supply of sand entering it (this is the main reason why an erosion situation prevails), and groynes would therefore not fill by natural accumulation. Also, the coastline is fully developed, and no expendable erosion area exists.

It can be shown that the cost of building a groynefield and filling it with sand would far exceed the cost of a beach replenishment programme. About 60 groynes approximately the size of the Patawalonga groyne would be needed, and the beaches between these would need to be filled with sand. The Coast Protection Division of the Department for the Environment is presently updating the costing of strategy alternatives.

Sand Replenishment and Re-pumping:

Since 1973, 421 000 cubic metres of sand have been moved in the Coast Protection Board's sand replenishment programme. 271 000 cubic metres of this has been placed at Brighton, and small amounts have been placed at other places where local erosion is occurring, such as Henley Beach South, the West Beach Trust area, and in front of the Glenelg sewage treatment works. The sand is taken mainly from the accumulating northern beaches of Semaphore, Largs Bay and Taperoo, and also from other places where it builds up and becomes a nuisance. Sand has been taken regularly from south of the Patawalonga entrance to help reduce the silting up of this entrance.

As regards the honourable member's suggestion relating to the "re-pumping" of sand from the offshore bars onto the beaches, in considering this, one must bear in mind that a sand dune, beach, and offshore bar system is in equilibrium and that this equilibrium changes according to the waves and tides—the forces which shape the system. For example, winter high tides and storm waves cut into sand dunes, lower the beach levels and place the sand on a much enlarged offshore bar. Summer conditions result in a return of this sand. In this context, it can be appreciated that the artificial transferring of sand from one part of this system to another will only cause a temporary change. To be effective, replenishment sand must be brought in from outside the local dune/beach/bar system.

Pumping of sand is, of course, often an economical way of transporting it, though it has not been a practical option for the Adelaide beaches. The relatively small amounts of sand, and the distances involved do not warrant the large capital costs of establishing a pumped system. However, the North Glenelg beach has been replenished by pumping as part of the Patawalonga Channel project.

In regard to problems associated with beach replenishment: the greatest is no doubt the traffic which these projects generate. Routes are chosen to minimise nuisance to coastal residents, but some inconvenience is inevitable. Increasing transport costs and fuel shortages will no doubt make trucking a less attractive option in the future.

BERRI IRRIGATION

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works,

together with minutes of evidence: Berri Irrigation Area Rehabilitation of Headworks Revised Scheme.

Order that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: REDCLIFF PROJECT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: For a decade now, South Australians have been encouraged by prospects of a petro-chemical plant being constructed in the State at Redcliff. Expectations about the \$1 billion project have been raised on numerous occasions only to die away again as nothing eventuated. It was in this atmosphere of uncertainty that the Government came to office 13 months ago determined to regenerate industry generally and, as part of this thrust, clarify the Redcliff situation.

The Government believed the people of South Australia had a right to know exactly where they stood on Redcliff and was determined to do something about it. I discussed the project while in Tokyo earlier this year, and a number of Japanese companies indicated interest in possible future involvement.

During subsequent talks in Hong Kong with representatives of the Dow Chemical Company, which at the time enjoyed exclusive rights on Redcliff, I insisted that a date be set for a Dow decision, and 10 October was agreed on. As that date approached, it became clear to me and the Government that the State's interests would be best served by my personally speaking with the Dow executives before they made a decision. Redcliff is too important to South Australia to leave anything to chance.

On 19 September, accompanied by my press secretary, Mr. Quirk, I flew to the United States, where we were joined for the Dow talks by the Chairman of the Redcliff Steering Committee, Mr. Bill Schroder, and the Director of Energy with the Department of Mines and Energy, Dr. Malcolm Messenger. We met Dow's President, Mr. Paul F. Orefice, and other Dow executives in Midland, Michigan, on 24 September, where I explained the importance of Redcliff to South Australia. Notwithstanding this and other points made by myself, Dr. Messenger, and Mr. Schroder, Dow said that the company was not in a position to make a Redcliff decision for two years.

Dow showed me studies which indicated that, while demand for caustic soda by the Australian aluminium industry would be very strong, the recent recession in the U.S. had left Dow with an excess of the associated chlorinated hydrocarbons. It is a situation, which I believe, has been partly caused by the geographic location of Dow's existing overseas petro-chemical plants. Although not totally unexpected, I was naturally disappointed by the Dow decision, as I am sure most South Australians were.

Nevertheless, for the first time in nine years of confusion and false hopes, we at last knew where we stood. There had not at any time been any definite commitment by Dow to proceed with the project. Just as important, as events have subsequently shown, other prospective developers also knew where they stood.

I informed Mr. Orefice that the delay left the South Australian Government no alternative but to open the Redcliff project to other developers as well as Dow, and that Dow could no longer expect exclusivity. Dow recognised and accepted this situation, although the company still hopes to be the ultimate developer, as illustrated by its ready agreement to continue detailed environmental impact studies and marine studies in

Spencer Gulf at a cost of more than \$1 000 000.

This the company regards as a way of saving time in the long run, should Dow eventually become the developer. Dow also sees it as a tangible demonstration of the company's goodwill and determination to maintain a strong interest in the project. Indeed, the South Australian Government and Dow Chemical remain on the very best of terms.

The question of Government incentives in relation to Redcliff was not raised or discussed, except that Dow is well aware that the incentives originally offered would have to be renegotiated in the future in the light of conditions pertaining at that time. After the Dow talks, arrangements were made for Dr. Messenger to accompany me to Japan, on the way home to South Australia. It was felt that his expertise would be invaluable in Redcliff discussions in Japan that we were confident would occur as a result of Dow's announcement. The enthusiastic interest of the Japanese in Redcliff was heartening.

The Mitsui Group was particularly interested in the withdrawal of Dow's exclusivity, and we held lengthy discussions on the company's possible involvement in a joint Redcliff project. Last Thursday, within three weeks of my return from those talks, an eight-man delegation from Japan's Asahi Chemical Industry Company Limited visited me in my office and officially informed me that Asahi and Mitsui Toatsu Chemicals wanted to proceed with a joint feasibility study as soon as possible. Letters of intent were delivered from both companies indicating their firm interest in the study. The Government immediately offered every assistance.

Although the Redcliff project is still a long way off, and still in no way certain of being built, I believe that we now have the best chance ever of an eventual start. The Dow situation is at last clear: we know where they stand and they know where we stand. And now we not only have Dow still interested and still working but we have two other world chemical giants, Asahi and Mitsui Toatsu, investigating the project.

As I have already said, we still have a long way to go before Redcliff becomes a reality. But certainly, with companies of such high international standing as Asahi and Mitsui expressing strong interest, in addition to Dow, we are cautiously optimistic of a favourable outcome for South Australia.

In conclusion, I point out that my talks in the United States and Japan were not confined exclusively to Redcliff. I discussed other matters of vital interest to South Australia, and in the case of one, in particular, I am hopeful that it will result in further benefits for the State. I am not in a position at present to comment further on this matter, but I hope to be able to make an announcement within the next few weeks.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Loans to Producers Act, 1927-1962—Regulations—Loans to Growers
- ii. Superannuation Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Part-time Members

By the Hon. D. O. Tonkin, for the Minister of Mines and Energy (The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Report, 1980.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board—Report, 1979-80.

By the Hon. D. C. Brown, for the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Dried Fruits Board of South Australia—Report for year ended 29 February 1980.
- ii. Pest Plants Commission—Report, 1979.

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

By Command—

- i. General Elections, 1979—Statistical Return of Voting.

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Company Take-Overs Act, 1980—General Regulations, 1980.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Constitutional Museum Trust—Report, 1979-80.
- iii. Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1979-80.
- iv. South Australian Waste Management Commission Act, 1979-1980—Regulations—Various Amendments.
- South East Regional Cultural Centre Trust—
- v. Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.
- vi. Report, 1979-80.
- vii. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1979-1980.
- viii. State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1979-80.
- ix. Corporation of Adelaide—By-law No. 6—Obstructions to Vision.
- x. Museum Board—Report, 1979-80.
- xi. South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—Regulations—Interim Development Control—District Council of Peake.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Highways Department—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Credit Unions Act, 1976-1980—Regulations—Liquid Funds.
- ii. Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1979-80.
- iii. Charitable Funds, Commissioners of—Report, 1979-80.
- Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—
- iv. Certificate of Identification.
- v. Folding Tables.

By the Minister of Water Resources (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Lands (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—For year ended 30 June 1980—

i. Surrenders declined.

ii. Return of Remissions.

Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1934-1940—For year ended 30 June 1980.

iii. Disposal of Surplus Lands.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Minister of Fisheries): As Minister of Fisheries and pursuant to Statute, I lie on the table Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Fees.

Mr. O'NEILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Minister used the word "lie". I understood that that was unparliamentary language. He said, "I lie on the table".

The SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order and I ask all members to cease being facetious.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: I.M.V.S.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Following publication of my reply to a Question on Notice from the member for Mitcham, which appears on page 184 of *Hansard* for the week ended 7 August 1980, Mr. Duncan Sheriff, the former Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology, made representation to me by mail claiming that my reply had, in effect, accused him of "professional misconduct and inhumanity". The part of the question concerned read as follows:

Did the former Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology complain to the Director of the I.M.V.S. that this and other practices carried out on dogs in the animal operating theatres were cruel and should be stopped, and did the Director threaten such Acting Director with disciplinary action if he should take the matter to the R.S.P.C.A. or any other animal welfare body?

The answer which was provided for me stated, in part:

The Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology did complain that there was inadequate post-operative supervision of animals and suggested fuller veterinary supervision because such supervision was partly his responsibility and he could not give adequate time to it.

I agreed to see Mr. Sheriff who told me that the passage to which he objected was that which referred to post-operative supervision being partly his responsibility and that he could not give adequate time to it. I indicated to Mr. Sheriff that I would refer the reply back to the Director of the institute and, if there were any inaccuracies, I would be willing to make a Ministerial statement correcting any inference which had reflected unfairly upon him.

I asked the Director to investigate Mr. Sheriff's objections and, as a result, the following statement was prepared for me to read to the House:

In my reply to Question No. 169 raised by the honourable Mr. Millhouse and appearing on page 184 of *Hansard* for the week ending 7 August 1980, I stated that, "The Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology did complain that there was inadequate post-operative supervision of animals and suggested further veterinary supervision because such supervision was partly his responsibility and he could not give adequate time to it".

The former Acting Director believes this to be a reflection on his professional conduct and implies negligence on his part. I wish to state clearly that no such implications were intended by the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, who advised me on this matter, or by me.

As a member of the Animal Users Committee, the former

Acting Director did have responsibilities for all matters pertaining to the animal operating area which he inherited from his predecessor but which may not have been fully explained to him. In any case, he acted properly by reporting the unsatisfactory situation to the Acting Director of the institute.

It was the former Acting Director's predecessor and the present Director of the Division of Veterinary Sciences who pointed out that more time would be required to give personal veterinary supervision to the post-operative care of animals. The former Acting Director has pointed out that he would have found the necessary time had he believed that this was one of his direct duties and responsibilities.

In no way was any professional misconduct or negligence implied by the Director of the institute over this particular matter. His objection and that of the council of the institute was that the former Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology sent a copy of his internal memorandum, complaining about the situation, to the President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Veterinary Association before time was allowed to rectify the whole matter.

I put this statement to Mr. Sheriff to see whether it contained redress for what he considered to be a wrong, but he was not satisfied and maintained that his complaint remained.

I therefore asked the Chairman of the I.M.V.S. to establish the facts of the matter and provide me with a statement which would clarify Mr. Sheriff's position and which would withdraw any reflection that may have been wrongly cast on him. I have now received the following reply from the Chairman of the institute:

I received your letter of 29 September in connection with Mr. Sheriff's allegations about the answer supplied by the I.M.V.S. to Mr. Millhouse's questions relating to the use of dogs for medical experiments.

As you requested, I sought to discuss the matter with Mr. Sheriff in order to ascertain specifically what it was that he complains about in these answers. He refused to see me and referred to the correspondence wherein he said his objections were detailed.

I have therefore studied the correspondence and made inquiries about the relevant events. This letter concerns only Mr. Sheriff's complaint about his personal position and reputation.

In January 1978, whilst Mr. Sheriff was Acting Director of the Veterinary Division, he notified the Director of the institute that in his opinion the arrangements for use and supervision of the Animal Operating Theatre were not being adhered to and were unsatisfactory. The theatre was immediately closed that same day by the Acting Director of the institute in the Director's absence on holiday.

The theatre was subsequently reopened for restricted use after the immediate questions of management and supervision of the care of the animals raised by Mr. Sheriff had been fully canvassed and new procedures instituted.

It is quite clear that the incidents concerning the animals reported by Mr. Sheriff were totally unsatisfactory and he was correct in notifying the Director of the deficiencies. The recommendations he then made as to appropriate management and supervision of the animals in the theatre have been included in the procedures now followed.

In a letter to the Director, Mr. Sheriff states in part—

The suggestion that it was lack of my time that led to any of the cruelty, negligence and culpable folly that prompted my protests at the time is a lie.

and further—

To suggest that a lack of my time could make me negligent to the responsibility imposed on my conscience and my obligations as a member of the Royal College of

Veterinary Surgeons is an accusation of professional misconduct and inhumanity that I reject categorically.

Any criticism or accusation of the type mentioned by Mr. Sheriff was certainly not intended, and, to the extent that the answer given could be interpreted in the manner which Mr. Sheriff alleges, it is withdrawn, and an apology extended to him.

It is a matter of individual interpretation whether the answer does state or imply any criticism of him in this respect. It was certainly not intended to convey that impression and it is sincerely regretted if it is capable of being so interpreted. I would like to make it quite clear that it is not, and never has been, suggested that Mr. Sheriff on this occasion, or at any time, failed to carry out his duties as a veterinary surgeon properly or in accordance with appropriate rules of conduct for veterinary surgeons.

If this clarification of the particulars that concern Mr. Sheriff's reputation does not sufficiently resolve his objection, may I suggest that I request the Ombudsman or the Public Service Board to investigate and report on Mr. Sheriff's complaints and the related events.

That letter is signed by Mr. Alan McGregor, Chairman of the institute.

I believe that the foregoing statement, which is now on the record, and the letter from the Chairman of the institute clearly indicate that, if any inference could have been drawn from my reply on 7 August 1980 that Mr. Sheriff was negligent in respect of the post-operative supervision of animals, then such inference was not intended and is withdrawn.

Finally, I wish to advise the House that I am currently making arrangements for an inquiry by an independent consultant into the use of laboratory and experimental animals by the I.M.V.S. I have had discussions today with the Chairman of the institute council, and I expect to be able to announce the scope and nature of the inquiry in the near future.

QUESTION TIME

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the time for the asking of questions without notice to be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I indicate that questions that would normally go to the honourable Deputy Premier will go to the Premier and those that would normally go to the honourable Minister of Agriculture will go to the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

PALMDALE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier give the House details of the proposal, which he announced at the Master Builders Association dinner on Friday last, to give financial aid to persons affected by the failure of the Palmdale Insurance Group? In particular, can he say whether the outstanding claims will be met in full and whether the proposed scheme will cover common law claims as well as claims under the Workers Compensation Act?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall be very pleased indeed to refer the Leader's question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. At present, the matter is still being investigated in detail, but the facts are substantially as I stated them during the speech to the Master Builders Association.

BEACH EROSION

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Environment say what action is to be taken to correct beach erosion at Reedie Street, Henley Beach? My question arises following a letter to the Editor in this morning's newspaper, as follows:

We have been frequent visitors to South Australia for many years, and particularly to Henley Beach.

During our last visit we were shocked and appalled at the state of Henley Beach's foreshore between Marlborough and Reedie streets. The erosion evidently caused by the combination of sand removal and recent storms has left a potentially dangerous situation. Instead of dunes there are high sand cliffs and this means that, with the onset of warmer weather, young children playing, climbing or digging are placing their lives in terrible jeopardy.

Surely the council (and who else is responsible?) is not going to wait for a tragedy before taking some firm action. It is a matter we would imagine to be of the utmost urgency.

The letter is signed by Dr. and Mrs. Murray Hayward, of Jacksons Road, Mount Eliza, Victoria. With the publication of that letter, I believe that the Government, and especially the Minister concerned with beaches and the foreshore, with particular reference to Henley Beach, should have an opportunity to explain to the House what action is being taken.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, I did see the Letter to the Editor in this morning's *Advertiser*, and I am pleased that the member for Henley Beach has brought up the matter, because it gives me the opportunity to clarify a couple of matters today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is all very well for members opposite to have a bit of a chuckle, but I am very pleased that the member for Henley Beach is looking after his electorate and looking after the people who use beaches in the area. Before I say what the Government is doing through the Coast Protection Board, I want to commend the local council for the work that it is doing down there. It is very much a sharing of responsibility, and that goes for funding also, and the responsibility it has taken in these matters is to be commended, because the local government authority recognises the responsibility that it has in regard to its beaches.

Last week I announced that three sand-carting contracts would be let to replenish the Adelaide metropolitan beaches with sand. These related particularly to the southern beaches, but we are looking at metropolitan beaches generally. I am pleased to be able to inform the member for Henley Beach that over the next five weeks some 15 000 cubic metres of sand will be carted from Largs Bay to Henley Beach and 3 000 cubic metres will be carted from Grange to Henley Beach. Also, the carting of 30 000 cubic metres of sand from Semaphore to Brighton will be carried out until December. This is part of an annual programme to maintain metropolitan beaches and to reduce the risk of storm damage along the coast.

This year, more than usual, we have had many problems with the beaches, and a terrific loss of sand was caused by the severe storm of 27 and 28 June this year. As I have reported to this House before, it is interesting to note that that storm was recognised as being the worst storm on our metropolitan beaches for some 10 years, but, because of the work that the Coast Protection Division, the board and the local government authorities are doing, the effect of that storm was much less than has been the case in the past. The annual sand replenishment programme has been carried out for the past seven years, and I believe it has

been very successful in maintaining the desired sand levels of the beaches and in protecting the foreshore areas. So, I can assure the member for Henley Beach that we are conscious of the matters that were raised by Dr. and Mrs. Murray Hayward in the paper this morning, and that we are taking action to rectify that situation along the metropolitan coast.

MOORE'S BUILDING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Premier say whether any money has been paid to companies by way of compensation following the Government's decision to use Moore's building? If it has, can he say which companies have received such payments, and how much each has received? Also, is it true that A. W. Baulderstone Pty. Ltd. has been appointed project manager for the proposed redevelopment of Moore's building in Victoria Square?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The only company that I know of that has been paid any sum at all (compensation is the wrong term) has been the firm of Civil and Civic, which, as some of the former Ministers opposite would know, was the original author of the concept to turn Moore's into law courts. I think I have stated before in this House that at least one Minister of the former Government was approached by Civil and Civic, I think directly, with the proposition to convert the Moore's site into law courts, and that was as long ago as April or May last year.

Civil and Civic did a great deal of work in regard to developing the concept and the original plans. The work done by that firm has been made available, or will be made available.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What about Woodham Biggs?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sorry, I cannot say anything about Woodham Biggs. I should not think so. Civil and Civic is the only company, that I know of, that has received any payment. The payment was based entirely on an assessment of the work that was done in regard to preliminary studies, both for the concept and for the working drawings, and they will be available for the designers of the complex.

COOPER BASIN

Dr. BILLARD: Does the Premier agree with the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in the *Advertiser* this morning that "The future of South Australia seems bound up in the way the resources of the vast Cooper Basin are handled"? The statement was made within the context of a special supplementary section of the paper in which a number of experts in specific areas, as well as the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition from the political area, presented views about what the future holds for the State. I understand that a great proportion of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition dwelt on the subject of the Cooper Basin, comparing the Cooper Basin in importance with the move by the Playford Government to develop the Leigh Creek reserves following the Second World War.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, obviously the Government must agree that the Cooper Basin is of extreme importance to South Australia, but we believe that the State's long-term interests will be best served by a diversity not only of supply but also of perhaps competition to the Cooper Basin producers, and we are investigating a number of alternative gas supply options.

These options include supply from the Northern Territory, from Palm Valley and Mereenie, and from Bass Strait via Victoria.

Regarding the latter possibility, it is interesting to note that consideration is at present being given by the Federal Government and the Pipelines Authority to extending the lateral pipeline from Dubbo to Wagga on to Albury so that Bass Strait gas can be made available to both the South Australian and New South Wales natural gas supply systems. While the quantities of natural gas involved may not be great (they are, obviously, still subject to negotiation), the net effect could be the extension of the life of the Cooper Basin field very much in favour of supplying Adelaide and South Australia.

There is also considerable committed exploration in terms of off-shore exploration. Amounts totalling some \$70 000 000 to be spent over the next five or six years have been allocated for drilling off the Great Australian Bight. I could also say that the finalisation of an agreement with the Pitjantjatjara has, subject to negotiation, opened up highly prospective areas for exploration in the very near future.

I believe that to say that the Cooper Basin holds the major part of our potential for the future is being rather narrow, and I point out that there are vast deposits, as honourable members will know, of copper, uranium, and gold at Roxby Downs. There are also other uranium deposits and brown coal deposits, the first samples of which will be taken from Port Wakefield within the next week or so. There are brown coal deposits at Kingston. Indeed, there is a vast range of mineral wealth, so it would be incorrect to ignore those potential developments.

I would go one step further by saying that we cannot, in any way, ignore the iron and steel industry; the Iron Triangle still has tremendous potential ahead. I have been informed only today that the total output of the iron and steel mills at Whyalla is virtually totally committed to the end of this year and well into next year, and business is booming. We in South Australia have a tremendous potential by way of energy and mineral resources, and we intend to make the very best of them.

TEACHING CONTRACTS

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is true that no person on a teaching contract with the Department of Further Education in this calendar year will have that contract renewed in the next calendar year? I have been approached by two people who teach with the Department of Further Education with the information that they and all persons in their position will not be employed on contract by that department next year, because no existing contracts will be renewed. This matter is of considerable concern to these people and, indeed, to people in that department generally, because a good deal of some of the critical areas of the D.F.E's concern is almost entirely taken up with people who are working on a contract basis. One of the people who approached me is involved, for example, in the music field. I am sure that these people would be interested to have some assurances from the Minister, if assurances can be forthcoming.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I believe that the honourable member is probably referring essentially to contractees appointed under the stream 6 courses within the Department of Further Education. Undoubtedly, there will be some reduction of stream 6 courses, but it would be untrue to say that no contracts will be renewed. This matter will depend on decisions made at local level and

also, to some extent, on whether courses can be made to be self-supporting. Cabinet arrived at a decision many weeks ago, and it was referred to during the Estimates Committee debate, that \$250 000, I believe, had been made available from stream 6 contract appointments and that, if any additional courses were to be mounted, it would depend largely on whether they could be made self-sufficient. We will not know until later this year the ultimate answer regarding the number of people whose teaching contracts will be terminated. People holding existing contracts will be in line for renewal, provided that the course is within the terms already laid down by the committee (that is, that the course automatically carries on) or that a new self-supporting course can be mounted in lieu.

ART AND CRAFT COURSES

Mr. SCHMIDT: Is the Minister of Education aware of rumours in the southern area that the advanced art and craft course at O'Halloran Hill is to be transferred to Stanley Street, North Adelaide? I have been approached by a number of students from O'Halloran Hill who have had it come to their notice that the advanced art and craft course is to be transferred from O'Halloran Hill, where it presently serves a number of residents in the south and, therefore, is convenient to those people in the south, to Stanley Street, North Adelaide. They have been told that the reason is that a centralising programme is under way in the Department of Further Education and that this move has been designed to bolster the Stanley Street art college.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The rumour was brought to my notice, I think on Wednesday or Thursday last week. The honourable member may realise that the rumour being promulgated at that stage was much stronger than the one he has brought to my attention. It was pointed out by people in that area that about half of the college's art and craft courses were to be closed down and transferred to Stanley Street: that is untrue. The art and craft certificate courses will be continued at O'Halloran Hill. What is true is that a survey was conducted during last year to determine the extent to which the advanced certificate was to be continued in colleges other than Croydon Park.

It was determined that, at O'Halloran Hill, about 10 per cent only of all those currently undertaking art and craft certificate courses would continue with the advanced certificate. Two decisions were made. One was that, in future, anyone who wished to enrol for the advanced certificate at O'Halloran Hill, as a new course, would be discouraged and recommended to go to Croydon Park.

The second was that those already enrolled in the advanced certificate course at O'Halloran Hill would be told that they would be able to continue the course at that college. It is part of a centralisation programme that was determined as a result of that departmental survey which indicated that only 10 per cent of O'Halloran Hill students would continue to the advanced stage of that particular certificate course, therefore making it less than economical to continue it at that college.

PRIVATE CONTRACTORS

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Public Works say why contractors are being used to move furniture in Government offices? I have been advised that on at least three occasions in the last month contractors were used to move furniture within the confines of Wakefield House. In one instance, the contractor charged

\$150 to move one desk and one chair over a distance of some floors. It has been reported that in another instance the contractor charged \$200 to move two desks and two chairs over a distance of a few floors. In the most recent incident, which occurred last week, a contractor moved a desk down one floor via the elevator and charged \$75; I am advised that that task took less than 30 minutes.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I do not know the details of any contractors being engaged for that sort of work. If the honourable member had bothered to consult some of the former Ministers, particularly Mr. Corcoran, he would have found that contracts of that size do not go to the Minister for approval. The Minister has only to approve contracts worth \$10 000 or more. However, I will get the details for the honourable member. I would expect that, if contractors were obtained, they were obtained because they were required. That is the obvious answer. I will certainly get information on the matters the honourable member has brought before the House and come back to him with a reply.

DAIMLER-BENZ CORPORATION

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he, the member for Newland or I have any direct association with the company Daimler-Benz of any nature whatsoever, including financial or employment? On Thursday 25 September the member for Florey stated (and I quote his very words):

The company that he—
meaning me—

worked for, Chrysler, is well known for using people through Governments throughout the world to get its way.

He then continued by saying:

... it may well be that the gentleman—
again meaning me—

is applying his expertise in that area on behalf of the Daimler-Benz Corporation . . .

In a subsequent personal explanation, the member for Florey implied that I had a "guilty conscience" on this matter. These allegations have serious imputations in relation to the Government's decision to proceed with the busway to service the north-eastern suburbs, and I would appreciate the Minister's comments on this matter.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister of Transport to answer the question as to his knowledge of the matters.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It ill behoves members opposite to laugh while the member for Todd was asking that question. The imputations that the member for Todd has said that the member for Florey made in the debate are absolutely disgraceful. I have questioned the member for Todd and the member for Newland, who have both assured me they have no association with the Daimler-Benz Corporation. Rumours are circulating in the suburbs along the route of the north-east busway that not only the member for Todd but also the member for Newland and I are going to receive Mercedes-Benz motor cars because of the Government's north-east busway programme. I hope (and I believe this would be true of most members opposite) that those rumours are not being promulgated by members on the other side of the House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If members opposite will take this matter seriously, as it should be taken, I want to say that the only association that members on this side of the House have had with the firm of Daimler-Benz is when the Minister of Industrial Affairs and I visited Melbourne

before the last election, when we were investigating the Government's transport policy at that stage. I categorically deny that there is any association with that firm at all.

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Environment a firm position on the proposal to develop land to the east of the Flinders Chase National Park for agriculture, especially in view of the startling finding of the Interdepartmental Committee on Vegetation Clearance in South Australia which has now been public for more than three years?

Members will be aware of the outrage expressed by conservation groups at the possibility that this invaluable tract of Crown land south of Gosse be developed for agriculture. For many years, groups on both sides of the conservation fence have had their eyes on this land, adjoining Flinders Chase. However, after the shock administered by the Vegetation Clearance Committee report, the argument swung strongly in favour of the preservationists. As the development plan for the Island observes:

Kangaroo Island is at present vulnerable to development activities that could quickly destroy its character.

It has been put to me that the islanders themselves, whether farmers, pastoralists or traders or in the service industries, realise how much is at stake if the plough-it-up faction gets its way, creating 17 extra blocks. The Vegetation Clearance Report notes (and I think it worth repeating):

It is apparent that much of the impetus for continued clearance on Kangaroo Island is coming from mainland professional and business interests who have invested capital in development blocks.

I ask the Minister whether he agrees that the type of development proposed is contrary to the long-term best interests of the island community.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government has not made a decision in regard to this land on Kangaroo Island. As the honourable member has asked this question, I think it gives me another opportunity to clarify a few points, because much has been said about a report that came out through the Department of Lands. The Minister of Lands has already made it quite clear that that Department of Lands document concerning Kangaroo Island was in fact an internal status report on unallotted Crown land. As such, it was for the information of the Minister only, and it was one of many departmental status reports prepared on a variety of subjects at the Minister's request. It is also interesting to note that the report makes no recommendations. It is only a study document that was made available to Cabinet for its information.

Further consideration of that report will take place between the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture, and me, as Minister of Environment. When we have had further consideration of that report, the Government will be in a position to tell the House and the public generally what is to happen to that unallotted Crown land on Kangaroo Island.

ALGERIAN EARTHQUAKES

Mr. GUNN: Can the acting Minister of Agriculture say whether the Minister of Agriculture has any information on the effects of the recent Algerian earthquakes on South Australian Department of Agriculture personnel working in that country?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I thank the honourable member for that question. Of course, the South Australian Government was very concerned to hear of the earthquakes in Algeria and to hear of the loss of many thousands of lives. On behalf of the South Australian Government, I extend to the Algerian Government and its people the deepest sympathies of this Government and wish them a speedy recovery in being able to restore services and the essentials of life of those people affected.

Within a matter of about 24 hours of the earthquake the South Australian Department of Agriculture did contact its officers involved in that project. I must stress that the earthquake in Algeria affected an area over 200 kilometres from the site of the South Australian Algerian project at Ksar-Chellala.

Contact was made with members of the South Australian team within a few hours of the news reaching Australia. They were completely unaffected by the quakes, although they did feel minor tremors. There was no damage to life or property and all were safe and well. Within 24 hours, all next of kin were contacted by staff of the Overseas Projects Division of the Department of Agriculture and were given an assurance as to the safety of the team.

The team was authorised by the Minister (the Hon. Ted Chapman) to give whatever assistance it could to the Algerian Government and the Algerian authorities in the affected area. The four-wheel drive vehicles involved in the project were on stand-by and the wives of team members gave assistance with the organisation of relief materials, and I thank the officers of the South Australian Government in Algeria who participated in that way.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. PLUNKETT: Does the Premier approve of the use of the existing Adelaide Airport at West Beach for international flights? If so, will the 747 aircraft be allowed to land at the airport, and will the existing curfew on late night flights be continued if international flights through West Beach are allowed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not really think it is a matter of whether or not I approve of Adelaide Airport's being used as an international airport. However, I do know that there has been a considerable amount of discussion in the community just recently about the prospective use of Adelaide Airport by overseas airlines and I thank the honourable member for his question.

One of the matters that was raised fairly early in the life of this Government was whether or not Ansett and T.A.A. would operate flights from New Zealand via Hobart to Adelaide as part of an initial international flight service. That prospect has been a long time in coming but it is thought that, with the introduction of wide-bodied air bus and 767 aircraft, which T.A.A. and Ansett are going to use on their domestic services, such flights may well be possible. I am advised that the bigger aircraft will mean slightly less frequent services, and that the noise level of those aircraft is below that of domestic aircraft currently in use, so that there is no question of there being a breaking of the curfew if in fact Ansett or T.A.A. decide to move into the New Zealand-Hobart-Adelaide run.

The second proposition put forward (and how successfully I do not know) was when the Leader of the Opposition, I think, approached Sir Freddie Laker and asked whether he would consider sending out wide-bodied aircraft, I think DC10's on charter to South Australia. I have heard nothing more about that proposal. I do not know anything about the conditions which would have

applied to flying in directly with DC10's; perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will be able to help the honourable member later on that score. Qantas then entered the field and said it would be prepared to consider flights initially from New Zealand to Hobart to Adelaide, and that it would use a modified 747 aircraft, which would be perfectly okay. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on where you live, the full-size 747's and DC10's would not be able to land at Adelaide Airport without considerable modification and lengthening of the runway, certainly not with a full load. I understand that with a light load it is possible and, indeed, it has happened in emergencies.

The next suggestion made, and I think very seriously made, is by British Caledonian, which came to South Australia and to other States only a matter of weeks ago. It is interested in developing international services between the United Kingdom, which is its home port, and Australia. It already has a big trade between the United Kingdom and the south-east area of the United States. The company is concerned not only with providing flight services, but also in developing tourist resorts, and hotel accommodation, and indeed the propositions put forward as being possible for Adelaide sound extremely interesting. One of the matters raised in passing (I understand no decision has been made on the type of aircraft to be used) is that it is looking at wide-bodied aircraft of the same style which will next year start operation on the domestic interstate run anyway, so that there would be very little difference in aircraft type and a lower noise level than we have now with present domestic flights.

One thing which the company was quite adamant about and which I brought to its attention and made sure that it was aware of is the fact that there is a curfew at Adelaide Airport and we do not in any way support the breaking of that curfew. The requirements that relate to Adelaide Airport at present would have to be adhered to in all circumstances. If that does go ahead and we have British Caledonian or Qantas or indeed any other operator flying in, they will have to fly in aircraft which are suitable for the Australian and Adelaide Airport conditions—that they will fly in aircraft which have a lower noise level than existing domestic aircraft, and that they will fly in during the appropriate hours so that there is no question whatever of breaking the curfew.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Fisheries indicate the current position regarding the issue of A class fishing licences to those applicants who were previously employees of holders of fishing licences, and the relevance of applicants having to have been in the employ of fishing licensees, since 27 June 1977? I have been told that the delay in reaching decisions on the applications is causing some great concern and difficulty since, under present regulations, it is a requirement that a fishing boat can put to sea only if the holder of an A class licence is aboard. Those who have been previously employed by licence holders and who own their vessels are now unable legally to put to sea unless the licence holder is aboard. Thus, where previously there may have been some four to five boats working under one licence, this now cannot be done unless the owner can split himself five ways. Therefore, the delay in the decision of the department over the applications is felt by the applicants to be damaging. I seek the Minister's answer to this urgent question.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is quite right when he says that a change has come about in

the licensing procedure, namely, that the skipper for whom these people have hitherto worked has to be aboard the vessel. Quite a number of remote employees have applied for transfer to be holders of A class licences, and I will have to get the details for the honourable member. However, I know that the Director has made quite considerable progress in examining applications, and I can understand the alarm that has been expressed by the honourable member.

It is a matter that I shall have to take up with the Director. I will do that, and I will inform the honourable member of the result as quickly as possible. There was some delay this year in getting out the regular licences to fishermen. I imagine that the licences to which the honourable member has referred must be virtually ready for processing, but I shall take up the matter with the Director and see that the honourable member gets a report.

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Minister of Environment stand by what he wrote to Dr. Andrew Black, President of the Nature Conservation Society, in his letter of 1 August 1980, about the unallocated Crown land at the western end of Kangaroo Island, immediately east of Flinders Chase, and, if so, will he oppose the plan to develop this land for agriculture, if necessary to the point of resignation? In the past few months, there have been growing alarm and perturbation about the suggestion, emanating, I think, from the Minister of Agriculture, who has a property close by, that this land should be opened up for agricultural purposes and divided, I think, into 17 blocks of 2 000 acres each, or something of the sort—from my observations, not nearly enough land in poor soil to support—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the explanation of the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes indeed, Sir. This is what the Minister wrote in his letter of 1 August, in part:

The Department for the Environment has a long-standing interest in this area, comprising, as it does, some 14 659 ha of relatively undisturbed vegetation. Although no comprehensive, detailed studies have yet been undertaken, there is no doubt that the region supports a wide range of native fauna and forms a valuable adjunct to the Flinders Chase National Park. The extent of the department's interest is reflected in the fact that efforts were made in 1977 to have the land added to the park.

It was a damned pity it was not done then. That sets out, I think fairly, the Minister's view on this matter, and it seems to be diametrically opposed to that of some of his colleagues. I understand that the matter is at present being considered by Cabinet. One of the Ministers has said that a document was submitted to Cabinet—not for decision, of course, but merely for information. In my experience, documents are not submitted to Cabinet for information; they are submitted for decision. This is a matter of grave concern, I know, to my friends in the Labor Party, as well as to the Australian Democrats, although I can concede the pressure on the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member, for the last time, to come back to a simple explanation; otherwise, I will call for the answer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have finished, anyway, Sir.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The first point is that it is a pity that the member for Mitcham has not been listening. I do not know whether he was in the Chamber today when I replied to the member for Stuart on this matter. If he had been, I think he would have received the answer he was

looking for. Secondly, I have no intention of resigning, much as the member for Mitcham probably would like me to resign. The other point that he has made, quite rightly, is that in 1977 the previous Government spent some time looking at this matter. He made the point that perhaps the previous Government should have made a decision then, instead of its members coming out now and saying what should be done. I reiterate what I said previously: the matter has been brought to Cabinet; no decision has been made, and further discussions will take place between the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Lands, and myself. When those discussions have taken place, and when we have considered the matter, the Government will make a decision.

MEAT TRADING HOURS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government has refused the suggestion of late night trading in fresh meat? This afternoon, petitions bearing 46 518 signatures were presented to the House, following petitions with 263 signatures presented previously, giving a total of 46 781 signatures. As the instigator of the petition, I am pleased to receive the support of the small butchers throughout the State. Is the Minister aware of the feeling and the support of the butchers? Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Denton, Secretary of the Meat and Allied Trades Federation of Australia, South Australian Division, which states in part:

On Thursday 16 October 1980, the Meat and Allied Trades Federation was contacted by the supermarket chain "Action Price Stores Proprietary Limited" and asked to supply petitions opposing the extension of the existing trading hours of fresh meat. This chain of supermarkets is based in Western Australia and has had first-hand experience in late night trading of meat in that state.

Petitions were delivered on Friday 17 October, and when inspecting a store on Monday 20th, I found several large signs explaining the disadvantages of extending trading hours and a statement that any increase in trading hours will result in an increase in that supermarket's prices.

From this evidence, it appears that the very large supermarkets' only reason for extending trading hours is to gain control of the retail meat market. This will result in a cartel and cartels of this nature, particularly when the commodity is an essential part of the Australian diet, must be prevented so that free trade can survive.

I understand that, in America, the large combines are able to purchase stock on the hoof from farmers and graziers. By buying up before the meat reached the abattoirs, the large supermarket chains are able totally to capitalise on the market, thereby creating a monopoly, forcing out the small butchers and creating an inflationary situation of very high meat prices. Has the Minister considered the matter?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I have considered the matter. Unfortunately, I cannot indicate to the honourable member what the Bill will contain. I think it would be most inappropriate for me to give any indication of that until the legislation is formally introduced. Certainly, the Government would take note of that sort of public opinion, and I can assure the honourable member that it will take into account, in considering suitable amendments to the legislation, the 46 000 signatures, which is a massive petition to be presented to the House. At least, the Clerks know now who is responsible for initiating the petition, and I am sure they will thank the honourable member for the opportunity they have to table the petitions.

In discussing the shopping hours legislation, I have had

negotiations with many bodies, including the Meat and Allied Trades Federation, to which the member for Hanson referred. The federation put forward very strong arguments supporting the petitions tabled to date. The preparation of the legislation is running to schedule and, as I think I indicated to an honourable member opposite just recently, I expect the legislation to be before Parliament by about the middle of November. On present indications, that certainly will be the case.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: O'BAHN

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: On 25 September, the member for Todd made some statements regarding speeches I had made on 23 September and 20 August 1980 in relation to the O'Bahn transport system. In his speech on that occasion, he made six assertions that I was incorrect, and in one instance he thought I might be mistakenly thought of as being correct by default if he had not answered me.

He also challenged the veracity of the statements I made in my speeches on two occasions with the words "totally false", and in one further instance he added that I was "far from the truth". Also, on three instances in that speech he imputed false motives to me, at one point saying that my statement was "shown for what it is", and at another point accusing me of being "emotional". He also indicated that I was concocting fabrications, by implying that I was using no facts in my speech. Lastly, Sir, he indicated that I was purveying false misrepresentations by virtue of reporting events reported by the former member for Newland.

With particular reference to those points, I believe that I am called upon to make a statement indicating the facts that I used in that speech and to indicate where I believe I have been misrepresented by the member for Todd. With regard to one part of the speech concerning the question of bus capacity, he said that I was totally inaccurate on that point. I wish to advise the House that I got my information from a booklet titled "The O'Bahn—a systems concept for solving local transport problems in industrialised and developing countries" and produced by Daimler-Benz. On page 7 there is a particular reference which states "articulated vehicles, 150 passengers". I also had that statement supported by another document titled "The O'Bahn system—description and applications" by Herr Hubertus Christ, issued by the Department of Transport in Adelaide on 13 June 1980. On page 23 of that document is stated: "Articulated bus capacity, 150".

I am aware of the indications in the NEAPTR documents about S.T.A. regulations limiting capacities in articulated buses. I am also aware of industrial awards which limit capacities in articulated buses. I stated that the capacity of the buses in question was 150 passengers. That is what appears in the Daimler-Benz documentation. The member for Todd in his speech referred to seating capacity. I was not referring to seating capacity, and I believe it was an unfair attempt to try to undermine the facts that I was giving.

With regard to damage to roads, the member for Todd referred to axle loadings, implying that I had said that articulated buses had heavier axle loadings than did standard buses. At no time in my speech did I refer to the term "axle loadings". Instead, I referred to the loadings of the total bus on the road. I acknowledge that axle loadings on articulated buses are somewhat lighter. Again, Sir,

using the information provided by the Daimler-Benz booklet, I have calculated that articulated buses have an empty axle loading which is some 13 per cent lighter than standard buses, and, when full, less than 3 per cent lighter. In total, articulated buses are 23 per cent heavier, and I contend on the basis of wheel repetitions over a period of time that the damage and wear and tear to the roads would in fact be greater. Furthermore, I contend that axle loadings are not equal for all wheels in an articulated bus.

Regarding the Hamburg experiment, the member for Todd said that I did not explain why the system was in operation for only a short term. He further said that the Government wanted to show the people what the Hamburg project could do, and it did it. He said, "The member for Salisbury should have explained that." I shall quote from my speech on that occasion, where I made the following statement:

The project [the Hamburg project, that is] was used at an international exhibition in order to display the expertise of German transport engineering.

In other words, I clearly said what the member for Todd alleges that I did not say.

With regard to the Essen experiment, I made reference to the following statement:

It has been said that the city of Essen is installing this system [the O'Bahn system] at great expense.

I did not say that I had said that: I said that it had been said.

The SPEAKER: Order: I draw attention to the fact that there is too much audible conversation.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I made my assertion on that point from information contained on pages 46 and 48 of the "Progress report of the technical evaluation of the guided bus system", produced in December 1979. Using the information contained in that document and using the information contained in the other document by Herr Hubertus Christ, I came to a figure of \$15 000 000 as a minimum for the cost of the Essen project. Given that Essen still maintains an l.r.t. system and will be expanding that system and so therefore has those vehicles already, the decision not to upgrade the l.r.t. on the roads where the O'Bahn will go means a much greater cost in the swap to the O'Bahn system. That was the point I was making. I still adhere to the fact that the sum of \$15 000 000 is a great expense. While I accept that that may be a subjective interpretation, that is the opinion I stand with. Furthermore, as the next project, Essen stage 2 will involve a combination of O'Bahn and l.r.t.—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. The honourable member may have five minutes for the purpose of making a personal explanation. If he desires to continue, he needs to seek further leave of the House.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I seek further leave, Sir. Leave granted.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I mentioned the point that, because they are combining this in the next project, the costs are comparable between l.r.t. and the O'Bahn system in the city of Essen. The next point is that the member for Todd said that I was quite incorrect in implying that the guideways for O'Bahn buses go along ordinary roads, so I point out that in my previous speech I indicated that the Minister's statements were quite equivocal about that, prior to the Minister's statement about the acceptance of the O'Bahn system. I also report that pages 5 and 6 of the April 1980 report of the Director-General indicated the same—

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The House has been extremely tolerant in relation to the honourable member's personal explana-

tion, but I believe he is simply debating the issues. He keeps using phrases like "but I contend that" and "I contend that" which is simply debating the issue. It is not a personal explanation. If the honourable member has been misrepresented, he surely should have indicated that already quite precisely without going on and debating the entire issue. Therefore, I ask that he be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I do not intend to uphold the point of order and rule the honourable member out of order. He indicated at the commencement a series of areas where in his view there was misrepresentation. I have listened very closely, and he has been tying the statements made by himself and by another member. I will accept the point raised by the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the words "contending" and "contention" have tended to appear too frequently towards the latter stage of the honourable member's statement. Whilst he continues to refer to statements made against him and referring to the reason for his having made the statements associated directly with the factual information, I will not rule him out of order.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Given the state of affairs before the Minister made the formal announcement—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to reflect on the Minister's interjection by way of a point of order.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I meant the Minister of Transport's personal announcement on the O'Bahn system some time ago. The statement I made about guideways going along the ordinary roads was made prior to that statement based on information obtained in the documentation, including page 18 of the Christ document, and also a reference in the *German Tribune* of 1 June 1980 which indicated that guideways could go along ordinary roads. Therefore, it was not quite incorrect for me to make that assumption.

Furthermore, it has been asserted by the member for Todd that I said that the Government was against the l.r.t. system. I have gone through my speech of 23 September very carefully, and at no point did I make that allegation that the Government in general is against the l.r.t. system. Indeed, I gave the Minister credit for incorporating in the O'Bahn system the possibility for later conversion to l.r.t.

Also, the member for Todd indicated that, by relaying to this House comments of Mr. John Klunder, the former member for Newland, I was taking part in the misrepresentations that he was making. I have looked carefully at pages 42 and 43 of the report in question and I find that they are open to interpretation, particularly when viewed in the light of the comments made on page 3 of the Director-General's Report of April 1980. In this regard, if there is any misrepresentation it is certainly not intentional, but I do not think that there has been misrepresentation, because I feel that that matter is open to interpretation.

I wish to close on the point that, if the member for Todd wishes to juggle concepts and practise semantic gymnastics, he should be more truthful.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DAIMLER-BENZ

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. O'NEILL: The member for Todd made remarks earlier in this session on a matter about which I want to make my position clear. In the debate in question, I made certain remarks about the Daimler-Benz Corporation and the Chrysler Corporation. I stated:

I make no allegations, but it may well be that the

gentleman is applying his expertise in that area on behalf of the Daimler-Benz Corporation . . .

I further said:

I hope that I am wrong, and I certainly will be glad to hear any member dissociate himself from it.

I also said:

I will be interested to hear Government members assure me that they have no connection with anything that might in the least be unsavoury.

On the same day, in a personal explanation, I said:

I made no charges against him.

I know nothing of the proposition that the Minister of Transport, the member for Newland or the member for Todd may be receiving motor cars from the Mercedes-Benz Corporation, nor have I heard any statements to that effect other than the statement made by the Minister in the House today. I totally reject the insinuations made by the member for Todd that I was implying that he was operating on behalf of the Mercedes-Benz Corporation. I certainly hope that, if the \$15 000 000 contract goes to the Mercedes-Benz Corporation, such does not prove to be the case.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr. GUNN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr. RUSSACK: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee A be agreed to and that the expression of opinion agreed to by the Committee be noted.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I address my remarks to the report of Estimates Committee A, which is before us, and I indicate that this will be the first opportunity that I have had to comment on the Estimates Committee procedures that we have just gone through. This was a new experience for members of the House; it was an experimental procedure, and it was put into operation as a result of undertakings given by the Government as part of its election platform prior to the last election. As such, we on this side felt duty bound to co-operate in the procedures that the Government wished to follow, and we also felt obliged to attempt to give the experiment a fair go and an opportunity to ascertain whether it could work.

The Premier made a number of fairly lofty assertions in support of the new system. Much was expected, quite clearly, by the Premier and his Government. Their move was based, in part, on the experiences that they had over a period of years in Opposition, during which time they

experienced some frustrations and difficulties in regard to proper examination in the Parliament of the Budget and Loan Estimates of the Government. I indicated, on behalf of the Opposition, that we were happy to try the procedure and, indeed, we welcomed the attempt by the Government to give effect to those policies that it enunciated when in Opposition—that it would introduce such a procedure specifically to provide the Parliament, and particularly the Opposition, with greater opportunities to question the Government.

A number of things accompanied the procedure: one was the provision of more information than had been provided in the past, and this was greatly appreciated, although the value of that information was perhaps not quite as great as first glance at the rather bulky document that was provided would lead one to believe. However, more information was definitely made available, and this was extremely welcome.

I would also like to place on record that, in the formation of the Sessional Orders that put this new procedure into operation, the Government consulted with the Opposition and attempted to gain, and in fact gained, some consensus as to the form of those Sessional Orders, so I believe that the procedure got off to a pretty good start. It is only to be regretted that, within a day or so of our attempting to use this new experimental procedure, a number of deficiencies in the form of the Sessional Orders and a number of problems in terms of the Committee's operations were noted. That, in itself, is not something to despair about, because, quite clearly, both the Government and the Opposition foreshadowed that, as this procedure was an experiment, a review would have to take place at the end of the procedure to ascertain whether it had been effective. Clearly, problems would arise in the course of the experimental procedure.

The Premier, in introducing the Sessional Orders, emphasised what he termed the pioneering nature of what was to be undertaken. He said:

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 the Parliament.

I believe that that was a fair statement, and it was certainly appreciated. The Premier went on to say (and this is relevant to today's debate) that he would give a further undertaking to the House that the opinions of the Committees and all members, not only those who served on the Committees (and this has particular reference to either members of a minority Party or independent members of the House), as to the Estimates Committee procedures and possibly improvement of the Sessional Orders (that is, in future proceedings) would be carefully considered by the Government. He also said:

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.

That statement was also welcomed, and I am sure that it is one that the Premier wishes to put into effect. It is an important undertaking because, as the Committees proceeded, many problems, not only of procedure but, I would suggest, of principle, arose, which suggested that a total review of the procedure is needed. We must

determine how that review can best be conducted.

Clearly, the Premier has invited us, as members of the House, to express our views and no doubt this will be done during the debate. He suggested, further, that those views will be carefully considered by the Government prior to moving to establish some sort of entrenched situation in terms of Standing Orders. Obviously, when the matter reaches that stage, it is the Standing Orders Committee of the House that must examine it and make final conclusions.

I suggest that it would be very useful, indeed, if we had an intermediate step that concentrated specifically on the experience we have all gained over the two weeks of the Committees, that would look at that in a round-table Party situation, try to identify the problems, and propose recommendations to solve them. On the basis of a report, only after an exercise of that nature, should the Government itself move to formulate a final policy. I have written to the Premier along those lines, and provided copies to members of the minority groups, or the Independent members, in the House. I have made a specific proposal that there be a special all-Party committee of the House (by that I mean the opportunity for all to be represented by participation), and that it not have an entrenched majority of the Government because the object of the committee would be to try to reach some sort of consensus, or all Party report, and it should not be a Government committee but a committee of the whole. It is most appropriate that you, Mr. Speaker, should be the Chairman of such a committee, although I have not spelled that out in my letter to the Premier.

This committee should be established to review the experience of this year's procedure to consider all relevant submissions and comments that will be made on that procedure, and to make proposals that will form the basis of any changes needed. I think it important that the exercise be conducted in that way because, speaking on behalf of my Party, I indicate that we have serious reservations about the value of the new procedure in the longer term for effective opposition in this Parliament, and, indeed, for effective responsibility of the Executive to the Parliament. Those reservations I am not going to spell out in detail now, because I think that they are more properly explored in a different atmosphere in the sort of setting I have suggested in my letter to the Premier. I believe that they need to be explored.

Obviously, there is a wide range of views about the effectiveness of these Committees, not just on the Government and Opposition sides, but within the respective Parties themselves. I would be interested, for instance, to know of the considered response of the Ministry. I would like to know from individual Ministers how they viewed their particular experiences before the Committee, and the effectiveness of that proceeding. I know that, on my own side, obviously there is a difference of views among the various members who sat on those Committees as to the ultimate value, ranging from views that suggest that the whole exercise will not achieve the object suggested, to others saying that, with some improvement, it can indeed be very effective. All those views should be considered by a group specially constituted for that purpose.

I have also suggested some of the matters that the committee could investigate. Those matters highlight the difficulties that have been exposed during the course of the Committee procedure, and I will indicate them to the House. The first one I have listed is the means of participation of all members, including members of minor Parties and Independents, in the proceedings. That was clearly an issue which arose early and which caused

considerable problems. The problem of that sort of participation was anticipated in the Sessional Orders that we adopted. It was made clear in these Sessional Orders that all members of the House of Assembly had a right to attend the Committee proceedings and that the Chairman of those Committees had a discretion to allow them to ask questions after the Committee members had exhausted their line of questioning. Therein lay the problem. That clear rule was laid down and, in some instances, it was possible to implement it. In other words, after a reasonable period of questioning by the Committee, other members (sideline members, as they are referred to in some other State Legislatures) were allowed to ask their questions. In considering some lines, this proved difficult.

One of the problems was that the sideline members were not to know when their opportunity to ask questions would arise. That necessitated their being present constantly throughout the Committee hearing. Not knowing when their opportunity would arise, they had to be on the spot when it did arise.

Mr. Millhouse: A very boring exercise, I may say.

Mr. BANNON: That procedure has problems in it, although I add that it was the responsibility of members of this House who were interested in particular lines before a Committee to be there throughout the course of the discussion, for two reasons: first, if they were interested in a certain line, they should have been following the proceedings of the Committee, whether they thought them boring or not; and, secondly, the questions they wished to ask could well have been asked by the Committee, in which case there would have been no need for them to ask their questions, thus avoiding repetition. It seems sad to me (and this applies to the member for Mitcham) that some members did not feel that he had any real reason or responsibility to sit there throughout the parts of the proceedings in which they could not participate, awaiting the opportunity. The suggestion seemed to be that it should have been, in a sense, laid on for them to come in, get up and ask questions, and leave for other duties or obligations.

That is not on, and I suggest that the attitude of the member for Mitcham, in this area, has not been properly exposed. He attends the House when and as he pleases, not when and as he really should do so in terms of his responsibility. He says that it is boring. We know that he has legal and court work which occurs at the same time as the Parliamentary sessions, and that takes priority over Parliamentary sessions. We know that he records his attendance every day in the House, but his attendance is often fleeting, simply for the purpose of the record. He cannot deny that.

Mr. Millhouse: I seldom miss a day.

Mr. BANNON: That is true, but the honourable member does not take part in the proceedings. It is not good enough for him to say that he is being precluded from participation in the Committees, when he knows that he did not, particularly during those two weeks, often make himself available to take part when the opportunity arose. I do not want to go into that in any more detail, but I agree with him, in broad, that there should have been greater opportunities to participate.

I refer, in this context, to a specific incident that caused considerable problems in the Estimates Committee considering health. I have carefully read through the *Hansard* proceedings. I believe that the Government members of the Committee, particularly the member for Hanson, behaved in a most appalling fashion. That was probably the lowest ebb that the Committee proceedings reached during the two weeks they were sitting, because of the attitudes taken by Government members, particularly

the member for Hanson. They were aided and abetted cheerfully by the member for Mitcham. True, he had some questions to ask, but so indeed did our spokesman, the member for Napier, on a range of health matters have detailed and important questions, as did other Opposition members. They were embarking on that exercise, and the member for Mitcham quite rightly asked whether he would have an opportunity to participate. It was made clear by the member for Napier, on behalf of the Opposition members (the minority members on that Committee), that he would indeed have such an opportunity, and that it was appropriate that he should have. Rather than say to the honourable member, "You can sit there all day and hope you'll get your opportunity, whenever it turns up, by being there," it was said, "We'll give you an indication as to when you can ask your questions." That was an extremely fair and reasonable facility being made available to the honourable member. It could have allowed him to do what he wished to do during the afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: I could have gone to court if I had wanted to, because at—

Mr. BANNON: The honourable member could well have taken the afternoon in court if he had wanted to, but the important thing is this: the Sessional Orders made quite clear that sideline members, members not on the Committees, would have their opportunity only at such time as the members of the Committee elected by this House had finished their line of questioning. That has always been said in this situation. It was made clear by those members of the Committee that at a specific time they would ensure that the sideline members would have an opportunity, and they even said what that time would be. Surely, no greater concession than that could have been made to the member for Mitcham but he was not happy about that. He wanted to jump in as and when he pleased, and indeed some of the Government members, particularly the member for Hanson, moved to try to make that possible.

I believe the Chairman of the Committee was placed in an extremely difficult position. He was in a situation in which he could understand the need to give the sideline members some opportunities; he could also see that the members on this side were prepared to allow that member to have his opportunity; but in the meantime the majority group on the Committee, the Government group on the Committee, was in a very provocative fashion, I might add, through the member for Hanson, attempting to allow the member for Mitcham to get in virtually at will. The Chairman had to somehow try to balance those two demands. I do not want to traverse the merits of it any further; I think I have put fairly clearly our stand on the issue. We believe that the Sessional Orders as laid down should have been observed. That was what was being done in other Committees. It was understood that in the course of the proceedings the member for Mitcham would have his opportunities and those opportunities would be made available to him at a specified time. That was not good enough, and so a long procedural wrangle followed which wasted the time of the Committee.

These Sessional Orders were brought down by the Government; they were introduced by the Premier and they were the rules under which the Chairmen were going to operate throughout the course of the proceedings. The member for Hanson, in fact, was trying to change those Sessional Orders and distort the understanding under which sideline members could participate.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: It was a pity the discretion was taken away from the Chairman, wasn't it?

Mr. BANNON: The Chairman's discretion was there,

but the clear understanding of operation as agreed between us was that it was only when the members of the Committee, who had the primary role of questioning the Minister on those proceedings, had finished their line of questioning that the sideline members could ask questions. It was a great pity that that incident arose and that that wrangle took place, but it did take place. I believe it is one of the most important matters we should look at in the inquest, if you like, on the Committee system. We should do it on the principle that there should be adequate opportunity for all members of the House to participate in those Committees at appropriate times, and those times should be spelt out. We should not have Chairmen placed in invidious positions in the course of proceedings over balancing the respective rights of the members of the Committee as against the members of the Parliament, as occurred on that occasion.

I have suggested that the time limits on Committee considerations and flexibility as between the various sets of Estimates be examined. This was clearly another problem. Every Minister had a day set aside for the consideration of his Estimates. In some cases that meant a day comprising a morning, afternoon and evening session, and in other cases it meant only a morning and afternoon session. There was no real attempt to balance the importance of the portfolio—the degree of questioning that might be necessary for one Minister as opposed to another in the course of the proceedings. There was some slight flexibility in this; by reference to you, Mr. Speaker, the time of a Committee's session could be transferred to another day with adequate notice so that questioning could continue. On one occasion, that of the Committee considering the Premier's vote by agreement with the Premier, the Committee and yourself, a further one hour of questioning the Premier on a subsequent day was allowed. I think that was the only example of any kind of flexibility as to the time taken by questioning by members. Indeed, one of the real problems we had was in terms of the sessional times. There were several occasions when perhaps a further half an hour at the end of the day or the end of a morning session could have solved a lot of problems. On one occasion it could have solved a sideline problem experienced by the member for Mitcham. On another occasion it could have solved the problem of bringing a debate to a conclusion, but we were tied inflexibly to those hours of sitting as laid down by the House. That is something that ought to be examined and freed up in some way.

The third matter I wish to mention is that of the rulings of Chairmen. I believe that the Committee should look at all the rulings made by Chairmen in the course of these proceedings and they will find that, in some cases, there has not been consistency either in terms of the ruling or in terms of the procedure under which a Committee was adopted. Some of those are minor matters, such as whether members of the Committee should remain sitting or should stand when questioning a Minister. That is a fairly minor issue but one that perhaps ought to be worked out. Another instance was that in Estimates Committee A there was no restriction by and large on the number of follow-up questions a member could ask following a particular line of inquiry. In Estimates Committee B, a rule of thumb was established by which members would be restricted to no more than six questions before another member would be called. Again, I am not commenting on which is the better procedure, but I am suggesting that this inconsistency between the two Committees could perhaps be resolved by an examination along the lines I am suggesting. All those rulings should be looked at because they contain, I suggest, in some cases solutions to

problems in the Sessional Orders which are worthy of examination, and, in other cases, inconsistencies which should be ironed out.

The fourth point I have mentioned is that of the role public servants should play in the Committees. I concede that the Premier made quite clear when introducing the Sessional Orders that the participation of officers would be at the discretion of the Minister. It was interesting actually that early copies of the minutes of the Committee showed the officers appearing before the Committee as witnesses, and this was subsequently corrected. Certainly they did not perform as witnesses in all of the Committees. The Sessional Orders made clear that questions were to be addressed through the Chair to the Minister and that the Minister would provide the answer or, at his discretion, suggest to the Committee that a particular officer be able to make a statement directly to the Committee.

I would have thought that one of the great advantages of the Committee would be that active participation by officers. In the Committee of the whole with the Minister on the front bench and the officer passing notes from the box a lot of time was wasted and often information was not properly conveyed, and the advantage of having the Minister flanked by his advisers at the table is obviously, in terms of information gathering, a good one and one to be retained, but it is only of real value if the Minister is prepared to allow those officers to provide that factual information directly. Far too often we had the example of Ministers holding a whispered conversation with their advisers and then reinterpreting to the Committee what should have been fairly straight factual information. That I believe was totally against the spirit of the Committee proceedings.

It got off to a bad start because the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who appeared before Estimates Committee A on the first day, simply did not let his public servants say a word. He took all questions, and if he needed information he got it through the public servant while the Committee waited, and then he provided information in a reinterpreted form direct to the Committee. That was time wasting and it worked against the spirit of the way in which the Committees operate. On the other hand, I would suggest it must be quite clear as to what the public servant is there to answer and what the Minister is there to answer, and this distinction was blurred very much in some considerations of the Committees by the way in which the Minister chose to use his advisers.

In other words, the purpose of having advisers there is to provide factual information directly, not to be used as a shield or protection for the Minister on matters of policy which should be within his province to answer. We had at one extreme the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Attorney-General. Even when asked by the Committee whether or not he would permit his public servants to speak, the Attorney-General said, "Definitely not"; he would answer all the questions. On the other hand, we had the Chief Secretary whose use of his public servants in matters of policy was, I felt, quite improper, and I use that word advisedly. I think it is improper to force public servants to make policy statements or in fact to bolster the political aspect of a Government's policy or performance. That is not their function and it is invidious to make them perform it. That is why of course in Ministerial offices there are particular secretaries who are appointed at the discretion of the Minister in order to assist with that political aspect of the work of Government. It is quite proper for there to be so, and one of their important functions is to make that distinction between the political role that the Minister plays and the role of advice that the public servant plays which should not get him involved

directly in the political arena.

In the case of the Chief Secretary, for instance, questions were put to him by the member for Stuart on one occasion directly about the policies of the Government in relation to law and order. He quoted from the Liberal Party platform, the policy statements made by the Liberal Party before the election, and he said, "In terms of these Party objectives what is the policy?" Those questions were passed to the Police Commissioner to answer, and that was quite improper and a misuse and abuse of the public servants, and indeed if there was a case for guidelines for public servants that, I think, would be one instance—a Minister's throwing a question, which was essentially a political question about a policy matter, to his officer, and that officer having to cope with that question as best he could without directly entering the political arena. I think the Chief Secretary should be severely censured for the way in which he used his officers on that occasion. They are not there to shield or protect the Minister; they are not there to answer questions of policy; they are there to provide factual information directly to the Committee. There we have two extremes, and I think these extremes should be balanced and some guidelines should be laid down in respect of that, either in Sessional Orders themselves or by agreement as to just how that participation should work.

Then there is the question of adequacy of the Sessional Orders themselves which should be part of this whole exercise. I suggest that another matter which should be looked at by the committee is the opportunities for Opposition members to question members of the Government *vis-a-vis* those of Government backbenchers. One of the features of the Committee system which we had was that it provided an in-built guillotine procedure which was not present under the Committee of the whole. It meant that time limits were set beyond which the Committee could not stray, and on those occasions when we wished to deal at greater length with some issue or pursue it to some greater degree we were not able to do so. It was not just the constraint of time; it was the fact that members of the Government on the Committee exercised their rights to ask questions to a far greater degree than they had even done under the Committee of the whole procedure, and Ministers replied at far greater length than was ever their habit under the unrestricted time limits of the Committee of the whole procedures.

An examination of *Hansard* (and I think this should be done in a detailed statistical way, something I have not undertaken at this stage) should be one of the tasks of the committee to look at just how much time was taken up by Government Ministers, by Government members and by Opposition members in the course of the proceedings of the committee. I think that we would find that the ability of the Opposition to question the Government was severely curtailed as a result of that change of policy and of procedure. We are not suggesting that Government backbenchers be denied the right to seek information; of course they have that right and should be allowed to exercise it. However, there was not sufficient recognition of the fact that, by doing so in the Committees, they were effectively blocking out the Opposition for long periods of time and reducing sharply our opportunities for questioning that we had under the previous procedure. That concerns us in Opposition, and it would no doubt concern the Government when it found itself on the Opposition benches.

As far as Ministers are concerned, I think the length of their answers should be looked at. One of the widest abuses of this procedure occurred in the community welfare examinations. As I am talking generally at this

stage, I can refer briefly to the procedure adopted there whereby the Minister concerned, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, answered a question himself, referred it back to a senior adviser for further information, commented on the further information provided, then referred it to another officer to provide further information and, in the end, on one particular occasion, over 30 minutes was taken up with that sort of procedure. That, again, in a restricted time situation makes it extremely difficult for Opposition members to exercise their options in asking questions. That I suggest is a matter which must be looked at because in that respect our rights in Opposition have been quite severely curtailed.

Finally, I suggest that this special committee look at the experience of committees in other Legislatures. It is true that in the course of formulating these proposals the Premier and his advisers no doubt looked at procedures adopted in the Federal House and in other Legislatures (not many of them) where this procedure takes place. I suggest the all-Party committee ought to have the opportunity to look at those procedures, and to examine the way in which other Legislatures have had to cope with the sort of problems we have had on this occasion. I hope that this proposition is one that will commend itself to the Government and indeed to other members of the House. I have suggested to the Premier that this would be a constructive way of assessing procedures and of providing recommendations for future Budget considerations.

I believe that, without such an exercise, if we simply go into next year on the basis of a Government examination and assessment of members' comments, which are then brought down and put into the form of Sessional Orders, we will not have advanced this process at all. We have to do it on an all-Party basis, comprehensively, well before the event, before next year, so that we are not putting something together in a hurry when the occasion comes around. I would suggest, as an overall assessment, that this year, while an interesting experiment, has not been successful. Many changes have to be made; many problems were discerned which must be cleared up before we do it again. If they cannot be cleared up, perhaps we would be better to revert to the system which operated before.

I would like to turn from that to a particular matter that arose in the course of Estimates Committee A, and confine the rest of my remarks to that. In doing so I intend to move a motion and I think it appropriate that I do so at this stage and then proceed to speak to that motion, on the understanding that it will be voted upon at the termination of this debate on the report. I move:

To amend the report by inserting after the words "agreed to" first occurring the words "accept that the line Other Government buildings, \$22 100 000, be reduced by \$100"

That motion moved in that standard form in essence allows me to debate this issue and promote a vote of no confidence. I do not need a seconder under Sessional Orders. My purpose in moving that motion is to focus attention on a particular aspect of the Government Buildings programme as it relates to the development of law courts and court complexes around the Victoria Square area. Of course, this is the notorious issue of the Moore's building, one of the single most striking mistakes that has been made by this Government in its first 12 months of office and one which it has resolutely refused to reconsider in the face of what I would have believed to be not just tremendous pressure but also quite cogent argument against it.

It is a great pity that the Government appears incapable of listening or of modifying its dogmatic attitude to this issue, because I believe it is one that transcends a decision

of the Government and in fact affects not only the city of Adelaide but, in some senses, the State. It is an important issue, and a number of people in the community are most concerned about it. I believe that matters have not gone too far for the decision to be reversed or substantially modified.

Let us remember the context in which this decision was made. It was soon after the Government came to office that it would have had to consider a proposition that the previous Government had before it to acquire Moore's building. That proposition had been before the previous Government, and I must stress that at no stage had the previous Government made a decision as to what it would do with the building it was to acquire. It was concerned that the Moore's organisation was going out of business and that the building would be taken over. It was concerned that there would not be sufficient space for development for the international hotel project.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On a point of order, Sir, as Minister of Public Works, I must point out that the line referred to by the Leader of the Opposition does not relate to Moore's. There is no expenditure or planned expenditure under this line for Moore's or for the Supreme Court building. Therefore, I ask that your rule this motion out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot give a ruling at this stage on the point of order. I intend to take advice, and therefore I will permit the honourable Leader to continue his remarks.

Mr. BANNON: Thank you, Sir. If, as the Minister suggests, there is no planned expenditure in this line for the whole of the courts complex, or whatever, I would take advice as to the way in which I can introduce a motion on this matter. I believe it is a technicality.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If I can pursue the point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, now that you have received your advice, the Moore's complex has been paid for, and all the costs are coming from the Superannuation Fund. There is no allocation under the "Other Government buildings, capital works" line for the Moore's building, and it would be quite inappropriate for the Leader of the Opposition to use this line to talk about Moore's. Where else he does so is his concern, but I believe that he cannot ask for a reduction in this line, on the grounds that there is no allocation of funds for Moore's. I believe that your ruling, Sir, does not take into account that the funds are coming not from this vote but from the Superannuation Fund. I ask you once again to uphold the point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. However, I point out to the honourable Leader that he is in order in referring to Moore's building during this debate, as it was a matter before the Committee when the Attorney-General was appearing before it. I uphold the point of order; therefore, the Leader cannot proceed with the motion at this stage.

Mr. BANNON: I accept that, Sir. I will formulate an alternative motion. I believe that it is a technicality. I want to get this matter on and get the Parliament to consider it. In the course of the Committee's deliberations, when questions were asked on this matter, the Attorney-General informed the Committee that it was a matter for the Minister of Public Works, and that indeed it would best have been raised under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works. Later, he referred to the fact that the Public Buildings Department was having some consultancy role in relation to drawing up the plans for the building. If that is not correct, obviously nothing is being spent at all in the Public Buildings Department on it, and there is no point in reducing the vote for Public Buildings. I suggest it would be quite easy for us to find some other

element or item of expenditure in this Government Budget which we could use for this motion.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I should like to enlighten the Leader. All of the costs of Moore's, including design costs, have been covered by the Superannuation Fund, and the entire cost of design and construction has been capitalised into the cost of the building and covered by the Superannuation Fund, and then becomes part of the rent. Until rental is paid by the Government, there is no direct contribution by the Government to the cost of Moore's building, and I believe it would be most inappropriate under any of the lines, because there is no specific allocation for Moore's building, to debate a motion of no confidence or a reduction of a line on that basis. I think the Leader will have considerable trouble in finding any line under which there is an allocation of funds for Moore's.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the Minister's explanation; it really was not a point of order. I believe that, as the Attorney-General discussed this matter when he appeared before the Committee, the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to discuss the broad issues of the matter.

Mr. BANNON: I believe that this is just a technicality. It surprises me that there is no expenditure being undertaken this year on anything connected with court development. I intend to go on to this general matter. For instance, someone must have paid for the Hassell Report. Am I to assume that that was the Superannuation Fund?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am not absolutely certain about the Hassell Report. It does not deal with Moore's.

Mr. Crafter: The Attorney-General said it did.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It deals with the planning of the courts precinct overall. I understand that the company of Hassell Architects is doing the planning of Moore's building. Those costs and therefore, I presume, the costs of Hassell Planners, will be part of the Moore's complex. I think the Leader should realise that to debate specifically Moore's building and the allocation of funds for that purpose requires a debate on moneys involving the Superannuation Fund, and it would be most inappropriate to do that. I do not see any harm, from my point of view, in talking about the complex, but the Leader cannot move to reduce the line. That would be most inappropriate because there is no line to reduce, as there is no expenditure involved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable Minister that I have already ruled on that matter. The honourable Leader is quite entitled to discuss the need for further accommodation and other matters relating to the courts in this State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that the most helpful advice that the honourable Minister has just given to the Chair will not preclude his taking part in this debate later.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

Mr. BANNON: I am beginning to suspect that the Minister is not too keen on my discussing this issue, and I certainly understand that. I accept your ruling, Sir. If that is technically correct, certainly we will not move a motion on that line.

But we have a right to move it either in relation to the Superannuation Fund or in relation to Public Buildings expenditure. I suggest that the Attorney-General has misled the Committee quite considerably, and I refer to page 90 of the report, where he said that a planning team is looking at the facilities and needs of the courts with respect to planning the Moore's complex. The Attorney also stated:

There is also within the Public Buildings Department a project team which has the overriding responsibility for the

development of the Moore's site, and the question whether there should or should not be shops in the Moore's complex . . . is ultimately a question for the Public Buildings Department in consultation with me but acting on and taking into consideration any recommendations of the consultative committee.

So, the Attorney-General made it quite clear to the Committee that a project team was working on this. I understand that the people concerned must be paid salaries and, therefore, if that line is reduced, that project team will certainly be affected, and it directly revolves around Moore's. The Minister is attempting to say that not a cent is being spent on that court redevelopment anywhere in the Government. That is quite ridiculous. On page 90 the Attorney went on to say:

The question whether or not there will be any retail development . . . is largely irrelevant . . . It impinges upon the architectural work for which the Public Buildings Department has a responsibility.

That is within the purview of the Minister. The Attorney later refers to the Hassell and Partners report, which must have been commissioned and paid for by someone. So, there is definitely public expenditure taking place, and I shall deal with the device of the Superannuation Trust later in my remarks, because the Government is in fact attempting to shelter behind that somehow to justify the outrageous waste of public money on this proposal.

I refer to the fact that when the new Government came into office it was confronted with the question of Moore's, the international hotel development and the court development, all of which were under active consideration previously. It was made quite clear by the Premier that Moore's was not required by the Government, that no action would be taken to do anything about that building to save it as a business, or indeed, even as a building or facade on the square. On 11 December 1979 the Premier was quoted as saying that Moore's was not required by the Government. He was reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 16 December as saying:

The State Government does not have any plans for buying the building. Hopefully, someone will be able to find a use for the store. It is a fine building which adds character to Victoria Square.

Two days later the Attorney, Mr. Griffin (not the Premier, who in the past would probably have announced such things) announced that the Government planned to use Moore's for law courts. This was an extraordinary bombshell for everyone in the community, because, unbeknown to most people anyway, a major commercial proposition for the development and preservation of that store was in fact in an extremely advanced stage, and the Government's clear announcements that it had no intention of buying the building or planning its redevelopment had obviously affected those commercial considerations and those negotiations which were taking place. Therefore, it was a matter of some surprise to the community, which thought the Government had no interest in the building, and a quite devastating bombshell for the traders, who believed that in fact the retail component of the Moore's store was to be not only retained but in fact redeveloped, that a large amount of private enterprise funds, would be spent on upgrading and refurbishing that retail outlet. So, some shock waves were set up as a result. The traders' response was quite clear. It was one of immediate and sustained opposition.

On 19 December Mr. Myer Solomon, President of the Central Traders Association, was reported in the *News* as saying that the plan was a disaster, and he predicted that potential customers for the area would be decreased by 15 to 20 per cent. Indeed, there has been a major impact on

trade in that area as a result of Moore's building lying derelict as it is at the moment, pending the work's being done to upgrade it for court purposes. We have been told on city council statistics that there has been a major decrease in the number of cars using that area and in the traffic which used Moore's as a front gate, or front door, to the Victoria Square retailers. So, there has been a problem there, which has been brought about as a direct result of closing down that retail outlet. No wonder there was such an outcry from them.

On 21 December a deputation of traders saw the Premier, and following that the traders endorsed the development project which had been made by Mr. Jack Weinert. He has been accused in this place by the Premier of having sour grapes because his proposal was overridden by the Government decision. When one looks at what happened to Mr. Weinert's proposal, how in fact last-minute Government intervention virtually pushed him out of the market place, despite the firm proposal that he had, and the fact that he had a contract which was going to be put into effect, quite imminently, I think that to describe Mr. Weinert as having sour grapes is totally wrong.

He is pursuing his quite legitimate private enterprise objective in this case, and in doing so he had the full support of the Central Traders Association and the Victoria Square traders, and the members of that deputation made it quite clear to the Premier just what they thought about it. They launched, at some considerable expense to themselves, a press and media campaign explaining exactly what their stand was and why they thought the Government's plan was wrong.

The Premier's response, after some delay, was to offer a working party of Government and city council representatives to look at improving facilities in the trading area. This committee has turned out to be a complete sham. It was quite obvious that it was devised hastily to act somehow as a lightning conductor for the Government, and that the Government's intention was for it to do nothing more than simply quieten down the protest that was going on at the time, to make the traders and other members of the community believe that something was being done. It was a sham; it has rarely met and, indeed, it was told quite clearly by the Government representative on it (he has certainly said this to a number of members on the committee) that the question of Moore's was not negotiable, that that was to be used for courts regardless, and that the committee itself was fairly useless and irrelevant. I think that the view of that committee was expressed most clearly by Mr. Weinert at the public meeting held last Thursday in Victoria Square. I shall quote from a submission that he has written on behalf of the traders which was adopted by the traders and which is as follows:

Apparently this committee was basically only a sham to allow the public outcry, which at that time was very strong and extremely vocal, to die down, for after a couple of meetings which dragged on over quite a considerable time the committee was told by a representative from the Premier's Department that they had to accept the Government's decision on Law Courts in Moore's, that basically the committee was completely useless.

They are not my words but the words of the people involved in this enterprise. I think that makes the situation quite clear as far as the committee is concerned.

One of the members of the committee, an Adelaide City Council representative, Mr. Bambacas, at the meeting last Thursday pointed out that the committee had come up with very little indeed and that about the only thing that was offered to the traders was a few trees in the streets. I think that was what was said, and in fact Mr. Bambacas

announced that he was resigning from that committee because there was no point in his continuing his membership. He is one of the ward councillors for that area, a prominent member of the city council and a trader who knows the needs of the people he is representing, and I think his statement was extremely significant in that context; it is one that is certainly shared by all the other traders. The working party was a farce. I must point out that the traders made a quite detailed submission to the Government on 4 January in which they set out some clear proposals about what might be done in order to preserve Moore's.

It would not have cost the Government or the Superannuation Fund a cent; in fact, the Superannuation Fund could well have made some money on its investment by a lease-back arrangement that was proposed, which would have allowed the development of the building for retail and commercial purposes. That would have been quite an advantageous offer in regard to the Superannuation Fund but, of course, the fund was under instructions from the Government to redevelop the building for courts and it could not consider, without the consent of the Government, the proposal that was put to it by the retailers. That is a pity, because that proposal would have solved the whole situation, and the fund would have made some money and preserved its investment.

On 11 February, it was announced in the *Advertiser* that a major compromise had been reached between the Government and the traders which would allow the ground floor of Moore's building to be used for retail trading. The report appeared under the headline "Top level working party to be set up. Big plan to develop Victoria Square", and it was stated that the working party (which has since been described as a sham) would consider a number of plans for redevelopment of the square. The working party was to consider a wide range of very interesting matters, among which was a proposal that Moore's building be utilised for future retail use. It was made quite clear that that was the understanding of the committee and that that would be the sort of thing that the committee would consider under its terms of reference. This proposal was hastily contradicted that afternoon by the Government: an article in the *News* purported to correct the situation by stating that plans to use the buildings for courts would proceed. It was stated:

The Government would proceed with its plans to use the Charles Moore building as law courts, the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said today. He said there was no question of the ground floor being set aside for retail activities as reported in this morning's newspaper.

The Premier was commenting on the reports about the redevelopment. The article continued:

At this stage there was no plan involving the State Transport Authority building in Angas Street or the old E. & W.S. building in Victoria Square.

Nor was there any intention to devote the ground floor of the Moore's building to retail trading.

"I hope there will be provision on the northern facade of the building for a shopping arcade to link it with the proposed international hotel, but that would be all," Mr. Tonkin said. Just to set the record straighter, if that is possible, and to indicate the whole sorry contradiction that has arisen because of Government action, I point out that one must refer to the *Advertiser* of the following morning, 12 February 1980, in which the Premier made what was, in essence, the second correction. On that occasion, he corrected the *News* report. First, the Premier said that it was wrong to say that retail provisions would be allowed for—he said this in the *News* that afternoon. Then he said, in the *Advertiser* next day, that he would always be

prepared to see some retail facilities contained in Moore's building. He stated:

The extent of the retail activities would depend on the amount of space in the building not required for law courts. Essentially, what the Premier was saying was that he has always said that the working party could look at that question and the position of retail facilities. I suggest that no-one really knows the true position to this day, certainly not those people on the committee representing the Adelaide City Council and the traders, the general public, or the traders and their staff who are being adversely affected by this dreadful decision.

Having considered the contradictions that were made by the Premier, let us look at the Attorney-General's performance. The chief questioning of the Attorney occurred during the Estimates Committee procedure which is the subject of debate at present. The Attorney's performance was quite outrageous. He was asked a number of detailed questions that he first tried to field by passing them over to the Minister of Public Works, suggesting that this matter was not within his province, although he had pointed out that the provision of court space, the wishes of the judges, the steering committee which had been set up to plan and which would report to him, were matters for his concern. He suggested that he had considerable ignorance in regard to the matter and, in that context, we should recall that it was the Attorney who made the announcement that Moore's building would be converted into law courts. He made a public statement in this regard and outlined the Government's initial proposals. It was quite proper for members of the Committee to question the person who is in charge of law courts and the provision of space and who made the initial announcement concerning the use of the building.

Having said that he had little to do with the matter, the Attorney then proceeded at length to answer some questions. One would have thought that he was being frank with the Committee. The Attorney was asked many specific questions and, in most cases, his answers were vague, but they were vague because he claimed to have a complete lack of knowledge about the matters that were being discussed. He tried to answer some questions in relation to court accommodation; in fact, he outlined what he thought would be the future use of Moore's building in regard to the courts that the building would house. The Attorney talked about the possibility of redevelopment of Federal courts and a number of other matters, but he was not very forthcoming or frank with the Committee members. In answer to questions about the Hassell Report, he said that he had seen the report but that he had no recollection of what it contained. He could not remember what the report contained. Some time later, the Attorney made the amazing statement that he had heard no opposition from anyone in regard to the use of Moore's building as a criminal court complex.

While all this was going on, the members of the Committee who were questioning the Attorney were blissfully ignorant that a major statement was being released by the Minister of Public Works, in which the proposals canvassed in the Hassell Report were opened for public discussion. Public submissions were called for from the public, closing on 17 October, regarding the plans that the Government was developing for Moore's building and the whole courts complex. It is amazing that the Attorney-General, the chief law officer of the Crown, the man in charge of the development and of courts of law in this State, and the man who announced the original proposal, professed ignorance of a report (not a non-recollection of it) when obviously a Cabinet decision had been made to release the report for public comment. That

was a quite extraordinary performance.

We left the Committee at the luncheon adjournment to find, on one of the pages of the *News*, not only a report about the Hassell proposals but diagrams and information about which the Attorney had not seen fit to inform the Committee. It is little wonder that we returned to the Committee and moved a motion of censure against the Attorney, which he found some difficulty in answering. This was a great example of total cynical contempt of the Committee and Committee procedures, which will come under investigation and which, as we have suggested, should be considered by the Premier. There is no point in my going through the evasive and misleading responses made by the Attorney-General. I suggest that there is considerable conflict between what he says will happen, what he says is or is not negotiable and what he says is public reaction, and the true facts of the matter.

The Hassell Report is an extremely interesting document. The most interesting aspect of it is that the brief was not given to find the best and most appropriate way of providing court accommodation in this State, but involved the setting aside of Moore's building on the assumption that that building would be developed for courts, come what may, willy nilly, whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, and, putting that aside, what else could be done to rescue the surrounding area. The brief was fairly difficult and interesting. Certainly, the constraint on the terms of reference was the same constraint that had been applied to the ill-fated working party that was set up by the Premier and, as an example of the Government's complete intransigence in regard to this matter, it will not allow a consultant, a planner or traders who are vitally affected to look at or review the decision. That is out of bounds: nothing can be done about it, according to the Government. This is an extraordinary way in which to conduct public debate.

On page 27 of the Hassell Report appears a very significant statement. The report refers to the fact that the urgent requirement of the Supreme Court and the Central District Criminal Courts for additional criminal courts will be met and the activities of both the Local Court and the Central District Court will be consolidated and grouped together. The report states that this is a most desirable result, and continues:

The intensity of development in the Moore's building will leave much of the Supreme Court site vacant or under-utilised.

There is one of the extraordinary facts about this situation. The Government has earmarked for this sort of development a site on which there is plenty of available land and on which the Commonwealth has land earmarked, in turn, for courts development. It will intensively develop a retail emporium, a shopping store, the front door to the Victoria Square trading outlet, the second most important trading outlet in the city, and leave all of the adjoining site vacant, or under-utilised, in the words of the Hassell Report.

What an extraordinary proposition: on the one hand, it is intensively developing a retail complex, and perverting its use for courts, next door to an international hotel and in front of a major shopping centre, and on the other side of the road are large areas of unused land and derelict buildings waiting to be redeveloped. That is an extraordinary way to go about improving the court system and developing the site. What is happening now is precluding the development and upgrading of Moore's, using private money by private developers, while the Government leaves land under-utilised on the other side of the road. We could have two projects: a project for a Government court building on the site that has been set

aside for it, which will be generating employment and putting money into the economy. The Superannuation Trust could be used as a device to provide that, as it was for Wakefield House, for the Public Buildings Department's headquarters. The money being squandered on Moore's could be used for that project. Meanwhile, on the other side of the road, a major upgrading of an important retail development could go on, and not cost the Government one cent. We would have two projects for the price of one, instead of one project that will cripple the retail area, and little done on the other site, except in the long term. That is spelled out clearly in the Hassell Report, but its terms of reference precluded it from developing that point further. The report goes on to say (and this is more significant):

Although the "Moore's" development takes into account short term future requirements, there is little room available for future expansion. The space built into the "Moore's" building will, at the present rate of growth, start to become inadequate within five years after which time additional needs could only be accommodated by moving some of the facilities to an alternative site. The options involved in this regard are also considered in the next section.

There is a situation which is saying that not only is the Government going to develop Moore's building and pervert its use into law courts, but that within five years what is being done, the intensive development, will be inadequate. It will be useless. That is an extraordinary situation. Why is the Government not thinking ahead in the long term and embarking on a staged programme of redevelopment on the Supreme Court site itself and those surrounding buildings which it already owns? Why is it putting money into acquiring a retail store to do that, when that store is clearly inadequate and clearly very costly indeed for that purpose? The whole implications and logic of the Hassell Report are that Moore's building should have been left alone and the development that was to take place should have taken place in the land acquired and owned by the Government for that purpose. It is outrageous that the Government persists in its misguided decision when we are really looking at a short-term five-year proposal.

The Government is locked into the Moore's proposition for at least 40 years, under an agreement with the Superannuation Trust. That is the only way the trust will get its money back. Much money will be spent by the taxpayers in terms of the development over the next 40 years. The Superannuation Fund moneys will be secure, but it will be a cost both to the Government and the taxpayer. One of the main arguments of the Government is that the Moore's proposal is a cheaper option. During the urgency motion in February, the Minister of Public Works claimed that it would represent a saving of between \$7 000 000 and \$10 000 000 to the Government. That was based on the estimate that Moore's building would cost \$16 000 000. I suggest that all the evidence points to the fact that the cost has been a gross under-estimate. Much more work will have to be done on Moore's to convert it to courts than was originally anticipated, and it will cost much more. The \$16 000 000 talked about by the Minister will be about \$20 000 000 or \$30 000 000, on the figures available at present. We are looking at an increase of at least 50 per cent on the price quoted, after his claiming that the Government would be making a saving.

Remember, the leasing arrangement with the Superannuation Fund is based on a rental that escalates each year according to changes in the c.p.i. The fund's money is protected. The initial rental is 6¼ per cent of the total cost of the building at completion, including all holding charges and an allowance for interest on all moneys outlaid by

the trust. That information was conveyed to the Opposition by a letter from the Under Treasurer, who is one of the trustees of the Superannuation Fund. We have calculated that, on the basis of the building's costing \$16 500 000 (I am suggesting that that cost has escalated sharply indeed) and on the basis of a modest inflation rate over the whole period of about 5 per cent, the rent to Moore's over those 40 years for which the Government is leasing it will be over \$100 000 000. That is why Mr. Weinert constantly refers, in some of his more polemical attacks on the Moore's proposal, to Monarto.

While I do not agree with him about the value to the State of the Monarto project or its direct cost, it is certainly clear indeed that the waste of money, if there was one, at Monarto, about which people and the then Opposition talked, set against this Government's waste of money, dwindles sharply. Without going into that, we are looking at over \$100 000 000, and considerably more if the base price is above \$20 000 000 and if inflation continues at its present rate of over 10 per cent.

Mr. Crafter: We're not being left with any asset at the end of that period.

Mr. BANNON: As my colleague has pointed out to me, we are not being left with any asset at the end of that period. Undoubtedly, a new leasing arrangement will have to be entered into or, if there is anything left of the Victoria Square trading centre, the Central Market and the various businesses there, perhaps the reconversion of Moore's can take place.

One of the most extraordinary aspects (one has to keep using this word, because the project defies all logic) is that, while it was true when the original decision of the Government was announced in December that there was no absolute certainty of an international hotel going ahead, since then it has become a reality, and work has commenced on it. I would have thought that the fact that the hotel is going up on that site makes it even more compelling for the Government to change its mind about the use to which Moore's building will be put. The concept of having a major international hotel situated in a civic square next door to a group of law courts seems extraordinary. Surely, the amenity of the whole area could be substantially upgraded if people could leave their hotel and go into a shopping, retail, office-type complex that the Moore's redevelopment, as proposed by the private developers, would have provided, and from there into the Central Market and its facilities, and the numerous shops in that area (a major and important retailing area, the position of which would dovetail well with the proposal for the hotel). However, that is not to be. People will leave their hotel and be confronted with South Australia's law courts, with criminal courts, in a building for which access is restricted or barred. The facade will be there but, in terms of amenity of people leaving the hotel, there will be no benefit whatsoever, and, meanwhile, behind that facade trade is dwindling.

The fate of that area is in the balance because of this decision. One would have thought the reality of an international hotel in itself, alone, would have made the Government reconsider. Let me just turn to one final aspect of this whole sorry saga and that is that part of the proposal which introduces the concept of a remand centre on the site. It is an addition which I think makes the Moore's decision even more grotesque. The remand centre appears in three of the five options in the Hassell Report and, given answers by the Chief Secretary in Parliament recently, it appears that the Government is committed to a remand centre in the city. I remind the House that the problem of a remand centre is an extremely acute one. Adelaide Gaol is absolutely and totally

inadequate. Many of the problems we have in our prison system at the moment stem from these inadequate facilities. The problem is not only for the inmates but also for the people visiting them and for the people having to act as warders and guardians and run that prison. The Industrial Commission has condemned the Adelaide Gaol, the unions have condemned Adelaide Gaol, and it is high time something was done about it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the honourable Leader needs the assistance he is getting from my right.

Mr. BANNON: Under the previous Government, a decision had been made after an exhaustive examination of a wide range of sites, on the extremely difficult question of the location of a remand centre. The problem is that the Adelaide Gaol cannot be closed tomorrow and replaced by another facility; an adequate site has to be found somewhere in the metropolitan area within reach of the courts in order to house the remandees. It is extremely difficult, as the Minister would know—as he no doubt has examined the documentation on this of the previous Government—to find an adequate site within the constraints that something of the nature of a remand centre demands. A considerable investigation over a long period of time had taken place to find that site, and finally the site was identified and the final decision was taken. In fact, in the then Government's building programme the building of a new remand centre, its planning and commencement of construction was there, ready to go at the change of Government.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You put it right where the standard gauge rail link was going.

Mr. BANNON: It was an important decision, and no doubt the new Government has a right to reconsider it. I will deal with the question of that site in just a minute. The Government has a right to review it, but its review apparently is taking the form of placing that remand centre on that court site right in Victoria Square, right in the heart of the city. It is an option contained in the Hassell Report, but the Hassell Report, too, makes very interesting reading as to the reaction of various groups in the community to such a proposal.

It has been difficult to get any information on this urgent remand centre project from the Government. Apparently, the Chief Secretary is not prepared to provide much information. I wrote to him on 22 September saying that, during the last week, during Question Time he had answered a question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition concerning proposals for a new remand centre. I said that in the course of his reply he had referred to the former Government's proposal that the centre be built at Regency Park on a site on South Road next door to the State Transport Authority's workshops. Proposals were under way for a standard gauge interchange and the Islington railway workshops are there. There is a large amount of space on that site. There is a transport corridor which will probably not be needed because of the upgrading of South Road and there is space at the back of the Islington workshops that is owned by the railways. There is industrial development further to the north on that site. The site to be taken over for the Regency Park remand centre was not large; certainly it was very adequate for its purposes, and could be well landscaped and integrated. It was next door to the State Transport Authority's workshops and would not interfere with any other plans for the development of that area.

I wrote to the Chief Secretary and quoted his answer that the matter was examined by the Government and it was found that the development that it had in train for the

site did impose on that part of the metropolitan area, so the matter was not proceeded with. Presumably, that is the railway development that has been referred to. I went on to say that I would appreciate his advice as to exactly what development the Government had in mind for the Regency Park site, as the Chief Secretary had suggested. I received the following reply:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 22 September 1980 regarding the Government's intention with respect to the Regency Park site. I will have inquiries made into this matter and advise you of the outcome of my representations as soon as possible. Yours sincerely, W. Allan Rodda.

What an extraordinary answer! There is the Minister in charge of the correctional services of this State, faced with the urgent need to get Adelaide Gaol closed and a new remand centre built, saying to the House that the site which was identified previously was no longer suitable because of the plans the Government had for its development, and, in reply to a question asking what those plans were, saying that he will have inquiries made into the matter and advise of the outcome of his representations as soon as possible. I was not asking him to make representations to anyone. I was asking him to make answer a straight question, something that should have been within his knowledge.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Not within his knowledge.

Mr. BANNON: It clearly was not, although he implied to the House it was.

To whom was he making representations? It would be interesting to know. Certainly since then I have had no further reply. I followed it up with a letter on 5 October. I said:

I am not asking you to give any representation on my behalf in this matter. I am asking you for information, which, as the Minister responsible for this area, you should be able to provide, and information you clearly implied in the Parliament that you had. If you are unable to provide the information for which I am asking, I shall be forced to seek a direct answer from the Premier.

I do not know whether I will get any help from that quarter. The Chief Secretary is clearly unaware of what plans the Government has in mind for a remand centre and where it might be sited. The Hassell Report spells out clearly what the Government has in mind.

Is there any value or purpose of having a remand centre on that site? I would suggest, as the previous Government noticed in its exhaustive examination of possible sites, that that site is totally wrong for such a function. I think this can be picked up in large part from the Hassell Report, which refers particularly to the response of the judges to the proposal for the remand centre. At page 20, it says:

The Judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court, is strongly opposed to such a close link with a remand centre for the same reasons it would resist being associated with the Crown Law office or the Police Department.

The apparent linking of the Police Department, or indeed of the prison system directly with the courts obviously may imply in the public's mind some doubt of the degree of impartiality or independence the Judiciary has. That is a fair point to put forward. The report continues:

Remandees, it is agreed, would think they were being imprisoned by the court which was supposed to also fairly and independently conduct their trial and pass judgment upon them. It is also felt that, in the eyes of the general public, the independence and dignity of the courts would suffer through association with the remand centre.

The report goes on to say:

The opposition of the Judiciary to a remand centre in the Supreme Court precinct and/or in the same block cannot be over-emphasised.

It is obviously a basic and fundamental disagreement with it. The report continues:

The security and cost advantages for locating the remand centre adjacent to the proposed new criminal courts of the Supreme Court and District Criminal Court may not be as significant as they first appear.

That is something the Government could well note. Incidentally, on the question of security, it is clear that, if Moore's is to be used for courts, some elaborate tunnel system will have to be introduced to allow secure access by people who are using the court complex to the site on the other side of the road.

The estimated cost of that tunnel will be \$500 000. It has not been made clear who will pay for that. Is it to be provided as part of the Moore's development project out of the funds of the Superannuation Fund, or is it to be paid directly by the Government as part of any redevelopment of the Supreme Court site? The answer to that question would be interesting. On the cost question, the Hassell Report states that approximately 60 per cent of all remandee trips are to the magistrates courts which are, of course, located not on that direct site, and approximately 35 per cent of all trips are to suburban magistrates courts which are dotted around the city. The cost saving to the Department of Correctional Services has been calculated by the department at about \$32 000 per annum. Measured against some of the problems that a remand centre would cause on that site, that is not a very great cost saving at all.

Certainly, there is the advantage for visiting rights; it is much more accessible for relatives and people wishing to visit prisoners and for solicitors acting for those prisoners. That has certainly been an advantage of the present Adelaide Gaol situation. On the other hand, on that restricted site a multi-storey building, which is what would have to be produced, would leave no recreational space or ground space for people who are not prisoners but who spend in fact some months there on remand awaiting conviction or sentence. So I would have thought in terms of amenity, in terms of image, in terms of what a remand centre should be all about, to imprison people in a high-rise building in the centre of the city would be quite against the public interest, as much as the interest of those involved. So again we must look at a site outside the city. No comprehensive reason has been given why the site chosen by the previous Government is not acceptable but, if it is not, then let those reasons be stated and let another site be found.

Finally, we come to the question of where we go from here. At a public meeting last Thursday, a major shop in the area closed for an hour to enable a meeting to be held on its premises. The people who spoke were not people associated with the Labor Party. On the contrary, I think one or two of them would be quite pleased to say that they are active members of the Government Party and have been major contributors not only to its policy but also to its finances. I know that the former President of the Party, the member for Rocky River, would know some of these individuals and know the extent of their contribution to his Party; they make that quite clear and do not back away from it. On this issue, every one of them has described the plan as a disaster, as a sham, as an obsession by the Government, as not in the interests of either themselves, their employees or the community in South Australia. That is a pretty savage indictment of a Government from its own supporters and that has been one of the odd aspects of this whole situation. It is not as if it is leading luminaries of the Labor Party or members of the trade unions that have been making representations to the Government.

These are the very people to whom the Government

appealed at the time of the last election, the small traders in this city, who in fact put their money where their mouth was to support the Government in the course of the election campaign by that scurrilous job-rot campaign (many of them now regret it). These people actively and openly supported the Government, and one would have thought that at the very least they would have had the right to be listened to when the Government came to power instead of being treated in the shabby way they have been treated. They have learnt their lesson. At least under the previous Government, whether people were supporters or opponents, the doors of Ministers were open; they were received, listened to and their views were taken into account, and you will not get too many people in this city who would say otherwise. Members of the Government should talk to these traders about the way they have been treated, and they will see the major damage that has been done to their standing in the eyes of people who were their active supporters; I suggest that in many cases they will no longer be active supporters.

To a person they have condemned this proposal and asked the Government to reconsider. It was interesting that among the speakers was Alderman Condous, a Deputy Mayor of the City of Adelaide, who said that already, since Moore's had closed, the number of cars using council car parks in the area had declined between 15 and 20 per cent, a clear indication of the down-turn in business which will not return if the Moore's plan goes ahead. It is interesting that the statistic lines up closely indeed to the original prediction made by Mr. Meyer Solomon, one of the leading traders in the area, in December last year about the loss of trade that he thought would be experienced.

Alderman Condous indicated that the city council was not in favour of the Moore's plan, that in fact the Mayor had made personal representations on behalf of the council to the Premier asking him to reconsider the decision. I understand that the council is to debate this matter yet again to reaffirm its policy of opposition to this Moore's court proposal. All of those who were from the council at the meeting, Alderman Condous, himself a small trader with experience in business, Councillor Bambacas, similarly experienced in business representing the ward, and Councillor Ravesi, who is an active member of the Liberal Party, support the proposition that Moore's is totally wrong for court development and that there must be reconsideration of that decision.

That meeting was a clear, cogent expression of opinion to the Government. It was a warning from a large group of their own supporters about the betrayal that they had felt in relation to this particular retail area and the decisions taken for it. They passed the following motion unanimously:

That the Government be advised that this public meeting rejects the proposed law courts in Moore's building; that the Government be advised that this public meeting rejects a remand centre in the location proposed; that the Government be advised that this public meeting recommends Moore's building be used as a commercial enterprise along the lines recommended by your association president to the Premier by letter dated 4 January 1980; and that the State Superannuation Fund call tenders for a retail commercial office development in Moore's building.

Those are the clear wishes of the people living, working, getting their livelihood out of that area. Those are the clear wishes of the people who have used that area for their shopping over many years. Those are the clear wishes of the Adelaide City Council as put in representations to the Government. The whole proposal must be taken back to the drawing board and the decision changed. If the

Government sticks rigidly to this proposal, not only will this decision be costly to it and to the taxpayers and to future Governments in terms of public finance outlay but it will also be very costly to this Government in terms of the support that it enjoys in this community. It is alienating very rapidly and quickly some of the support it had and it is highlighting clearly that, if small business wants to advance and develop in this State, it should forget about talking to the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government and come instead to the Opposition and look at our policies and at what we did in practice and at what we plan to do in the future, because it will get a better hearing than it had from the group it supported at the last election. So, I move the following motion, which I understand is in order:

To insert after the words "agreed to" first occurring the words "except that the vote 'Public Buildings, \$56 131 000' be reduced by \$100".

I understand that the motion is procedurally in order to give this House an opportunity to vote clearly on this whole question of the court development project which includes Moore's but which also extends beyond it, as my remarks have indicated.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I want to make some remarks in relation to the Moore's complex, and to support the motion. The Leader's comments on the way in which this Government, particularly over the whole Victoria Square matter, has treated small businesses in South Australia are particularly pertinent. When one looks at the way in which some of the traders in that area have been treated by this Government, that treatment indicates that they have been indeed shabbily dealt with.

I want to deal with a couple of instances in which some of the traders have found themselves in grave difficulties as a result of this decision, and in which the Government has not lifted one finger to date to assist them in the predicament in which they have been placed by the Government, that predicament being, first, the financial difficulties in which they have been placed and, secondly, the difficulties in which they have found themselves in relation to their businesses generally, staffing, and so on.

I want to deal particularly with the position of Arturo Taverna. This was a long-established South Australian business with its headquarters in Moore's building, in Victoria Square. When this proposal was first made, the company employed 25 persons; now, the number employed in that business has been reduced to three—this as a result of the policies of a Government that pledges that it is in favour of employment, building up the private sector, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, *ad nauseum*. That is the situation: from 25 employees down to three. Furthermore, the takings of that business have dropped by \$10 000 a week.

That is only the tip of the iceberg of the impact on the whole of the Victoria Square area. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to figures released by Alderman Condous in relation to the car park, but I am told that the figures (15 per cent to 20 per cent down in the takings of the car park) are reflected across the board in the area. All of the businesses operating on a regular basis of 5½ days and half a night a week are finding that business is down by about 20 per cent as a result of the decision to close Moore's.

But worse is to come. In any modern planning theory, one knows that certain types of human activity should not be placed together. For example, one hopefully would not build a hospital next to a sporting arena, because of the noise. Again, one would not put a residential area smack on the doorstep of an industrial area. Likewise, any

halfwit could see that it is very undesirable to even consider putting a remand centre in the middle of a shopping centre, and next to a proposed international hotel. It is quite extraordinary that this should even be considered by the Government.

The Minister of Public Perks—Public Works, at least—was only too anxious to deny that the Government had made any decision on this matter, but let him deny in this House that the Government is actively considering the establishment of a remand centre on that site. The fact is that the Government is considering such an establishment, and that decision is causing great concern among members of the South Australian community, particularly amongst the members of the superior courts in this State.

I understand that the judges of the Supreme Court recently held a meeting at which they expressed their absolute and utmost concern about the proposal that a remand centre should be built anywhere near the courts complex. I understand that the Chief Justice has written in the strongest terms to the Attorney-General, objecting to this proposal and calling on the Attorney to oppose the decision of the Government, to reject the recommendation of the Hassell Report that a remand centre be established on that site. It would be interesting to hear from the Attorney on that matter. I suppose that, when the matter is put to him, he will deny that he has received any such letter, as he has denied previously that he has received letters from the court or representations concerning the whole of the Moore's project. As I understand it, the fact is that the Chief Justice has written on behalf of the Judiciary to the Attorney-General, expressing the total opposition of the whole of the Judiciary to the establishment of a remand centre on that site.

Well the Judiciary might express grave concern about this matter. As the Leader has pointed out, it would be a complete abrogation of all the fundamental principles of the division of the courts from the other arms of law enforcement, of the courts from the police, of the courts from the prisons, to ensure that at least justice is seen to be done, to ensure that the courts are seen and perceived by the community to be an independent arm of the judicial process. If a remand centre were to be established on this site, it would be a sorry day for South Australia.

I want to say something more basic about the proposal in general to establish courts in Moore's building, because I believe that that proposal has not been aired sufficiently. I made the remarks in Estimates Committee A that many of the Supreme Court and other judges were concerned about this proposal. They see it at best as a second class proposal, as a last opportunity to relieve the enormous pressures that exist on the use of courtrooms in this State. They are not at all happy with the proposal, but they feel that they have no alternative but to co-operate in its execution, given that the Government has made clear that it is this or nothing. It is in these circumstances, as I understand it, that the courts are continuing to co-operate with the Government, albeit reluctantly, on this matter.

It was not surprising to me that the Attorney-General should deny that he was aware of any concern being expressed by the judges. That was symptomatic of his whole performance in the Estimates Committee. It was interesting to see how the Ministers from another place, used to a more leisurely style of existence and a more relaxed atmosphere, performed when they were confronted by some members of this House. The Attorney-General, in my view, was the worst performer from the Government front bench in the Upper House.

Throughout the whole of his testimony, evidence and answers, or whatever you like to call it, he showed a quite

lamentable grasp of his portfolio. He showed that he had little real idea of what was going on in the matters the Leader has referred to this afternoon, when he said the Attorney-General had misled the Committee quite seriously. That is a clear indication of the fact that the Attorney had little or no knowledge of what was actually happening in his portfolio. He fumbled and floundered about and falsified his way through the whole of his evidence. One has only to read *Hansard* to see how many times the Attorney said that he knew something about a matter, only to be pulled up later and shown that he knew no such thing.

This Minister is the Minister in charge of the courts in South Australia and is responsible for promoting this Moore's complex plan. What we will end up with, as I said in the Estimates debates, is a situation where the courts of this State are spread from Wright Street in the southern part of the city virtually down to North Terrace. That is a very sad situation, and particularly in this debate is it sad, because one could hardly imagine a less efficient method of operating a court system than to have courts spread everywhere. Certainly, from time to time it is necessary to establish temporary court accommodation to take account of short-term demands for the use of courts, but that is no excuse for establishing a large complex of the type proposed for Moore's which will be inefficient, as that building will not be big enough to house even the current needs of the courts system in South Australia.

The proposal takes no account of the need for Federal or Commonwealth courts. No long-term planning is involved in this in relation to the Commonwealth. The Attorney-General made that quite clear in answer to questions in the Estimates Committee. Where is the long-term planning? Where is the consultation between the Federal Government and the State Government? It is nowhere to be seen, because in its bumbling innocence, to some extent, this new Ministry fell into office and found itself confronted with making hard decisions, and when, no doubt, they received advice from public servants, they simply accepted it without considering all of the ramifications. I think that we will very much rue and regret the day that the decision was made to build the court complex in the old Moore's building.

As I have mentioned, the traders in that area are gravely affected for the future of their businesses, and well they might be. It is the Premier's contention that this proposal will not drastically affect their situation, because the Central Market is established in that area. That completely overlooks the fact that the Central Market operates on Tuesdays, Fridays and Saturdays only. Of course, the stallholders are required to pay a licence fee which takes into account the use of the complex on only three days a week. The other traders in the area are required to make ends meet over a whole 5½ day and one night operation, and in light of that, of course, they have much higher staff overheads and the like. They are not able to operate simply on the basis of the trade attracted to the area by the Central Market on the days that it operates. They will all go bankrupt if they are forced to do that, and something must be done to relieve that situation at the earliest possible time. I believe the only reasonable proposal on the horizon is for the Government to realise the folly of its ways, to withdraw from the decision that it has made in relation to Moore's and either to turn Moore's over to a private developer or, alternatively, allow the Superannuation Trust to develop Moore's as a shopping complex. As the Leader said, it would very greatly complement the international hotel which is to be built adjacent to that site. If that is not done, some of the traders are bound to go bankrupt as a result of the decision

of this Government.

What will happen to these traders? Has the Premier given any indication that the Government will pay compensation to traders who have not been in the Moore's building but who happen to be nearby and who have suffered grievous financial damage as a result of the Government's decision, and who, at this stage, will not be able to gain compensation as a result of that decision? There are any number of traders in that area that one can think of who will be very seriously affected as time goes on by the decision to close Moore's. They have already found that trade has dropped off dramatically—that the cream has gone off the cake, so to speak. What are they going to do? Are they going to get any compensation from this Government? I think not. They will not be eligible for compensation under the law as it stands; it would be only as a result of the Government's showing a little generosity in compensating people for the dastardly decision that it has made that would enable these people to get some justice out of this sorry mess, but there has been no guarantee or indication of that from the Tonkin Government. This great friend of business is quite happy, and apparently is prepared, to allow the small businesses, the small traders in that area, to go to the wall without any compensation.

In the instance that I mentioned earlier concerning the hair salon which is owned by Arturo Taverna and which continues to operate there, that firm is still being charged the full rental that was being charged when Moore's was an operating concern. That shows an absurd attitude on the part of the Government, and a very unjust attitude when one thinks that this firm could have its business so drastically affected that its staff numbers dropped from 25 to three, but yet it receives no consideration from the Government and its rental goes on as before. When these facts become known, that is enough to drive small businesses out of this State in droves, and that seems to be what the Government is proposing. I believe that great pressures must be brought to bear on the Government in an endeavour to get it to reverse this idiotic decision, to get it to see the folly of its ways and reverse its decision, so that Moore's building can again be used as a retail complex, as it was used in South Australia for many years past.

While I am dealing with these lines, I want to raise a couple of other matters in relation to the extraordinary way that this Government seems to go about wasting taxpayers' funds. I have just received the answers to a couple of questions and I would like to refer to the information I obtained. On 30 September I asked a series of questions in relation to the recent Royal visit to South Australia. In question No. 568, I asked:

Is the visit of the Ogilvys to South Australia this year an official visit and, if so, what will it cost the State?

We find that it is an official visit and that it will cost the State of South Australia approximately \$5 000. I think that is a very modest figure and probably understates the position very greatly, but I was interested to receive that information, and to find that the reception at Edmund Wright House cost approximately \$2 000 of that \$5 000. I would be absolutely amazed if those figures were correct. I have no doubt that the overtime and the ordinary time worked by the Police Force in this State would have amounted to far more than a mere \$3 000 over the time that Princess Alexandra and her spouse were in this State. What I find interesting about that is in comparing it with another question that I asked (No. 394) relating to expenditure by the Public Buildings Department. I asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs the following question:

Did the Minister or one of his Departments hold a function

at Wakefield House on Friday 22 August 1980 and if so—

- (a) what was its purpose;
- (b) how long did it last;
- (c) who were the guests and what were their names;
- (d) who or which firm did the catering;
- (e) what was the cost of the function . . .

We find out that a function was held on that occasion and that its purpose was to acquaint visitors with the diversity of services provided to other Government departments by the P.B.D.

Specifically, it was stated, it was to enable family members to gain an understanding of the work done by individual employees in the department. The function went from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. and cost the State of South Australia \$6 000.

Mr. Slater: A swim through.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would not want to comment on that, but a nosh-up at a cost of \$6 000 to open a building is a bit damned extravagant, and I believe that it is kindly ironic when one compares the sum spent on the whole of the recent Royal tour by this Royalist Government (a mere \$5 000) with the cost for a nosh-up that went from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. The Government cheapskated on Princess Alexandra: I may write to her and tell her how she has been treated by South Australia.

Mr. Becker: She wanted to know how the Public Accounts Committee was going. She wanted to know about the committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Perhaps the Public Accounts Committee will need to consider this matter in good time. I believe that this sort of expenditure in regard to the opening of a building would not receive the support of the people of this State. There is no doubt in my mind that, if the Government or anyone else carried out an opinion poll and asked the question of the taxpayers, "Do you believe that \$6 000 should be spent on a nosh-up simply to open a Government department?", the answer would be a resounding "No", and every member opposite knows that. The point I want to make is that departments like the Public Buildings Department, which have large budgets, have a very great degree of flexibility within their budgetary allocations and, in light of that, they are able, merely at the stroke of a Minister's pen and sometimes at the stroke of a public servant's pen—

Mr. Lewis: Are you reflecting on the public servants?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member believes that what I am saying is a reflection on public servants, he can take it that way. I do not believe that that is correct, and I do not believe that he believes that this sort of expenditure is correct. If he does, let him say so in the House so that I can write to the people in the District of Mallee and tell them.

Mr. Lewis: I have said so. Read the Committee record.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have the honourable member on side, criticising the Government for this expenditure, and I am pleased that he has been fair and reasonable in that criticism. This sort of expenditure is not justified, and I have never considered that it was justified. The time is long overdue that large Government departments be brought to account for this sort of expenditure. This kind of thing goes on frequently in large Government departments, in which there is an opportunity because of large budgets to make expenditure of this kind without causing a ripple in the rest of the department's activities. When I was Attorney-General, I found, in regard to the Law Department, which has a relatively small budget, grave difficulty in that my Ministerial car was unavailable at one time or another and I had to take public transport to go around town or to go to my electoral office, because the expenditure on motor

vehicles in that department was tight and only a few vehicles were available, which were well utilised.

However, when I became Minister of Health, I was amazed to find that there was a spare car for the Minister's office that, effectively, remained downstairs in the State Administration Centre in case the Minister's car was not available. This situation was a pleasant surprise to me, but I hardly thought that it was a particularly useful method of expenditure of Government funds. I do not reflect on the office of the Minister of Health or the Health Commission: I merely say that, looking at the Estimates, in making decisions about these matters, we should pay a great deal more attention to the expenditures of large departments, because this sort of ridiculous extravagance of \$6 000 on a nosh-up is not justified.

A pamphlet that was put into my letter box the other day indicated that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is proposing a little junket to Bowmans and all members of this Parliament will be invited, as I understand. It is proposed that we will see the Premier go through some sort of circus performance by scrambling down to the bottom of a pit, no doubt with a silver dessert spoon or some other implement, to scratch out a piece of coal in a ceremonial fashion. I believe that that is a ridiculous waste of taxpayers' funds. In due course I will ask questions about that matter, and no doubt some interesting information will be gleaned, although there is a tendency by these departments to disguise and hide the expenditure that occurs on such occasions. I indicate to those who are interested that I will not go to Bowmans.

In criticising this expenditure, I am not saying that there are not occasions on which it is proper for the Government to entertain and expend public funds for such purposes, but close control must be kept over those expenditures. In the Estimates Committees, I raised a matter in relation to one Minister's expenditure on overseas plane flights, and I know that you, Sir, would not allow me to refer to those matters in this debate, because I refer to Estimates Committee B. The Government's policy, as laid down by the Premier's Department, is that Ministers will travel first class. That is not necessary: particularly on overseas flights, the business class is quite adequate.

As I have said before, I travelled economy class during the time I was a Minister, and I never experienced any difficulty in doing that; in fact, I found that the business class in regard to overseas travel was quite satisfactory and, internally, the economy class travel was all that was necessary. In some instances, I found economy class to be more convenient because, when one goes to Ministerial conferences, one is usually accompanied by officers: I often travelled with two officers, and we were able to sit side by side, holding discussions while we were in the air.

This Government should review its policy on first-class air travel, because it involves a waste of public moneys. I put to members opposite that it is surprising to find that, when they opposite are required to use their own funds or, alternatively, the limited funds available through this Parliament for air travel, not many of them travel first class (and I have checked on this through various sources). The Deputy Premier was honest enough to say that, when he went overseas at his own expense, he went economy class. Departments are not justified in spending Government funds in this way.

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

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I support the Leader's amendment. He raised, initially, some comments with respect to the effectiveness of the Committees established to consider the Estimates this year. I do not wish to

canvass the work, or otherwise, of those Committee at any great length, because I hope that the Government will see fit to establish a committee, as recommended by the Leader, to give further and more detailed consideration to these Committees. I believe that the committee system has fundamental problems; there are some merits to that system, and it must be explored, and a decision made on balance.

However, as the Leader has said, the Committee considering the Attorney-General's lines was a classic example of the breakdown that these committees can bring to the effectiveness of the role of Parliament in providing a check on the Public Service of this State and on Government expenditures. We found that information which should have been available to that Committee was simply not forthcoming. When the Attorney was put under pressure, he suggested that he would withdraw from the Chamber, and this indeed was a most unsatisfactory situation. Later, when the Attorney was put under further pressure, he told the Committee that it was lucky that he had seen fit to come into the Chamber. This is not a satisfactory situation, if we are going to get down to the real business asked of us in the conduct of these Committees. The information that the Opposition members were seeking on that Committee was of the utmost importance to the people of this State, particularly with respect to the Moore's building project. The Attorney, time after time, for three-quarters of an hour would not answer fully the questions asked of him. He admitted, in the afternoon, that he had, within his knowledge, a report that had been made public that very day. He said that he had not provided the detail requested, because it had not been directly asked of him by question. He saw fit not to volunteer some of this very important information.

I was disappointed that he was one of the few Ministers who chose not to allow his advisers to speak when, obviously, they would have had some further information to enlighten the Committee on this important matter. With respect to the report published in the *News* of that day which gave the Committee the answers to the questions it was seeking but which were not forthcoming from the Attorney, he admitted that the Master, who was his adviser during the morning, had not seen a copy of that report, although it outlined the future administration of criminal justice in this State, possibly for the next 40 years or so. He said that the Chief Justice had not seen a copy of that report either, but the Attorney said that he would in due course give him a copy of it. It would seem that a most unsatisfactory set of circumstances arose, whereby two Ministries, which should have been working in close co-operation with each other in order to provide this fundamental facility in the community and to ensure that it was established in harmony with the community, did not take place.

As we have seen again today, the Minister of Public Works has denied that his department is involved in the Moore's complex by way of expenditure. It is indeed difficult to stand together the various statements of Ministers. The Attorney, in the Committee, said that the report prepared by Hassell and Partners was a matter for the Minister of Public Works. He said, "It is his report, and he is responsible for it, not I." Yet, the Minister of Public Works said today that he was unsure about that report and did not believe that it was his department that was paying for it. So, we find that, in the long-term planning (and, as the Leader has commented, it is an expenditure involving the State in over \$100 000 000), there is little co-operation between the departments or the Ministries. A fundamental document, prepared for

discussion in the community, has not been seen by the Master of the Supreme Court, although the report suggests that the administration of the Supreme Court, the probate office, and many courts will be housed in that building, although he has not seen a copy of it. This, surely, must be information that should have been made available to the Committee, other than by the tedious way in which it had to be drawn out of the Attorney, and the unfortunate set of circumstances whereby the Committee received its information from the public press.

The Attorney quickly rejected any idea that the press should be called before the Committees to explain how it was able to have this information, whereas the Committee of this Parliament, whose function it was to scrutinise expenditures of the Government, did not have this information. We see, in this decision and in the comments of the Attorney during that Committee, that he stated on a number of occasions that he was not concerned for the effect that this decision would have on the traders in this area. He said that that was a matter for other people and other committees to concern themselves with. He thought somewhat equivocally that law courts were compatible with an international hotel adjacent to them and with some shopping development within the Moore's building itself, and he chose not to disclose to the Committee that a remand centre was also proposed within the precincts. He was unsure, in the morning, about a tunnel, or tunnels, which were to be built, presumably at the cost of the Public Buildings Department, to transfer prisoners from the remand centre to the courts complex. However, in the afternoon, when further information came to light, more details were given on those aspects of this proposal.

He stated, in the morning, that there would be a major transfer of the criminal courts of the District Criminal Court and the Supreme Court criminal jurisdiction to the Moore's building. He mentioned the numbers of courts that would be located in the Moore's building. However, the plans released publicly do not disclose any criminal courts being established in the Moore's building itself. Clearly, there is a conflict between the evidence that the Attorney gave to the Committee and that which another Minister had seen fit to release for public discussion. The Committee met on 1 October, and the period for public discussion of those proposals closed on 17 October; thus, 11 working days were allowed for community participation in this immense project for the redevelopment of the central city area, involving the effectiveness of the international hotel (a multi-million dollar project), the redevelopment of the Moore's building and its effect on the traders in that area, the establishment of the remand centre, the Commonwealth-State courts complex, the redevelopment of the Murray Hill building in King William Street, and the upgrading generally of the Supreme Court complex itself, the effect it will have on the whole future planning of Victoria Square itself, and on the rejuvenation of the central city area—these are massive considerations for the residents of this area, for the Adelaide City Council, for traders, and for the public generally, apart from the practitioners of the law (judges and others), yet only 11 working days were allowed to the community to discuss this matter, particularly as so little information was forthcoming on expenditures and policies with respect to this development.

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

Mr. CRAFTY: Before the dinner adjournment, I was beginning to comment on the Government's attitude and policies towards small businesses. It is now clear, after the 12 months that this Government has been in office, that

there has been an unprecedented attack not only by Government policies but also by other decisions such as the purchase of the Moore's building for a purpose other than retail purposes. These decisions have resulted in a great deal of hardship in the small business community. I will go on later to explain how some of the Government's policy decisions have affected the small business man.

We see that there is now some activity by the Government to try to make amends for the decisions that are obviously having this detrimental effect in the community. The speeding up of the introduction of the city loop bus service is obviously one way in which the Government is trying to appease the very angry traders in the central city area. However, there is clear evidence that this is too late; it is closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. Clearly, the Victoria Square traders have been sold out by the Government. The closing down of the Moore's building has clearly been an advantage to the Rundle Street and Hindley Street traders, and is the beginning of the decline of that very long-serving group of business people around the Central Market. The proposed upgrading of Hindley Street is long overdue, but again it is a further blow to the Victoria Square traders that initiatives have been taken at the local government and State Government levels in the Hindley and Rundle Streets area rather than in the Victoria Square area.

The State Government has, contrary to its much espoused policies of letting free enterprise have a free rein in its activities, closed down a viable retail organisation. Particularly disturbing is the fact that this store was closed down when an entrepreneur was prepared to take the risk, to buy the store and to make a go of it. That person was supported by the small traders around him and, no doubt, by many members of the Adelaide City Council. However, this person was not given that opportunity; his efforts were thwarted. Such is the Government's attitude towards entrepreneurship and free enterprise. That decision will for many years to come ring in the ears of many small business men.

I am concerned that no comment has been made about the loss of goodwill in the Moore's building. Undoubtedly, that was worth a good deal of money, and that seems simply to have been written off as part of the expenditure. So we see, as the Leader has said, the effects on many small business men in that area. Indeed, one small business man told me that he paid his weekly rent for his premises from custom from the staff of the Moore's store. Of course, that income no longer comes to him and, as a result, that man is in grave financial difficulties. In fact, a number of businesses in the near vicinity have had to close down.

Another area of concern is the purchase of the former Cox Foys building by the South Australian Superannuation Fund, no doubt, again, at the Government's encouragement. Here again, the Government is showing its willingness to assist the Rundle Street traders, that section of the community which was so vocal in its support of the Government at the last election. That building has for many years proven to be a financial disaster, and it will certainly be of interest to Opposition members to see how the Superannuation Fund can receive an adequate return for its investment in that building. Obviously, it is a hindrance to trading in the Rundle Mall area to have that building vacant and not fully utilised. There will undoubtedly be considerable pressure on the Government to use some of that building for public services and to further bring people into the central business area.

The Rundle Mall car park is another matter of concern, because it is obviously not being used to its maximum potential. No doubt, again, demands will be made on the

State Government by traders perhaps to improve the accesses to that car park and to ensure that it brings more motor vehicles into the Rundle Mall area.

A further decision taken by the Government recently was to buy a very important 2 per cent share in the retail trader, John Martin's, and to rescue it from several take-over bids. Once again, the Government has shown its willingness—almost enthusiasm—to intervene in private enterprise and the free market.

The hollow statements that we heard for hours on end in this House last year when the former Government introduced the legislation to secure the ownership of Santos for this State and in the State's interest is now seen clearly as rhetoric. The venom that we heard from Government members and those in other places with respect to their colleagues who crossed the floor and their hurried exits from the precincts of Parliament is now seen as being very shallow indeed.

The attitude of the Attorney-General when he appeared before the Estimates Committee in relation to the effects of the Moore's decision on the traders of the Victoria Square area is clearly evident from his replies. The Attorney clearly said that he was not concerned with the effect that this project would have on the business interests involved, and that that was for others to consider. When questioned about what advice the Government had taken and what information it had before it on which it could base its decision that retail trading should no longer continue on that site, the Attorney-General refused to provide that information. He said, "I am not prepared to indicate from whom I receive advice. I am prepared to indicate that a variety of people were involved in that decision."

That simply is not good enough. If a massive decision like this that affects literally hundreds of traders is taken, at least Parliament should have before it the information on which that decision was based. I should have thought that it was the right of the Estimates Committee to seek that information. We see this lack of concern for the small business man. I do not mean the Bureau of Statistics' definition of a small business man, namely, one with fewer than 100 employees: I am referring to the family trader, shopkeeper and the person who employs a handful of employees, many often long-serving people who are skilled in serving the public.

The Government's much vaunted pay-roll tax deductions to increase employment opportunities for young people is a clear indication of its lack of concern for this section of the business community. It helps big business only. The total failure of that scheme is an indication of the lack of response that the Government has received from its friends in big business, where 6.5 per cent of the money made available in last year's Budget was spent on the job creation schemes that were very much paraded around the community by the Government before it was elected. The promise of 7 000 or 10 000 jobs was very short lived because, within 12 months, we have seen that this goal simply cannot be achieved in this way, whereas many people have been fooled into believing that it could be achieved.

The statements made in the House from time to time by the Premier, praising the scheme and defending it, are now very much off beam. I predict that the scheme will fade into oblivion within the next financial year. The then Government told the people of South Australia that the scheme would not work, but unconditional promises and full-page advertisements in newspapers telling people it could be done carried the day and people have learnt that, particularly the young people in the dole queues in this State. Some 20 per cent of young people between 15 and

19 years of age are unemployed, and they looked for some help, but it has not been forthcoming. That is the tragedy of these ill thought out, ill conceived, and purely political schemes.

A series of Government decisions in the past 12 months has harmed small business more than anything else. Clearly, that indicates that this Government has a friendship with the big supermarket chains, the big business operators and the manufacturers, rather than with the shopkeepers and small traders. The Minister of Planning said publicly earlier this year that it was the intention of the Government to deregulate, or to remove planning controls from the State Government sphere to the local government sphere in relation to the establishment of supermarkets. There was a plethora at that time of plans for supermarkets throughout the metropolitan area, especially in the fringe and inner suburban areas. The Minister said that local government could control this matter adequately and that it was not a problem that should have been tackled by the State Government, despite the fact that this has been effectively done in other States, particularly in Victoria, where stringent controls are exercised on the over development of shopping facilities.

However, owing to strong public opposition to the Government's plans, legislation was introduced into this House to bring about a partial moratorium on shopping centre development. That will come up for renewal or for attention in the next few months. Many small traders in the community can exist only if there is a limitation of major retail shopping outlets, the conglomerates, usually based around the major supermarket chains. If they are limited, the small business men can survive. They are very much at the whim of the State Government, and they have received little consolation from the State Government about their future viability.

Generally, the State Government intends to move out of planning controls and to hand them over, wherever possible, to local government. The small business man and the shopkeeper depend very much on State intervention in this area to protect their business, their trading patterns, their employment of staff, and their ability to serve the local community. It is so easy to upset these long held traditional trading patterns by an unfortunate decision at the local level, where a local council might not have the staff, the facilities, and adequate information before it, or an ability to see beyond its council boundaries the effect of its decision.

The Government's fumbling, its mishandling, its lack of concern for small bakeries has been evident in the past few months. We have heard the story of the Balaklava bakery and of other bakeries, and the story is all too familiar: massive supermarket chains and bread manufacturers are combining to eliminate the small family bakery from our community. It is a tragedy indeed for the local communities, for employment, for trade training, and for old-fashioned genuine service in the community.

Just today, petitions were presented to the House by many members in relation to the future viability of butchers. I have 16 butcher shops in my electorate, and most of the proprietors have contacted me. They are outraged, to say the least, with the Government's attitude towards allowing supermarkets to enter into an area traditionally provided by family butchers, small business men who manufacture smallgoods, and other services provided by butchers, and the manufacturing of other commodities. Now they find that their skills, their traditions of service to the community, are threatened almost overnight by the ability of the Government to change the trading laws. Once again, we find that the

Government is showing little concern for the small trader.

That trader is often a person who lives in the community he serves, and belongs to community organisations and groups, the backbone of the many community services. On the other hand, the supermarket chain often has a manager who lives in another district. He employs mostly part-time staff and is interested in his career opportunities, moving to a bigger store or another State, and has little relationship with the community from which his business comes. A recent example in my electorate was the case where the local council and traders were planning to conduct a Mardi Gras later this year and were seeking donations from various traders. They were told by the manager of a local supermarket that he had no money available to use for such purposes. When he was hotly questioned, he found \$20 out of petty cash which he gave very condescendingly to the fund.

We must bring about a situation in which, if we are to have supermarkets in our districts, they are properly planned. They must not threaten long serving traditional businesses or attack the very fabric of our communities, and they must accept the responsibilities for so long accepted by other business men in the community.

In the Budget allocations for the financial year 1979-80, a substantial sum of money was made available for consultancies to be allocated by the Small Business Advisory Unit. The sum of \$180 000 was voted for that purpose, but only \$19 000 was spent. I was somewhat astonished to read the Minister's reply to questions about why such a small amount of money was spent. He said that the money had not been spent in the past because there was not the need to spend it. We know that there has been a record level of bankruptcies among small business men in this State and right across Australia in recent years, and I would have thought the need to provide assistance now to small business men was the greatest it has ever been.

The Minister went on to make a number of statements. First, he blamed the advisory unit and said that it is inadequate to deal with this work of handing out consultancies. He said that small businesses often do not understand or appreciate the need for consultants. I would have thought that that was what the Small Business Advisory Unit was for. He said that small businesses, if they employed consultants, did so at the stage when it was often too late. I would have thought that the function of the unit was to go out into the community and to advertise its services, so that it could provide services that were needed, not when they were too late. The answers are most unsatisfactory. Once again, this is an indication of the Government's lack of concern for small business.

The Budget last year provided \$6 000 000 for incentives for industry in South Australia, and yet the costs incurred in the reports before us indicate that \$2 500 000 of that money was spent. The Government is caught in the game of helping its friends who happen to be the big business men in our community, and it is neglecting its friends' competitors, the small business men. At times, the decisions made, particularly some I have mentioned in relation to planning, are ill thought out, reckless, and harmful. The decision not to enter the planning field for supermarkets is disastrous. Once decisions are taken to build a supermarket and to place that investment in a district, they are irreversible, and the effect can only roll on.

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

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to speak on a few of the votes taken by Estimates Committee A. The first matter that I wish to touch on concerns the matter

spoken about by my Leader in regard to the redevelopment of Moore's building for the use of law courts. I support my Leader's motion and feel that this House should support it. As has already been stated, the siting of the building is within the central part of the city of Adelaide. It is central to one of the retail nodes in the city of Adelaide. Obviously, the major retail node is Rundle Mall, but Victoria Square in past years has been a significant retail area, and at the moment it can possibly be considered to be on the verge of a threshold in regard to what its future holds.

A decision has been made to turn Moore's building into law courts, and that will have a powerful effect on what happens to the entire retail structure of that node. As has already been stated by previous speakers on this side, the decision to take away Moore's as a substantial retail facility will affect other businesses. It will not be just a reduction in the total floor area available for retail activity but in fact it will impinge on the success or otherwise of other retail businesses in the remaining retail areas provided.

The building is next to the proposed international hotel and next to the central market. It is at the eastern end of a strip of retail development that runs towards West Terrace. In many cities, it is quite common that major international hotels are designed to be complemented by a range of retail activities, particularly small stores, but also other larger types of stores. As this Government has made so much of the work towards building an international hotel, following the work that was started by the previous Government, it seems unfortunate that it has not decided that it is equally important to look at the whole area in which the international hotel will be situated.

In that regard, it would have seemed logical that retail development should take place within Moore's building. We know that would be the most logical use of the area in terms of economics, because we have already had indications from business men that that is what should happen, and they have made those decisions on an economic basis. They have made them on the business methods that they use in determining whether or not an area is a goer for a new retail enterprise. Indeed, it has already been stated that an investor was willing to take over the site and turn it over to retail activities. That would be an expensive programme for one enterprise to undertake, yet that business man had gone through the business procedures of analysing the profitability or otherwise of the area. He came out in favour of that area's being used for retail activities.

In any event, the other businesses in the area by their protests about the Government's decision in this matter also clearly indicate that they have analysed this proposal according to their own knowledge of business methods and the business world, and they know that the decision of the present Government is wrong. In that regard, the decision can only be taken as a bad one in regard to providing law courts on that site. It is a bad decision not only because it wastes land that could be used for retail development that would be located in the heart of one of the retail nodes of Adelaide, but also, as I stated, it will seriously affect the viability of the other retail outlets in that area.

To take away such a significant component is already having an effect and must further isolate those other stores and lead towards a further aggregation of the retail trade in Rundle Mall. Members know already that within the square mile of the city of Adelaide we have the most heavily concentrated retail activity of any city in Australia. In terms of sales per square foot, Rundle Mall takes first place in Australia in terms of that concentration. The decision to allow Moore's to close as a retail area can only

help increase that concentration within Rundle Mall at the expense of other areas. In itself, that will not be worthwhile for the development of Rundle Mall. It means that Rundle Mall will face pressures on a cost and rent basis for the small businesses that operate there. It will make their enterprises difficult indeed and tend to promote the establishment of much larger corporate organisations dominating the retail trade, rather than small local State enterprises.

It has been stated that the Superannuation Fund is developing the Moore's building and that when the building is redeveloped the Government will pay rental for the use of the courts. Obviously, the Government has to pay rent for law courts somewhere, and to that extent one can say that this project is not involving any extra money, but perhaps it is. Perhaps this plan is not the best use for that building. The figures that have already been suggested for the amount that will be needed to upgrade the building indicate that it will not really come out well from any cost-benefit analysis.

Moore's building does not seem to suggest itself as being ideal for use as law courts in terms of the space available within the building, and the cost needed to make that space useful. It would, however, be able to be a useful building for retail activity, while another centre, perhaps a new building, would be much more cost efficient for the Government in terms of the provision of court space in an area closer to the Magistrates Court and police headquarters, factors that have already been mentioned.

The other factor that has already been referred to is that there are other added but so far hidden costs in terms of relating the Moore's law court facility with the other facilities such as police headquarters. An indication has been given of how much it will cost to construct a tunnel from police headquarters to the Moore's complex. That figure is substantial and over and above the other costs that have been indicated as being required for the redevelopment of the building. The decision not to allow the Moore's building to continue as primarily a retail area is a bad decision. The attempts by the Minister this afternoon to try to stifle debate on this matter by suggesting that expenditure was not being undertaken this year were not good. That did not further the debate in this House, but made possible the interpretation that the Government does not want to discuss this matter. The Minister finally had to acknowledge that perhaps some funds were being spent somewhere in regard to the Moore's building and this was perhaps an indication that he was clutching at some last straw.

I hope the Government will reconsider its decision and see the wisdom of the Leader of the Opposition's motion. I hope the Government will see its way clear, on the basis of rational thinking, to support the motion. Accordingly, I hope all Government members will join with the Opposition in voting in favour of the motion at the appropriate time.

There are two other matters that I want to touch upon, one in regard to the engineering and water supply provision and the other in regard to the area of the Minister of Health. I am sorry that neither the Minister of Water Resources nor the Minister of Health is in the Chamber at this time. I would have thought that since this week we are discussing the proceedings of the two Budget Estimates Committees it would behove the Ministers to be available to hear the comments made by members and find out the points they wish to raise. Through the use of the electronic aids available in this House, I appeal to the Ministers, wherever they may be in the building, that they listen closely to what I say or perhaps they could come into the Chamber. I refer to the matter of water for the

township of St. Kilda. This is a long-standing issue that goes back many years to the days of the previous Government. My predecessor had lengthy correspondence with various Ministers of Water Resources dating way back to 1973.

Various studies were done which indicated that the project was not feasible at that time. Shortly after my election I was approached again by the community at St. Kilda. I looked into the matter, and I decided to make another approach to the present Minister; I did so in March of this year. I prepared a six-page submission to the Minister outlining the various reasons why I thought the development of a water supply to the residents of St. Kilda would be not only in the interests of that particular community but, indeed, in the interests of much of South Australia as a whole, pointing out the very great potential of the township of St. Kilda as a resort facility for residents in the northern areas. I am serious about that. Already we have some resort development taking place out there, and I think that I have had clearly indicated to me by people who own land out there that it will be stifled if fresh water is not provided.

I pointed out at the time that, if an investigation were to be undertaken very speedily and that investigation proved that it was worth while proceeding with such work, and if it were done in the first part of this year, there could have been substantial cost savings. I based my argument for this on a number of facts. First, at that very time, or within months of that time, it was proposed to start work on the provision of water for sections of the St. Kilda Road, so that the machinery was already in the locality. The cost of paying for the moving of machinery to that area had already been met; therefore, the costs of removing that equipment and then bringing it back at some later time could have been avoided. Unfortunately, that possible saving has now disappeared.

Secondly, I indicated that growth in the township and the facilities provided in that township were dependent upon the provision of fresh water, and the economic returns from that growth will not come until the provision of fresh water is achieved. Thirdly, I indicated that costs in the engineering field over recent years have tended to rise faster than the prevailing rate of inflation and that further delays in this matter could only increase the cost somewhat disproportionately, and that therefore savings could be achieved by an early construction of such a scheme.

As I said, I wrote a six-page typewritten submission to the Minister on this matter analysing the various factors that I thought were important, thereby outlining the parameters which any investigation the Minister wanted undertaken could follow. The various points that I raised could have been critically analysed by the respective officers within his department. The first response I had to my correspondence was on 23 April this year, and this was one of the Minister's printed pending notes saying that my matter was receiving further consideration. Then, in June of this year, I received another letter which stated in part:

A complete re-examination of the scheme would take approximately three months to complete and, upon receipt of his report, I shall write to you again.

In other words, another indication of pending consideration. That was 20 June; three months was the time given and, therefore, on 20 September I rang the Minister's office asking where the three-monthly report was. After some days I received another letter, this time dated 23 September, and rather strangely the letter is very similar in wording to the letter I received in June. The letter stated:

A complete re-examination of a scheme to provide St. Kilda with a reticulated water supply has been scheduled for completion early in the new year.

I am very disappointed that this has been the attitude taken by the Minister. I wrote to him during the first couple of months of this year; I asked for a speedy consideration in an endeavour to make use of cost savings that could have been achieved if the scheme was given a favourable go-ahead, yet all I have met so far are continual delays. First of all, the Minister gave me an indication that a report would be available within three months. Now I am told that I have to wait even longer—indeed, a further three, four or possibly five or six months from 23 September.

The people of St. Kilda will not be impressed by that sort of approach by the Minister. The Minister could have endeavoured to provide a much more reasonable and decent report much more speedily. In his second letter to me he says that it is not possible to complete the work any earlier, as this scheme is one of 12 queued for technical investigation at the present time. Now, I hope that the Minister has taken the queue of the reports in the order in which they came into this department. I hope that his indication here that my approach to him in March of this year is now one to follow 12 others indicates that the other 12 were in fact received by his office before March of this year, because, if information becomes available to me that some of those other 12 reports post-date my approach to the Minister, that can be taken in only one way, that is, as a slight to the community of St. Kilda, indicating that they have no worth or priority in the opinion of the Minister. In a community that has waited many years for the provision of fresh water I do not think that will be received well, and I can assure the Minister that I will be following up this matter rigorously at the earliest possible opportunity to analyse just where the Minister's feelings stand on the needs of the St. Kilda community.

I now turn to another area concerning the Minister of Health. Again, I note that the Minister of Health is not presently in the Chamber. I regret that, and I note again that I think Ministers should be present in the Chamber to hear the comments we are making. We are supposed to be debating the Budget Estimates Committees and to be coming up with some rational discussion across the Chamber, but it is very difficult when one has to talk to an empty Ministerial bench opposite.

I wish to raise a point on behalf of a group known as the Target Identification Group, which operates in the northern suburbs, covering an area from Tea Tree Gully to Munno Para. The Target Identification Group has the following aims. It provides home calls for mothers of mentally deficient children. It provides day care facilities for those children. It provides a domestic help service to those families. It provides a baby-sitting centre, and also provides a wide ranging community health programme. Basically, it is attempting to provide a service whereby parents of intellectually retarded children are able to keep those children at home in the family situation. It is trying to prevent a situation where families are forced to put such children under institutional care which cannot be of any real help to many such children, and which certainly cannot be of any real help to parents, who find such a situation very distressing on many occasions.

This group has already applied for permanent funding from the State Government, and it has also applied for some interim funding pending consideration of its permanent funding request. The first thing I want to know (and I really would have liked to have the Minister here so that she could answer this) is what has happened to the request by the Target Identification Group for permanent funding? Can they have some indication that in this Budget that we have before us now there is an allocation for a group which is trying to provide a desperately needed

service, a home-based service, the sort of service that we all acknowledge should be given priorities now? I should add that that group has requested interim funding on a six-month basis to provide funds for a secretary/receptionist for its office in the Elizabeth Town Centre for half a day each weekday.

Such a person would arrange for referrals for parents of intellectually retarded children so that their children can be referred to specialists, take notes of meetings, and be involved in skills training activities to help with the home-care programme. Also, they have indicated that they have a need for a house, or some other accommodation over and above what they presently have in their limited office space in the Elizabeth Town Centre. Again, I would have been interested in the comments of the Minister on this. Was this a goer? Was this a possibility? The only information I can find in the Budget papers regarding this whole area of care for the intellectually retarded is information appearing on pages 574 and 575 of the programme document. There we have indications of the funding that will be given to the intellectually retarded services programme.

We find that it is proposed, according to this document, that the funding will grow from \$13 191 000 to \$13 568 000, a paltry growth of 2.68 per cent in cash terms, after allowing for inflation, a cut.

I cannot be convinced that the demand for services provided by such a programme as the intellectually retarded services programme has declined in the last year. I cannot be convinced that there is less need now than there was a year ago. In fact, I believe that there was a very real area of growth that should have been attended to in this Budget, namely, as I mentioned before, the community-based programme of such an activity. At this point, 96 per cent of the funding of the activities under the control of the Intellectually Retarded Services goes to institutional-based activities and only 4 per cent to community programmes, like the Target Identification Group I have already mentioned. That is a serious imbalance, an imbalance that invited an extra allocation by the Government to upgrade the community programmes area from one twenty-fifth of the total amount to something much more reasonable and respectable.

I hope that the Minister will give an indication that such will be the direction of her department, certainly in the coming year, and most certainly in the Budget that will be handed down to us next year, because the whole area of community care of the intellectually retarded is a vitally important one. A constituent came to me in May of this year indicating just one of the many serious problems that face parents caring for intellectually retarded children. Her problem was that her son normally studied at the Gepps Cross Special School and she was a student as well, so he was out at school when she was out at school. Because of different vacation times, she found herself facing a situation early this year where her son would be home and she would be at school. Her son, who was not in a position to look after himself, would have been left at home alone. Naturally, she approached the State Government health services area to find out what could be done. The answer was a sad one, because she was told from one place to another that there was nothing that could be done. Strathmont was not able to assist her. In that regard, I find the comment on page 574 of the programme papers particularly cruel in its humour, because it states:

Included at Strathmont are beds for short-term family relief placement, beds for respite care to give relief to parents and next of kin in situations of crisis or to enable families to have holidays, and beds for hostel assessment. School

vacational day care programmes for intellectually handicapped children living at home are also provided.

My constituent could find no evidence of that being provided for her. I wrote to the Minister about that, as I was very concerned. The response I received read in part:

There are only a few possible sources of support in these circumstances. . .

It continued later:

This case has drawn attention to the plight of a number of people throughout the State who have retarded members of their family. Whilst services are being developed to meet these problems, in the short term such cases will recur from time to time.

That, Sir, is a sad commentary upon the provision of services to the intellectually retarded in this State, and it certainly underscores how inaccurate the comment in the programme document is.

I had hoped that the Minister would give some clear indication that families placed in this predicament could expect some respite, some early alleviation of this problem. It is only one of the many problems that face families which try valiantly to look after their intellectually retarded children at home. That is surely something we would all support as being much better than forcing the children into an institution—distressing both to the child and to the family. I think that this is a matter which will need constant oversight and constant review, and I give notice that I will not be letting this matter drop easily and will be looking forward to finding out what the Minister proposes to do on other occasions.

I hope that the intention of the Minister set out in the letter she wrote to me on that occasion was far more serious than her addressing of that letter, because it was written promoting me to Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Irrigation, Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and member for Salisbury. I was quite surprised when I saw my pay cheque, because it had not gone up. When I brought this matter to the Minister's attention, she wrote me a letter and apologised for calling me all those things, saying:

I greatly regret any implied discourtesy—

I just wanted an acknowledgment that it was a mistake: I do not think it is an implied discourtesy to be called the Hon. P. B. Arnold. I think he is not that unskilled, that he has some ability as a Minister, and it is not an implied discourtesy to be called that, but that is something I will leave for the Ministers to sort out between themselves.

One other point I wish to touch upon covers the areas dealt with by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Sadly, I have to note, yet again, that the Minister in question is not available. A constituent came to me some time ago who wanted to take part in a course organised by Community Involvement Through Youth (CITY). The course had possibilities for helping him to gain some skill development that might have helped him obtain a permanent position. He tells me that he was advised by the people at CITY that, to be eligible to participate in that course, he would have to undertake two days volunteer work in the office of the CITY programme. I think that that is a very bad way of organising an agency such as CITY, given the fact that we had seen in the Budget that there has not been the development of the allocation of the CITY programme to take effect of, first, the growing number of young unemployed and, secondly, the effect of inflation and many of the other problems facing young people today. I fear that requests such as that, requesting this constituent of mine to do two days voluntary work, are merely one means of helping budgetary cuts to be made in the allocations while, at the same time, not reducing services. It is surely in areas like this that the Government

has an obligation to see that the appropriate agency is properly funded to meet all the fair and reasonable administration costs.

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

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the Leader's observations and his projected motion and, while fully supporting his statement that there is a need for a special committee of this House to examine the workings of the Estimates Committees, I would like to make some further observations. First, I indicate that the whole idea of the Estimates Committees was a very laudable one, which was first put forward by the now Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition some two years ago. I supported the idea then, and I continue to do so. There are some people in the community who may have an inflated idea about how quickly one can bring a new system like this into successful operation. It is obvious that there must be flaws.

The people who worked out the basic rules of the Committees are to be congratulated on the successes they have achieved, although it is necessary to look at some of the failures that occurred. Basically, the real failings lay not so much in the ground rules, the Sessional Orders or the rulings of the various Chairmen (although one or two of those rulings might have been disputable—but no reflection is implied) but in the way in which some of the Ministers approached the Committees. By way of background, I indicate that, when the Premier announced this idea, it was clearly his intention that members of the Committee would be able to question public servants direct, and that can be found in the Premier's speech in *Hansard*.

Moreover, it was foreshadowed in the very controversial guidelines for public servants which were announced a few weeks before the Estimates Committees were due to sit, and, in fact, it was perfectly obvious that, because of the attention that had been paid to those guidelines, members of Parliament who were component parts of the Committees would address questions to members of the Public Service. That is why the Public Service Association and others, including I, had a perfect right to scrutinise carefully those guidelines and to criticise them.

The guidelines situation has now become an absolute mystery: when I asked the Premier during a session of Estimates Committee A about what has happened to the guidelines, he first said, "There are no guidelines," then he said, "We are working by common sense," and then he said, "I have written to the Leader of the Opposition proposing that a committee be set up to examine the guidelines." I was not privy to any such correspondence, but I later found that a letter had been sent to the Leader of the Opposition, proposing that there be a review of the guidelines by a committee, a thoroughly fair committee (I do not dispute that), made up of representatives of the Government, the Opposition, the Public Service Association and the Public Service Board, with the Ombudsman as Chairman. That matter is under discussion at present, and I am not critical about that, but I am critical of the fact that public servants who attended the Committees were placed in a very difficult situation, because the Premier had not withdrawn the guidelines (the guidelines were still in existence), nor had the Public Service Board (I emphasise) withdrawn the guidelines (they were still in existence).

Therefore, any public servant who attended was placed in the dubious situation of knowing on the one hand that the guidelines were in existence for the moment, and of being told by the Premier that, on the other hand, somehow the guidelines were not in existence because we

were working on common sense and, belatedly, finding that some kind of committee may potentially scrutinise those same guidelines. I hope that, if and when such a committee is established, it can produce a set of adequate guidelines that will assist public servants when they give evidence before the Estimates Committees in due course.

I now refer to the Minister's approach to various matters. As I have indicated, there must have been a change in the thinking of the Premier's Party as to the role of the Public Service in the Estimates Committees, because the foundation speech two years ago contemplated that members of the Public Service would give evidence and be questioned by members of Parliament, and we had the guidelines; yet, there was a clear and noticeable division of opinion and action between different members of the Government Party. The Ministers' performances were interesting. I was singularly unimpressed by the attitude of the Attorney-General, about whose performance I will comment later, and by the way in which some members of the press let him off lightly when he behaved so disgracefully and badly in this very Chamber.

That rather arrogant member of the other House insisted on answering all questions himself and, although better in form, because at least he did not have to turn around like one of his colleagues, the Minister of Local Government, who repeatedly turned to public servants, took up to five minutes listening to a stream of information, and then proceeded to relay that information to the Committee. That performance was singularly pathetic and inept. At least the Attorney, whilst his performance was very substandard, was not reduced to that pitiable extreme to which the Minister of Local Government was reduced. The latter Minister's performance made a laughing stock of the whole matter: it is hard to have anything more than pity for that Minister, in any case.

The Minister of Health had a fairly easy time, because she appeared before the Committee on a very controversial afternoon. I see that the spokesman on health, the member for Napier, is present, and behind him is the redoubtable Leader of the Australia Democrats, who is, no doubt, feeling a little sick and sorry tonight, hoping that his Party would pick up the Senate seat in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Just no doubt about that, in spite of the wickedness of the Liberals.

Mr. McRAE: I am glad to see that the wickedness of the godless has been removed. The Minister of Health, because of the behaviour of the member for Mitcham, ended up with a fairly easy afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: Not because I gave it to her.

Mr. McRAE: It was a very debatable afternoon, and it is hard to judge the Minister's performance, because she was harangued at length by the member for Mitcham, very well, of course (and I listened to his speech), but that is not to say that he did not take advantage of the rules, and good luck to him. It is hard to judge the Minister's performance overall. I believe that the Minister of Water Resources came out the best of all Ministers.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a surprise.

Mr. McRAE: Well, I must be frank and say that he handled his work on the Estimates Committee admirably, and he spoke honestly and frankly; he answered questions fully and did not hold back information.

When he was on top of the information and could give it himself, he gave it fully and frankly. When he was not able to do it, he invited his advisers to reply. Obviously, he had confidence in them and they had confidence in him. It

looked very impressive. I tried to be present when all Ministers and their officers were being questioned and I thought that, of all the Ministers, that Minister came out of it very well.

However, not so in the case of the Minister of Mines and Energy. The display at that Committee was quite incredible. That was the reverse. Instead of being like the Attorney and insisting that he had complete control of the whole show, the position was quite the reverse and at times public servants were giving to that Committee not only the benefit of their knowledge of the facts but also their ideas on what the policy would be. At one stage it was difficult to determine who was the Minister, because one officer had such an over-confident stance that one could be pardoned for thinking that he had completely overborne his own Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: He probably had.

Mr. McRAE: He may well have, as the member for Mitcham has said. Finally, there was the Chief Secretary, who is the only Minister in the Chamber at present. I am afraid that I was forced to take a fairly low opinion of the Chief Secretary's performance, not that that is wholly his fault, because I think that, with respect, Sir, your Government has loaded on to him some very difficult jobs indeed. It simply has not been prepared to accept some of its election promises and it has forced that Minister to work with material that is simply not adequate for the job.

Having said those things, it is quite obvious that there needs to be an investigation into how these Committees work. If nothing else was obvious, that was quite clear, and I hope that there will be a Select Committee. I think we have made a reasonable start but I think a lot of things need to be cleared up. I basically agree with what my Leader said this afternoon and the support he received from my colleague the member for Norwood.

I turn now to the Attorney, because his performance must not be overlooked. Of all the Ministers, it strikes me, the Attorney-General, as the person who is the principal law officer of the Crown and the principal law officer of the citizens of this State, has a bounden duty to be fair and equitable in every sense. Of all the Ministers, he is the one who has the hardest responsibility cast upon him not to dodge behind tricky and remote doctrines but to fairly face the issues before him and to fairly deal with those whom he meets.

The honourable gentleman's performance, to say the least of it, was lamentable. In the morning he was questioned at length on what he proposed as to the disposition of the courts of criminal justice in this State. The record of my own Government certainly can be criticised, and I have been the first to admit this. However, it is not to say that, because one Government's record can be criticised, one does not criticise the record of the next Government. That is a total *non sequitur*.

In the morning, the members of the Committee of which I was a part questioned the honourable gentleman at some length and in some detail as to his proposals for the disposition of the courts of criminal justice and, indeed, the courts generally in Victoria Square. If one looks through the *Hansard* record, one will see that over and over again I put questions to him. I think I was the leading questioner. You were in the Chair that day, Sir. The Attorney certainly did not answer those questions fairly. He did not indicate to the committee that he had in his possession that day in his office (I do not mean that he had it in a bag next to him) a set of options that the Government was considering and was going to ask the public to comment on.

The way the Government has a fixation over these law court buildings is such that, if I was a member of the

public, I doubt that I would waste time or money writing to the Government, because it has been made perfectly clear to me by the Attorney and then by the Minister of Public Works that they have a plan that they will proceed to enforce anyway. Nonetheless, we were told via the newspapers (that is the only way we got it) that there were these four options open on which some comment could be made, but the Attorney that morning deliberately misled the Committee.

What did he gain by it? This is what astonishes me. It seems to me that, if a Minister is prepared to be fair, frank and open, he loses nothing and gains a great deal. For instance, he could have said, "At the moment I cannot be completely clear as to what is going to happen but here is a general idea of what we are putting forward: these are the discussions that have taken place in their broad outline, although possibly we have reached no specific conclusion."

That afternoon, when again we had the opportunity to question the Minister, he adopted the most defensive and ridiculous of position. It would be quite an unforgivable position. He had the temerity to say that no duty was cast on him to advance to the Committee details of those projected buildings, because no-one had put that specific question to him, although he had been questioned quite directly about the disposition of the criminal justice courts and other courts in the Victoria Square precinct.

That was his response and he became so downcast about the whole thing that he asked whether he could leave, and I think he would have been very pleased if we had said that he could. That was a very poor example given by a Minister who, in that month, had not had a very good record. First, he had tabled, in another place, a most vicious report on a former Premier, and that certainly did not enhance his professional reputation. In a way, I was sorry for the Hon. Mr. Griffin, because I know he prides himself on his professional reputation. He certainly did not do his professional reputation much good by that vicious report that he tabled, nor did he do it much good when he acted as a censor on a film.

I am not saying that I supported that film: I probably would not have. Since he had not seen it when he made the first decision, I am not surprised that people should criticise him; that he did not take the option that was open to him to refer it to a committee already in existence surprised me. Then, a person who would be prepared to do those two things might also be prepared to behave the way he did that morning.

This is all in the background of one of the principal planks of the Liberal Party in the election campaign, namely, law and order. The Attorney had the temerity to say outright to the Committee that afternoon that the only complaint that he had received as to the law courts plan was from the retail traders in the area. That is not true. Judges of the Supreme Court have commented about it, as have judges of the District Court and members of the legal profession. I am amazed that the Attorney made that statement. I can only assume that he was somewhat rattled when he made it.

There has been no greater desire than that expressed by the judges of the Supreme Court to have a proper court premise erected in that area. Anyone who has any conception at all of the justice system need only go down to Victoria Square and look at the existing lay-out and the proposed area of lay-out to see how ridiculous are the current situation and the solutions. If you look at the existing situation, you will find crowded and clumsily arranged courtroom buildings, which provide little in the way of comfort or amenities for anyone, and a great deal of discomfort and, as regards the environment, they

present a very disorderly and jumbled picture. Alongside the majestic old Supreme Court is a tumble-down hotel; behind that, a wood-and-iron temporary structure; and behind that again a row of what were tenement-type buildings, now owned by the Government, all amounting to a most unedifying proposition.

What is now put before us is that the Moore's building be split up into law courts, with a tunnel running under Gouger Street. This Government is always talking about cost-benefit programmes, so I suggest that it look from a cost-benefit point of view at the vast sum of money being spent on this ridiculous proposal, when the simplest answer would be to demolish the Supreme Court Hotel and the various pell-mell heap of buildings behind it and erect a joint Federal-State court building along the lines of that which exists in Hyde Park, Sydney. The Federal Government, after all, is supposed to be allied to this Government. It has displayed continual and great generosity, not only in the Eastern States, but now in Perth, where a joint Federal-State court building is under construction. The same thing should be done here. It would cost a substantial sum, but the building would be servicing the community for the next three-quarters of a century, or so. At a reasonable cost, one could provide essential and reasonable services but, instead of that, there will be a most ridiculous situation: of all things, a remand gaol fronting Wright Street and the little lane that runs between the old Supreme Court Hotel and Solomons building.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not a little lane; that's Mill Street.

Mr. McRAE: Is it? I, for one, think it absurd, for all sorts of reasons, that one has a remand prison at the southern end of that street and Wright Street. It is quite unedifying for any resident of this city who takes justifiable pride in Victoria Square to note that at one extremity of the city is a large multi-storey gaol. It is simply unbelievable. There will be something like 200 prisoners, if the gaol is to replace the Adelaide Gaol as a remand centre. How will those prisoners get adequate exercise? How are we to deal with their visitors and the necessary parking? If the Chief Secretary has been down there, he should know that parking in Gouger, Wright, and King William Streets is already hopeless. Parking space has to service many areas, such as the Central Market; it now has to service the new international hotel. It services the law courts, and the area is surrounded by numerous areas where no parking is permitted. How on earth will that area provide adequate parking and facilities for the visitors, let alone for the inmates?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I thought it would suit a lot of solicitors.

Mr. McRAE: That would be a wrong reason. The Minister is putting that in a joking fashion, and it does not bear commenting on.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I wasn't joking.

Mr. McRAE: The Minister was not joking.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It wasn't put to me as a joke.

Mr. McRAE: Is the Minister suggesting that solicitors have asked that it be put there?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: They find it difficult going to Timbuktu.

Mr. McRAE: I gather that the Minister is saying that. If that is the case, those solicitors are a disgrace to their profession.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: You're a barrister.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and proud of it.

Mr. Millhouse: Justifiably proud of it.

Mr. McRAE: I thank the member for Mitcham, who is one of my colleagues in the same honourable profession. In justice to the Law Society, the Minister might well clear

up the situation and tell the House whether he has received such a submission. If he has the, society ought to be ashamed of itself for putting forward such a suggestion. First, it is absolutely preposterous that a multi-storey remand centre be built there. What absurd nonsense it is! One should look at the glories of the old Treasury building and the new glories of the other Government buildings set around, and offset that with a multi-layer gaol. How ridiculous and absurd! Not only that, but to burrow under Gouger Street and to hide this new white elephant, the new Moore's complex. What a nonsensical proposition!

Mr. Evans: Could you use some white elephants to do the burrowing?

Mr. McRAE: With the way in which the two Ministers have been liaising with each other, I would not be surprised if such a thing happened. The honourable member was out of the Chamber when it was discovered that neither the Minister of Public Works nor the Attorney-General is taking any responsibility for anything. Each washes his hands totally of the whole affair. How it will all be worked out, I do not know.

First, for the sake of the prisoners (alleged offenders, in many cases) and their families, in the long run, decent and reasonable accommodation should be provided in the Islington or Regency Park area, where it was first proposed, at a sensible price. Secondly, in the interests of criminal justice in this State, there should be a rethink by this Government not only as to the best disposition of the law courts but also as regards the funds of the Superannuation Trust of the public servants of this State. The Attorney-General wrongly thought that the Master of the Supreme Court was a public servant. I do not think that he is. I think that he is a judicial officer. The Attorney said that afternoon that neither the Master nor the Chief Justice knew anything about the plans. We have plans that the Master has not seen, plans that the Chief Justice has not seen, plans that the Parliament has not seen, and plans that both Ministers now wash their hands of in terms of a final decision, which were released to us through the news media that afternoon. What a nonsensical and stupid state of affairs! I hope that the Government will back itself up. After all, it made law and order one of the major issues at the last election, and made numerous promises about doing something in this area.

We are yet to come to the Chief Secretary's vote, because we are dealing strictly with Committee A. He ventured into the field a little while ago. I hope that he was consulted, and I hope that he was not caught as badly as was everyone else down here when the plans were produced from a newspaper. I suspect that this little scheme was devised by these two Ministers, quite apart from anyone else in the Government, except obviously the Premier, and then suddenly thrown on us all. I hope that, eventually, something can be done to bring this whole situation back into perspective and I hope that, in the interests of everyone, not least the retail traders (the Leader has said that this Government is already referring so many matters to committees, and I do not think that that is a bad thing), the Government will rethink the whole situation in such a way that the views of everyone can be obtained, not just the Government's untutored views, but the tutored views of people who have something to do with the administration of justice in this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): If any confirmation was needed of the failure of the new system of dealing with the Budget, it is this debate and the deadness that we see. There are at present 13 members in the Chamber, and that is despite a very good speech by the member for Playford. When he started there were even fewer members in the Chamber than there have been since dinner time. At least,

under the old system, when each line was considered separately and members had an opportunity to censure the Minister on that line, there was some life in the debate. However, now, under the new procedures, the whole thing has been killed. That matter has arisen only today.

I criticised when I saw the way in which the system of Budget Committees was going, and I watched in frustration and boredom. I acknowledged this from a distance on a couple of days during the first week. I thought that, as I was not getting much of a go in this procedure, I would perhaps approach the Parties and see whether they would put me on one of the Committees. Therefore, on 4 October, I wrote the Premier a letter, part of which was as follows:

My dear David . . . One result, whether expected or unexpected by you, is that Peter Blacker, Norman Peterson and I have, to all intents and purposes, been cut out of the opportunity to take part in the process. You may say that we have the chance to ask questions after the members (in effect, the Labor members, as the Liberals seem to be sitting there in silence) have finished but that means waiting, in frustration, for many hours and maybe even then not getting in. Why should Peter or Norman or I have to wait to take part in a Budget debate until everyone else has had a go?

I went on later to ask particularly that I might participate in the proceedings before Committee B on the second Tuesday, because I wanted to have a go at the Chief Secretary. I do not know whether that would have happened, anyway, as it turned out. I said:

Will you arrange, either with your Liberal colleagues, or with them and John Bannon as well, for me to be a member of one of the Committees, at least on Tuesday?

I then said:

I know that you and your Party prefer the Labor Party to the Democrats; you all have said as much through the mouth of Brigadier Willett, in explaining why the Liberal Party is giving its preferences in the forthcoming Federal election to Labor ahead of the Democrats. You may therefore not want to give any possible advantage to me politically. Nevertheless, I hope you concede that every member of the House should have the opportunity to take a part in the examination of the Budget. You may retort that not all Labor or Liberal members are on the Committees, but I have noticed that the Labor members have been swapped around so that those most particularly concerned with a topic have the opportunity to question a Minister. As well, I have no doubt that questions are influenced by discussions at Party or Caucus meetings . . .

That was the quite friendly letter which I wrote to the Premier and a copy of which I sent to the Leader of the Opposition in this place. In due course, only two days later (it was quite quick), I received a reply, which started:

Dear Mr. Millhouse—

An honourable member: Not "Dear Robin".

Mr. McRae: Certainly not "My dear Robin".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly not. One paragraph of that letter read as follows:

I would be disposed to comply with your request if it could be demonstrated that you, or any other member of the House of Assembly, had been, or were likely to be, denied the right of participation. However, the evidence does not substantiate your claim that, to all intents and purposes, you have been cut out of the opportunity to participate.

The Premier ended up by saying:

I can see no obstacle, therefore, to your asking additional questions at either of these Committees tomorrow or on subsequent days.

I must say that I was moved to reply as follows:

My dear David, I had expected a refusal from you to the request in my letter to you of 4 October to become a member

of one of the Budget Committees but I had not expected you to take five pompous paragraphs to make it.

Even then, you did not answer the question which I put in my letter. I remind you of it: "Why should Peter or Norman or I have to wait to take part in a Budget debate until everyone else has had a go?" I should be glad of a direct answer to that question.

Of course, I have not received a direct answer to that. Indeed, I have had no answer at all to that letter, and I must say that I have not done much better with the Leader of the Opposition, either.

Mr. Trainer: What did he say? He doesn't like "Dear John" letters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. He writes "Dear Robin" letters, though. He wrote me back a four-paragraph letter saying, "No, you will not be one of the members of the Committee on our side." I therefore wrote back to him and, in part, said that I was disappointed but not surprised by his refusal. I continued:

The insult implicit in the first sentence of your second paragraph, that I am an "independent", is noted and will be remembered.

I then said:

You are quite incorrect in the third paragraph of your letter. I expect you know that—

that was that special arrangements had been made for me to get in so that I could ask the Attorney-General about a bike rack but, of course, he was wrong about that—

If you do not know it, then you should. . . . There was no question of my coming back after lunch (surely two hours of bored frustration in the morning listening to inexpert questioning—except from Terry McRae—without the chance to participate is enough for anyone?).

Indeed, that is about how the matter stands. I will not waste any more time on it. I hope that something will come of the suggestion for a round-table conference, whether it be by way of a Select Committee or whatever, to try to get some sense into the system. Otherwise, if it is going to work as it is working now and as it has worked in the past few weeks, we might as well scrap it altogether, as it is most unfair and ineffective.

I now come to the one time of glory that I did have, thanks to the member for Napier. I was anxious to ask a few questions of the Minister of Health and, because her department involved only one item, it looked as though I would have to wait the whole day in that state of bored frustration before I had the slightest opportunity to get in.

The member for Hanson, sensibly, suggested to the Chairman of the Committee on that day that at a certain time other members should be allowed to get in because only one item was to be considered that day. However, the Chairman of the Committee on that day (I think that it was the member for Rocky River) decided that he could not do that because, most unfortunately, he regarded himself as being bound not by the Standing Orders but by some ruling that had been made by the permanent Chairman of the Committee, not contained in the Standing Orders at all, that the Chairman was going to see every Committee member before he saw any other member of the House who wanted to ask questions.

I say with respect that that was a cardinal mistake and not something that could have been anticipated when we were debating the Sessional Orders in this place. It was merely a ruling made by the Chairman at the beginning of the Committee's proceedings. That is one of the misfortunes of the thing. However, let me return to the story. Eventually, after two hours, it was agreed by the Committee that the Chairman should be able to call on other members, and then my good friends in the Labor Party, led gloriously by the member for Napier, walked

out. They were gone! They were not going to put up with the insult of letting the member for Mitcham get in. So, I went down to occupy the place reserved normally for the Leader of the Opposition, because I was the Opposition in form and in every other way on that occasion.

For the first time in eight years I was sitting on the end of the front Opposition bench and starting to enjoy it, when suddenly I got a request to move back to the second row. I wondered what on earth the reason for that might be. Not until afterwards did I find that the children in the Labor Party had sent in a message that it was not fair for me to sit there.

Mr. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, can the member for Mitcham give the complete details about this protest? There was no such protest.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. I will go back. I found out afterwards that the children in the Labor Party had sent in to the Chairman to say that it was not fair for me to sit in the front row; those were their places, even though they were not in the Chamber, and therefore I should move back to the second row. If anything would show how ridiculous was the whole attitude of the Labor members on the matter, that does. But it did enable me to put some questions to the Minister of Health, unhindered by the members of the Committee. I believe that they came back after I left, and I believe that it was at the behest of the member for Playford, sensible fellow—one of the few sensible blokes in the Labor Party, as far as I can see, at the present time.

It allowed me to raise with the Minister of Health a very important matter, and that was a complaint I had about the way in which I had been misled by answers to questions which she had given me on the I.M.V.S., and particularly on the question of the way in which animals involved in experiments had been treated. My complaints against the Minister on that occasion in the preamble to the question I asked were two: first, that I had been given misleading information by her in answer to a question I had put, and information which obviously had been supplied to her by Dr. Bonnin, the Director of the I.M.V.S.; secondly, and far more seriously, that she had known about that for many weeks before she took any action at all, and she took some action only because I pushed her into it.

It is a very serious thing for a Minister to mislead people in this House. It is far more serious when the Minister, having been told that she has misled, takes no action to correct it. The Minister, at any time after the complaint was made to her by Mr. Duncan Sheriff, could have made a statement in this House correcting it, or at least saying that she had been informed that she had given inaccurate information.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, tell him to shut up, John. He would do much better if he kept his mouth closed. The Minister should immediately have said that she had been told that she had given misleading information and she was looking into the matter, but not one word was heard from the honourable lady until I taxed her with it in the Committee.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: The House was not sitting to report at the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, indeed, madam, the House had been sitting for weeks after Mr. Sheriff saw you. If the Minister goes to that, let me find the papers and see when the man went to see her. Mr. Sheriff was seen by the Minister on 2 September, and he wrote to her on 16 September, nothing having been done in the meantime. Is

the Minister suggesting that this House was not sitting during September? She knew from 2 September that there was a complaint about information she had given in this House. She had ample opportunity, if she had wanted to, to make a statement in this place and to say that she was checking the information she had given, but not a word was heard.

I knew nothing about it until Mr. Sheriff came to see me about the matter two days before the Committee met and I had an opportunity to talk the Minister with it. Now, because of what I said to her on that occasion and the questions I asked, we had today a Ministerial statement from the honourable lady. I have the statement here. Let me say, first and foremost, that, immediately it was given, I telephoned Mr. Sheriff and reported to him the significant parts of it. He is entirely satisfied, from a personal point of view, with the withdrawal and apology, even though it comes in the words of Mr. Alan McGregor and not those of the Minister. I do not want to give any impression other than that. If I had not taken some action in this place, the matter would still have dragged on and we would probably never have heard about it at all. I note that page 8 of the Ministerial statement, which I have here, has been appended later. It is in different typing and obviously has been added hurriedly at the end. That is the part about the so-called inquiry into I.M.V.S. It states:

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that I am currently making arrangements for an inquiry by an independent consultant—

whoever an independent consultant may be. What does that mean? Does she mean a business consultant, or a professor at the university? What sort of a person is an independent consultant? No explanation of that is forthcoming. It is only in relation to the use of the laboratory and experimental animals of the I.M.V.S. The Minister said:

I have had discussions today with the Chairman of the institute council.

It can be seen how hurriedly the whole thing has been put together. In my view, we need more than an inquiry into the way in which animals are treated at I.M.V.S. I believe that this is only the tip of the iceberg at that institute. This was only one of a dozen or so matters which I raised with the Minister, and which she answered eventually by letter during the recess, hoping that there would not be too much publicity. I was scolded by the Premier for putting the questions on notice again after they had not been answered in the last session of Parliament. If I had not done that, this would never have come out. It is only

because Duncan Sheriff saw it in *Hansard* that it has come out. This is the only one I have been able to check, but I believe it is only the tip of the iceberg.

We need not only an inquiry into the way the institute treats its animals, but a general inquiry. Since I raised the matter in the Committee, more information has come to me which has confirmed my fears. I will say something about this, and I hope the honourable lady is listening and will in due course intervene in the debate and give an explanation. The answer which has caused the trouble is on page 184 of *Hansard*. Another sentence of it states:

An unknown but small number of greyhounds were operated upon by Sir Dennis Patterson's team from the Adelaide Children's Hospital prior to 1978.

I ask you to note, Sir, and you have a professional interest in this, no doubt, as well as an interest as Speaker of this House, that the answer referred to "an unknown but small number of greyhounds". The Minister should be aware of this, because the letter is dated 16 October. A letter has been written to her, and a copy was sent to me by the woman who runs the anti-vivisection union, Mrs. Rosemary Ball, pointing out that the number is neither unknown nor small, because the experiment was written up, as I know now, in the *Lancet*. The numbers are given in the *Lancet* of 1977. They were not small, unless we think 37 greyhounds is a small number. On page 1279 of the *Lancet* is a table setting out the number of animals that were used in these experiments—69 in all—and the kinds of animals.

Mr. Lewis: Were you among them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not go into that. I was called a mongrel by one of the Labor members when the blowup occurred in the Committee, but I do not think I am among these animals. Let me go ahead. There were 14 mongrels, 37 greyhounds, and 18 beagles used in the experiments by Sir Dennis Patterson. Of those, 17 greyhounds were subsequently destroyed. The last column of the table shows the total number of dogs surviving for assessment of stimulator effect, and 10 of the 14 mongrels, 16 of the 37 greyhounds and all of the beagles survived. Two of them had their legs broken, poor devils, but they were the only ones mentioned in the answer given to me. Not a word was said about the others. I seek leave to have a statistical table from the *Lancet* inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical material?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

DETAILS OF DOGS USED IN PRODUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL DELAYED UNION AND IN ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF BONE-GROWTH STIMULATOR

	Mongrels	Greyhounds	Beagles	Total
<i>Total dogs operated on</i>	14	37	18	69
<i>Dogs subsequently destroyed:</i>				
Wound breakdown	1	9	0	10
Pulmonary infection	0	4	0	4
Uncontrolled haemorrhage	1	2	0	3
Failure of intramedullary fixation	0	2	0	2
<i>Remaining dogs healthy at 8 week</i>	12	20	18	50
<i>Dogs subsequently destroyed:</i>				
Pulmonary infection	0	1	0	1
Solid fusion	0	1	0	1
<i>Remaining dogs with successful delayed union</i>	12	18	18	48
<i>Dogs subsequently died or destroyed:</i>				
Fulminating infection	1	0	0	1
Fatal anorexia	1	0	0	1
Displaced anode	0	1	0	1
Destroyed battery	0	1	0	1
<i>Total dogs surviving for assessment of stimulator effect</i>	10	16	18	44

(22 pairs)

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now every member will be able to see it, and I want to know from the honourable lady, who no doubt will be able to find out from Dr. Bonnin, why the full detail was not included in the answer. Perhaps it was *precised* out, as was some of the other that she said on that afternoon, but to say that a small but unknown number were used when it is written up publicly—and we know that in fact 37 greyhounds were used of which only 16 survived—I do not believe her, and I cannot believe her. That is not all. The experiment was written up, and the next month there were two letters of criticism of the experiment in the *Lancet*, which is an English publication, and the letters were from English people protesting about the *Lancet's* writing up experiments that were obviously cruel. The first letter reads as follows in part:

I read with horror the paper on electrical bone-growth stimulation in your issue of 18 June. The "experimental model" was 69 dogs—pain-feeling creatures whose most sensitive areas are their legs and paws—

and so on. That was from some woman in Birmingham. The next letter reads:

Space is at a premium in the *Lancet*. Why, therefore, publish that paper from the Adelaide Children's Hospital? The experiment on an injured man was relatively humane in 1841. What was done to "A mixed population of 69 dogs" was unjustifiably cruel.

The worst of it is that after the letters there is a little note to this effect, which I am assured by Mr. Sheriff this afternoon is inaccurate, and it must have come from the I.M.V.S. The Editors state:

We would draw our correspondents' attention to the Methods section of the paper: in both phases of the experiment the bone ends were fixed rigidly.

The experiments were approved by the Animal Research Committee of the University of Adelaide, one of whose members is an official of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

I am assured that that is just not accurate, yet that was the information that was apparently given by the I.M.V.S. at the time to justify what had happened. This is just not good enough. The fact that animals were being treated in this way at the I.M.V.S. at the time shows to me that something was very wrong with the whole organisation at that time. If it had not been for Sheriff, who was then rapped over the knuckles for bringing it forth, it might have gone on indefinitely. Indeed, the Minister has said today that he was totally justified in the complaints he made.

Mr. Hemmings: No she didn't.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes she did. This is what she said:

It is quite clear that the incidents concerning the animals reported by Mr. Sheriff were totally unsatisfactory, and he was correct in notifying the Director of the deficiencies.

The member for Napier had better listen if he wants to be the Minister of Health one of these days.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is a joke, I know, but he had better listen to what was said. Since then I have had another complaint, and the man told me that he did not mind his name being used. Mr. Peter McNamara got in touch with me to say that he worked under Professor Vernon Roberts at the institute from May 1976 to December 1978 and was involved in a number of experiments concerning animals which had no backing of the Ethics Committee. The note I have of what he said to me was that the animals situation was disorganised and no-one knew who was in charge. He told me that there had been a number of experiments on rats which were equally cruel to those on dogs.

Frankly, I am not satisfied with the way in which the Minister has left it. She has diffused the issue today, or done her best by making the apology that she made to Mr. Sheriff, which was a richly deserved apology. She has said that there is going to be some sort of inquiry by a consultant, and we are supposed to take that and be satisfied with it. We do not know what are the terms of reference, who the consultant is, and we do not even know when the inquiry will be. All we know is that it was only today that she discussed the matter with Mr. Alan McGregor. It is obvious that she discussed it today because it had to be before the House met and before she got the stick again in this debate for what she had done, or what she had not done.

Her real fault lies in the fact that she is apparently not prepared to exercise the function of a Minister and make decisions for herself and make up her own mind. Being a Minister is a decision-making job. You are given the information and you make the decision. There was, from the very beginning, absolutely no reason why the Minister should not have made up her own mind about these matters. In her explanation today she said that Mr. Sheriff would not speak about the matters to Mr. McGregor, and Mr. McGregor simply read the documents. He was in no better position than the Minister would have been in to make a decision on these matters, yet if it had not been brought to light I doubt that we would have ever heard anything of it at all. There was no reason why the Minister should not have read the documents as McGregor had read them and come to the same conclusion as he came to.

Frankly, on the documents, the decision to come to was quite inescapable. If she wants to be a good Minister, the honourable Minister had better learn what the job of a Minister is: it is to stand up and be counted and make decisions for herself instead of hiding behind other people until she is pushed into something. I am very angry about this, and I believe that the Minister has not acted well herself; she is not taking the appropriately strong action in the case of I.M.V.S. even yet. I had thought of moving for a reduction in her line of expenditure, but it is not worth it under these conditions. If I moved the damn thing now, about three o'clock tomorrow morning we would have a vote when everyone had forgotten it and when it was a mere form at the end of the debate.

If this sort of thing is to mean anything, there should be a debate initiated and the vote taken straight away; otherwise it is a mere empty shell and not worth doing. This is simply another way in which this system of Budget Committees is a farce and is killing the Budget debate altogether. I hope this is the only year in which we will have it in this form. I hope that if we will have it at all it will be vastly improved next time, and this is one of the improvements that should be made.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): We have just heard over the past 30 minutes the member for Mitcham speaking on his favourite subject—himself. We were promised by the Premier and his Government that the Estimates Committee system would provide an ideal opportunity for members to examine as closely as possible the Estimates of Government expenditure. This did not quite take place, and the reasons are varied. My Leader expressed those reasons this afternoon. In one particular instance, as a Committee member, I was led to believe that some

Government members were attempting to be unco-operative in making the Estimates Committees work effectively. On occasions there were long and protracted answers by Ministers and long and protracted questions by Government members. This varied from Committee to Committee. I served on four Committees, and on some occasions the Ministers did answer the questions put to them. They sought the assistance of their advisers, public servants, and I believe some Ministers did endeavour to assist and co-operate as much as possible.

However, as I have said, there were long and protracted answers by some Ministers and long and protracted questions by Government members. Despite the comment of the member for Mitcham that many Government members remained silent during the questioning, that was not my experience. Perhaps the most notable problem that we faced was during the questioning on the health lines, when the member for Hanson (who surpassed all of the time-wasting exercises I have referred to) sought to allow a sideline member, the member for Mitcham, to take precedence of Committee members.

Opposition members objected strongly to that procedure because, as I understood it, we had accepted the practice that members of the Committee would have precedence over sideline members, who would have their opportunity to speak after members of the Committee had done so. However, when the Committee dealing with health expenditure, commenced in the morning, the member for Hanson sought to give the member for Mitcham the opportunity to ask questions before Committee members had asked theirs. Then, following the luncheon adjournment, the member for Hanson moved a motion which sought again to provide an opportunity for the member for Mitcham to question the Minister prior to the conclusion of questioning by Committee members. As I have said, this was quite contrary to our understanding of the arrangement and did not apply to any other Committee deliberation.

In respect of Estimates Committee B, I was required to wait until Committee members had concluded their questions on transport matters before I, as a sideline member, could direct my questions, as Opposition spokesman on sport and recreation, to the Minister. I was prepared to accept that position, as that was the ruling and the procedure that we adopted, but I certainly was not prepared to accept the motion by the member for Hanson which extended the privilege to the member for Mitcham.

I point out that the member for Hanson has probably been the most vocal member in criticising the actions of the member for Mitcham, and quite justifiably so. We have an example tonight: the member for Mitcham has just concluded his half hour address to this House, and has now left the Chamber. I doubt whether he will be back this evening, as he has probably gone home. In the case of the Estimates Committee examining health expenditure, I objected very strongly to giving the member for Mitcham the opportunity to use that situation for his own purposes, being allowed to come and go as he wished without taking any responsibility. So, I think the person who suffered most in regard to this was the member for Hanson. The member for Mitcham has now come back into this House, and I am pleased to see that he has. No doubt I have encouraged him to return.

Mr. Millhouse: You'll have to keep up the standard or I won't stay.

Mr. SLATER: That is a matter you can decide for yourself. The member for Hanson has been the most consistent person in criticising the member for Mitcham's non-attendance in this Chamber, and he was most inconsistent on the Estimates Committee when he sought

to give the member for Mitcham precedence over members of the Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: He acted quite properly.

Mr. SLATER: He acted most improperly. He is regarded as a bit of a maverick in his own Party, and I suppose that is why he is occupying the seat that he now occupies rather than one elsewhere, but I do not want to say any more about that. However, I disagreed most strongly with the motion that he moved to give a sideline member the opportunity to ask his questions when he had the opportunity to do so at the conclusion of questioning by Committee members.

The Estimates Committees would have worked effectively if everyone had been prepared to co-operate. I believe that those members who do not represent the major Parties, the member for Mitcham, the member for Flinders and the member for Semaphore, were prejudiced in regard to their opportunities in some ways, but the practices and guidelines were agreed to and set down for the Estimates Committees this year. I do not agree that they worked very effectively, for a number of reasons. I support the proposals made this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the changes that should occur by way of a Select Committee, involving members of this Chamber and the Upper House, to ensure that the Committees work more effectively next time. It needs the co-operation of all members. I believe that the member for Mitcham, the member for Semaphore and the member for Flinders should have the opportunity to be on the Committees. I am not criticising that fact but I am criticising the events that occurred on the Committee considering health expenditure. I believe that the Chairman of that Committee, the member for Rocky River, was put in a very difficult and invidious position in having to decide whether or not the member for Mitcham should have the opportunity, through the motion moved by the member for Hanson, to take part in the Committee at the time he did so. On the question of principle and the question of practice that we had accepted, Opposition members had no option but to withdraw from the Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought it was childish.

Mr. SLATER: Those are your thoughts. When we returned to the Chamber and the matter of rescinding the motion was considered, I did say that I and some members of the Committee may have misunderstood the position regarding the Chairman's ruling. I am still a little unclear about that decision, but the matter should not have arisen in the first place, and I hope it does not arise again. I want to give all members the opportunity to participate in the Estimates Committees, as they should do, because the whole purpose of the exercise is to give all members of the Chamber the opportunity to question Ministers and obtain information on Government expenditure. I do not think there is anything wrong with that, but we need to consider very carefully the operation of the Estimates Committees next year and ensure that such events do not occur again. As I say, I am sorry that the situation occurred, because I did use rather intemperate language to the member for Mitcham. I certainly have apologised to him privately, but at the time I thought he acted rather disgracefully.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't do anything.

Mr. SLATER: You wanted to use the opportunity to take over the situation, and perhaps we gave you the opportunity to do that. At the same time, I thought your actions were disgraceful, and I thought the actions of the member for Hanson were even more disgraceful. If the Committee system is to be effective it requires a precise understanding of Sessional Orders and the co-operation of all members and Ministers.

That is why I support the Leader's proposal this afternoon to form a special committee to ensure that incidents of the nature that I have described do not occur again and that we are able effectively to provide the opportunity for all members to question Ministers regarding the Estimates.

I turn to consideration of that part of the Estimates before Committee A that dealt with housing. I have no complaint about the way in which the Minister, the Hon. Murray Hill, provided information to that Committee. There is, however, no doubt from the answers given by the Minister that there is a philosophical difference between my ideas and Government policies with respect to the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust and its role in the public housing sector. This was certainly indicated during the Estimates Committee hearing. I questioned the Minister regarding funds provided for emergency housing. The amount allocated is \$239 000, which is largely taken up by salaries, \$114 000, rehousing assistance, \$70 000, and operating expenses, \$55 000.

I asked the Minister to provide me with information regarding the number of persons who had been assisted by the emergency housing office. He did not have that information available, but has now provided me with that information through the Chairman of the Committee. The letter I have received states:

I refer to the question raised during the Estimates Committee debate on 7 October 1980 by Mr. Slater, M.P., regarding assistance given by the Emergency Housing Office. From 1 October 1979 to 30 September 1980, 4 104 households, that is, approximately 17 000 persons, were assisted by the Emergency Housing Office. This assistance included rehousing in the private sector, advice and advocacy to assist persons to remain in existing accommodation and allocation of emergency housing with voluntary organisations.

I am a little unclear about the reference in that reply to 4 104 households, of approximately 17 000 persons, being assisted by the Emergency Housing Office. I conclude from the remaining part of the answer that they are persons who made inquiries of the Emergency Housing Office. The question I raised was how many persons had been assisted in obtaining housing by the Emergency Housing Office. I may seek further information from the Minister regarding this answer, because I find it difficult to conclude that 4 104 households have been assisted by the Emergency Housing Office regarding the obtaining of accommodation. The office is located in the Housing Trust, but there are still some 18 600 waiting for accommodation from the South Australian Housing Trust.

I want to say something now about the South Australian Housing Trust's activities. First, we all know that the trust was the first State housing instrumentality. It commenced operations in 1936. The most important difference that has occurred over the years, by comparison to other States' instrumentalities, is that the South Australian Housing Trust has provided housing for a broader section of the population. The trust at present still owns a higher proportion of its housing stock than does any other State organisation. I would like to quote from an article written by a Mr. Jim Kemeny, a Research Fellow at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham, England, who was previously a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics, University of Adelaide. This article is entitled "The South Australian Housing Trust: A Socioeconomic Case Study in Public Housing", which states, regarding housing stocks in South Australia:

The relatively large size of the public housing stock in South Australia is only partly as a result of the role of the trust in the industrialisation of the State: Equally important

has been the low percentage of public houses sold into owner occupation. Unlike all the other Australian public housing authorities, the trust has sold hardly any of its rental stock into owner occupation. At least until recently much of the stock has been built as double or multiple units, none of which can be sold because they do not possess separate titles. Like the other authorities, the trust does build houses directly for sale in addition to the rental housing construction programme. Although it is not possible from the annual reports to distinguish between houses built for sale and houses sold to sitting tenants, the overall sales data give a good indication of the differences between the States. Thus, whereas the Queensland Housing Commission has built slightly more dwellings than the trust [the South Australian Housing Trust], it possesses a rental stock little more than half the size of the trust.

The policy of retaining possession of most rental dwellings has had a major impact upon the trust's rent levels. An important characteristic of the sale of dwellings to sitting tenants in Australia has been the fact that the houses were sold at a discount and often with generous mortgages: in effect, transferring the low interest long term Government loan from the housing authority's rental stock to an ex-tenant owner-occupier. The policy of selling rental dwellings which cannot be replaced has two major consequences. The first is that since purchasing tenants are disproportionately drawn from among the higher income earners of the public tenants the proportion of tenants requiring a rental rebate is necessarily increased.

I point out that over the past seven years the persons receiving rental rebates from the trust who are socially disadvantaged, on benefits, or age pensioners, has increased from 7 per cent in 1973 to 35.5 per cent, according to the South Australian Housing Trust's annual report of 1980, so there has been a dramatic increase in the number of such persons receiving rental rebates.

I note with interest that, only a few days after the deliberations of the Estimates Committees and after I had asked questions the answers to which I believe could have been given then, a little article appeared in the City State early edition of the *News*, which did not appear either in the *Advertiser*, a later edition of the *News*, or any other press, under the heading, "Limit on Trust home sale". It was dated 17 October (one day before a significant event was to take place on Saturday 18 October), and it states:

The Government has moved to limit the number of houses made available for sale by the Housing Trust. It wants the trust to concentrate on providing rental housing for low income earners.

The move is designed to boost the ailing private building industry. Housing Minister, Mr. Hill, said the trust's principal role was to provide quality welfare housing on both a rental and sale basis for low-income people.

I am rather at a loss to understand how the trust can provide houses for sale to low-income earners when it finds difficulty providing rental accommodation to low-income earners who are unable to pay the required rent without receiving a rental rebate. I cannot quite understand the position whereby the Minister wants to sell houses to low-income earners. The article continues:

The emphasis would be on provision of rental accommodation, but for the present the trust would continue to sell houses. Mr. Hill also has ended a system which allowed the Housing Trust advantages in home finance.

"Previously the trust was able to provide mortgages itself or arrange more favourable mortgages with institutions like S.G.I.C. than a private developer," he said. "From now on, the trust will provide no mortgage finance and will be allowed only to arrange packages with other lending institutions comparable to those the private sector is able to arrange."

There is some significance in that announcement: it means that the trust no longer gives special protection selling houses, and thus it has moved from a position of having competitive advantage in regard to its sales activities. This is a very upsetting situation for the people of South Australia and, in particular, for those people who wish to obtain accommodation through the public housing sector.

I have had personal experience with the trust: I purchased my home from the Housing Trust some 25 years ago and I have been quite satisfied with those arrangements. I suppose that many people in South Australia, over the years of the trust's operations in house sales, have experienced the same pleasing result; they have been able to pay a low deposit and to repay a loan over an extended term because of their financial needs and, consequently, they have been able to purchase a home. However, the whole situation appears to be changing so that South Australians will no longer have the opportunity to purchase homes through the trust at reasonable interest rates in a reasonable mortgage situation.

The whole purpose of the exercise is oriented to the private sector, and this move will not assist the long-term housing situation in this State, because the biggest problem that young people face at present in purchasing a home, which is the most important possession in their life, is, first, to make up the deposit, or to obtain interim finance or bridging finance, and then to pay the interest rates that are required. If there are not two incomes, young people find themselves unable to do that. The most important aspect in people's lives is probably the purchase of a home.

The Annual Report of the South Australian Housing Trust, which was presented in the other place a few weeks ago, shows that the sales operations of the trust experienced a substantial surplus; the rental operations showed a substantial deficit, about \$4 900 000. I cannot understand why, if the trust is to continue to work as effectively as it has done in the past, the house sales section will be discontinued; neither can I understand how the trust can balance its budget in the future if it is to concentrate on welfare housing, because over the past three years the trust has balanced its budget in regard to the industrial aspects and to house sales, but it has experienced a substantial deficit in regard to its rental situation.

One of the reasons for this is that the trust has had to bear the brunt of the numbers of people who have obtained rental rebates. In actual fact, if people receive a rental rebate because they cannot afford to pay the recognised rent, those tenants who pay the higher rent are subsidising those who receive a rebate. One could say that the Housing Trust is bearing the burden of the Federal Government's not paying a sufficient pension or welfare benefit to those people who receive a rebate, and at the same time the moneys available to the South Australian Housing Trust for Commonwealth funds have been reduced substantially over the past four years. I believe that, if we are to achieve the criteria for a balanced housing policy, we must assume that everyone should be entitled to shelter that is sufficient for them to live in security and comfort, and that they should be free to choose either rental or purchase accommodation.

In the present economic climate, many families can only achieve reasonable housing if they deal with the public sector. It is rather sad that the Minister should announce that the South Australian Housing Trust will withdraw from sales, when such sales have helped many thousands of families in this State. I hope that the board of the Housing Trust, the Minister and the Government will

rethink the position. I believe that the trust has had a wonderful record in this State, far better than the record of any other State instrumentality, since its inception in 1936, and I hope that the Government will not gradually take away the advantage that the trust has had over the years, but it appears that this will be so.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): Like many other contributors to this debate, I express reservations about the time that was allocated during the Estimates Committees. I found on a number of occasions that, after preparing questions on the various lines, I was unable to put forward all of my questions. Most members would be aware of my interest in the transport industry and in particular in the railways. I spent a considerable amount of time in Estimates Committee B and I hoped that I would be able to question the Minister at some length. However, I found that the time allocated on Thursday 2 October allowed some five hours only, although there were a number of areas about which I and other members on both sides of the Committee wanted to question the Minister. Unfortunately, because of the Sessional Orders, there was a limit of five hours during which we could question the Minister.

I wished to question the Minister at length about the State Transport Authority. I had about 40 questions to ask him but, because of the allocation of time, I was required to make way for a colleague so that he could ask some questions that he wanted to put. I think it is most regrettable that any member of this House is not given sufficient opportunity to question a Minister at length on any issue which he may raise and which is pertinent to the Estimates. In the past, we have come in for criticism about the amount of questioning and the role of the Estimates Committee, yet I feel that Opposition members particularly were stifled by the Government in putting questions to the Ministers.

I refer now to an issue that I wanted to raise with the Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is one about which we have heard a great deal in this Parliament, particularly from members opposite. I refer to the matter of industrial disputes. I raised this question in Estimates Committee A on Tuesday 30 September, when I asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs whether he intended to initiate legislation to compel unionists to be involved in secret ballots. I have no opposition to secret ballots. Moreover, I was somewhat surprised to hear some of the statements that the Minister made about them. Some paranoid attacks have been made in this Parliament not only since I have been a member but previously by Government members when they were in Opposition. They attacked the trade union movement, particularly in relation to industrial disputes.

I digress to point out that we hear much through the media about industrial disputation in this country but little about the cost of industrial accidents. I vividly recall attending the Australian Council of Trade Unions congress in Sydney in 1973, when we were given the figures on industrial accidents in this country. That cost was far in excess of the cost of industrial disputation. I venture to suggest that many industrial disputes arise out of industrial safety issues, but this is not highlighted by the media. If it is, it would be on very rare occasions.

Regarding secret ballots in the trade union movement, my understanding, having spent about 25 years as a member of a union in the railway industry, is that there has always been in the rules of that organisation opportunity for any member at a meeting to ask for a secret ballot, and I recall that taking place on a number of occasions.

I come back to the issues that I have raised, particularly

the proposed legislation that I understand the Minister said would be introduced by this Government in the future on secret ballots. I find it somewhat surprising that he said that they would be introduced where industrial disputation was likely, because in March this year the Prime Minister rejected the proposal for secret ballots on stoppages. An article in the *Australian* of 30 March this year states:

Fraser rejects secret ballots on stoppages: The Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, yesterday ruled out secret ballots as a solution to industrial unrest. He described as "impractical" the use of such ballots to reduce the number of strikes.

Mr. Fraser said the Government had carefully examined but had rejected the introduction of secret union ballots.

He said: "It would take days before the results of union ballots were known. Problems such as time taken checking votes and finding out who is eligible to vote make it impractical."

Despite the industrial strife in New South Wales, Mr. Fraser said it would be unwise if his Government adopted a "show-them-who's-boss" attitude. The cost in terms of hardship would be enormous if the Government had a confrontation with the unions. Mr. Fraser said the public should wish Sir John Moore all the best.

Clearly, from my experience as a shop steward, union official, and, before I came to this place, the Branch President of a union that had about 3 500 members, I could not but agree with the Prime Minister in this respect. It was one of the few times that I have found I could agree with him, because clearly, on a State-wide basis, to conduct a secret ballot in industrial stoppages under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, it would take about a fortnight for the ballot-papers to be forwarded to members to obtain their views on whether they wanted to take industrial action.

If they decided to take such action, they could find that, during the period that they were on strike, the union was negotiating with the employer concerned to return to work, and we could envisage a scenario whereby agreement could be reached with the employer but, under the system proposed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this State, in my view, if he believes in secret ballots and the right of the membership, the members should then have the right to decide by secret ballot whether they would return to work. That could take at least another fortnight.

Clearly, the Minister of Industrial Affairs should review his attitude in relation to industrial disputation in this State to see that he does not have a confrontation with the trade union movement. On the question of penalties, we have heard a great deal when this Government has been in Opposition and since about penalty rates and the cost to employment opportunities in this country. We have heard from not only this Government but also the Federal colleagues of members opposite.

I recall reading articles in newspapers over the past few years about the attitude of the Liberal Party not only in this State but also in other States and in the Federal sphere, and from the Premier of Queensland. It was interesting to me to read an article in the *News* on Monday 26 February 1979, which states:

Penalty rates were not a major problem in the Australian hospitality industry, a South Australian tourism executive said today. Mr. J. T. O'Sullivan, South Australian Tourism Industry Committee chairman, claimed his view was supported by major hotel interests. Employees in the hospitality industry were among the lowest paid in Australia.

"The hospitality industry is now highly efficient because of the efforts of unions and management," he said. "The industry is facing a critical time and any confrontation with unions would be grossly out of place." He was referring to a

Federal investigation into penalty rates and their effects. Clearly, the attitudes of the conservative elements in this State, when they talk about penalty rates and the cost to the tourism industry, are fallacious. Penalty rates apply in all awards and determinations in Australia for work outside the standard hours and ordinary periods of work. Penalty rates apply to overtime, shift work, Saturday, Sunday and public holiday work, because of the inconvenience to many of those workers who are required to work irregular hours, and in many cases part-time work. We have heard from many of the conservative elements in this country about the cost of penalty payments in this State and in other States, and how this affects the tourism industry. It is interesting to reflect on a statement made by the Managing Director of Travelodge (Mr. R. S. Kirby), in which he said that overall penalties in the hospitality and tourism industry constituted a relatively small cost. He also indicated that, if penalty payments were reduced by \$20 a week, the cost of an overnight stay in a hotel would fall by 50c. That is a minimal amount.

International hotel rates are set on the basis of international prices. For example, the Hilton Hotel, in Hong Kong, charges \$53 a night. In Singapore, in the same chain of hotels, the charge is \$54 a night. In Tokyo (which we all know has an extremely high cost of living), the charge is \$97 a night. In Sydney, the charge is \$61 a night, and in Melbourne, the charge is \$57 a night. That should put to rest some of the criticisms we have heard from the anti-union elements in this country.

Another question that comes under the portfolio of the Minister is a question I have raised previously, namely, night work, and its effects on health. Anyone who has been employed in an industry where he is required to work shift-work, not just regular shift-work but irregular shift-work, would appreciate the effect it has, not only on his health but also on his family. As one who has had the experience of 24½ years of working in an industry where shifts were sometimes changed at two hours notice, I can understand the problems of many of the shift workers in Australia. I quote from an article appearing in the *A.P.S.A. Journal* of December 1979, as follows:

1. Night work as presently practised always causes fatigue, and in many cases other psychosomatic disorders. Rotation of shifts can add to this list of specific digestive disorders. The fatigue accumulates, and also as a person ages the ill-effects are less easily remedied so that matters only get worse as the worker ages. Night work obviously interferes with the worker's social life. In summary, night work is medically harmful, and while it may be an economic necessity for some workers, it causes difficulties in their social life.

2. Night work affects women the same way as men; however, it does exacerbate the problems of the working woman who has the "two jobs" problem of working and managing a household.

3. The explanation for disorders caused by night work lies in the fact that a person's circadian biological rhythms are no longer synchronised. There are good grounds today for assuming that this disruption of the timing of the body in itself causes bodily damage.

4. It is not possible to arrange night work in such a way as to preserve the quality of community life and avoid the effects of desynchronisation of the body rhythms. Since all continuous and semi-continuous night work schedules conflict with the body's rhythms, then they must be biologically and sociologically unacceptable.

5. Since no arrangement is capable at present of eliminating the harmfulness of night work, the only way to prevent medical disorders and social and family disturbances caused by night work is to strictly limit it. Night work should be banned wherever its practice is motivated solely by the

financial consideration of making costly equipment pay for itself more quickly.

6. There needs to be much more research done into night work, particularly as it affects the rhythms of the body.

7. The practice of night work is increasing due to a desire to recoup costs of expensive technology which has a short life. This economic calculation ignores the price paid indirectly by the employer, worker and community for the side effects of night work. Governments and the community must question more closely the need for night work and develop a new set of values as the post-industrial system develops.

I found myself unable during the Budget Estimates Committees to raise this issue, because of the limitation of time. As with many other members of the Committees and (to use the words of my Leader) the sideliners, I found it particularly frustrating to sit in the Chamber, after having done my homework, to find that I could not raise questions during the Committee proceedings. If members believe in democracy, and the right of the elected representatives to question the Minister, as a Minister of the Government—

Mr. Schmidt: Which Minister?

Mr. HAMILTON: Any Minister. The member for Mawson may well laugh, but this is not a laughing matter to me. It does no credit to this place.

One of the other matters which I wish to raise but on which I did not have sufficient time to question the Minister was the effect of technology, particularly in this State, on workers. We have heard many comments from Government members and employers to the effect that technology will not necessarily reduce employment opportunities or create unemployment in this State or country. Having taken a great interest over a period of many years in the effects of new technology on industries and the workers in this State, I find it very disturbing, after scanning through many of the press cuttings that I have accumulated over many years, to see time and time again not only employees but also the trade union movement and some employers saying that robots and new technology will imperil many jobs. In the time left to me, I refer to the *Clarion* newspaper of 23 May, in which it was stated that robot tellers would put 15 000 jobs in peril. That report stated:

Automatic telling machines could eliminate the jobs of about 15 000 Australian bank tellers within a few years. The Acting State Secretary of the Australian Bank Employees' Union, Mr. Allan Anderson, made this prediction today.

He said trouble was brewing in the industry over the introduction of the machines. Stop-work meetings would be called within the next couple of months, but this would be "just the beginning" of industrial action.

We have heard the tremendous criticisms by employers about a reduction in working hours for employees. However, this certainly does not take into account the vastly improved technology, machines and increased productivity that employees contribute. The report continued:

The union wants a 72-hour nine-day fortnight—with the aim of maintaining present staff levels before it will accept the machines.

Mr. Anderson made quite clear that the prime concern of his members was their jobs. He said:

While some banks have promised no-one will become redundant, the union foresees heavy cuts in recruiting and fewer promotion opportunities for employees—all in the name of natural wastage.

The other aspect is that, although in some instances employees will not be made redundant, it certainly makes it extremely hard for those teenagers who leave school and

try to enter the work force, only to find that the difficulty in obtaining a job is becoming greater and greater.

Over recent years, we have seen an increase in part-time casual employment. Having had 10 years experience as a union official, I realise what some employees go through and how they are being treated by some employers. I know of some instances where women have travelled six or seven miles to get only two or three hours work. When one takes into account the cost of running a motor vehicle, including the cost of petrol, it is hard to believe that these casual employees get so very little out of their work.

Regarding teenagers and unemployed people seeking jobs, I had brought to my attention earlier this year the instance of an employer who had a cafeteria in the kitchen of which some teenage girls applied for employment. The employer, having interviewed a young lass, said, "What are you like at washing dishes?" Although the young lass was dressed in her best clothes, she was asked to wash a pile of dishes in the kitchen. After spending an hour cleaning up all the dishes (no protective clothing having been supplied), the young lass was told by the prospective employer, "You have not done a bad job, but I will let you know whether or not you are required." The young lady received no correspondence from that person, but I was subsequently advised that the owner of this cafeteria had been carrying out this practice for a considerable time. Clearly, this was blatant exploitation of children who were seeking jobs. It grieves me to know that some people are prepared to disillusion young teenagers who are seeking employment.

The other matter on which I should like briefly to touch relates to consultation between employers and employees, and their representatives, namely, the trade unions. A classic example of this was brought to light in my area last month. A number of employees were laid off at Philips Industries. I knew nothing about this until I read of it in the 24 September issue of the *Advertiser*. I spoke to the union official concerned, who said that he knew nothing about it, either. So much for consultation! I telephoned the Public Relations Officer, a Mr. Carboncini, about the matter, to ascertain what opportunities would be given to these employees to transfer to other work.

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I want this evening to address my remarks specifically to the matters that were addressed in the aspects of the Committee on which I served. I refer to the Loan Estimates allocation for the Public Buildings Department. This was the only aspect of Committee A on which I served and, although I realise that under Standing Orders I could range far and wide in the 30 minutes at my disposal talking about health, industrial affairs and other matters, I see no reason why I should do so, first, because I did not serve on those aspects of the Committee, and secondly, because I know that they have been and will be covered adequately by my colleagues who were involved in these areas.

I refer specifically to the Loan Estimate allocation for the Public Buildings Department, which covers school buildings and the Department of Further Education building operation. It was my experience as Minister of Education in the older form of debate to be the Minister who was under examination when these matters were examined.

So, I was interested to find out, when I joined the Committee at the consideration of this vote, that the Minister of Education was not to be seen anywhere, although I believe he was in the precincts of the building, and that, in fact, this matter was to be covered by the

Minister of Public Works. I was particularly interested, first, because this was a deviation from previous practice and, secondly, because it seemed to me that in this sort of matter the Minister of Public Works and his department were clearly subordinate to the Minister of Education and his departments, the Education Department and the Department of Further Education, in that it is the function of the Public Buildings Department to service the needs of the Education Department, but it is the Education Department, within the policy guidelines laid down by the Government, that in fact makes the decision.

Therefore, it seemed to me that we would not be able to get very far back along the decision-making road in our quest for information. So, I taxed the Minister of Public Works on this matter. He assured me that he was fully briefed and that he had the necessary officers with him to handle any detail matters that he himself could not handle. However, I found that rather unsatisfactory, because of course the public servants could not be expected to handle matters of policy which would come within the inspection of the Committee, and so we would be left with a Minister who really was not or should not be the person who was making the ultimate decisions.

I did not get my way. The Minister of Public Works simply put me in my place, and so we had to proceed with asking him questions. I hope I am not in any way going beyond Standing Orders, because I want to use a reference to Estimates Committee B as an illustration of what I am getting at. When we came the next day on Committee B to the examination of the Education Department's budget, the recurrent expenditure, the Minister of Education asked Committee B what we would be doing in relation to the school building programme. No-one else could tell him. You could not, Mr. Acting Speaker, although you were Chairman of that Committee. You were not in a position to know because, by the nature of your position, you had not been in Committee A the evening before, and I had to inform the Committee that the matter had been dealt with the previous evening, although my participation in it was under some protest because I thought I was cross-examining the wrong Minister.

To further complicate matters, the member for Glenelg then attempted to ask questions about the school building programme. He asked some specific questions in relation to a school in his district, the Brighton High School. I then remonstrated with the Committee as a whole and sought your ruling, Sir, on the matter. You then ruled, quoting from page 132 of the record:

My ruling would be that money spent in that way comes from the Loan aspect and I ask the member for Glenelg to reserve the question until we consider Loan, which is the next vote.

Clearly, Sir, you had been confused by the convoluted nature of the whole exercise and where we had been put by the Government's attitude, and particularly the attitude of the Minister of Public Works, because I had to point out that the Education Department Loan fund deals with things such as school buses, and not with the commitment of money to school building programmes or D.F.E. building programmes.

There it was, and the member for Glenelg, of course, struggled on as best he could within what were by then the very narrow confines to ask his question about that high school. I have no objection to the member for Glenelg being able to ask these questions, but he was somewhat confused, as was I, by the fact that there appears to have been no clear decision by the Government beforehand as to how this matter of significant education spending in an area of decision making controlled by the Minister of Education would be handled, given that within the Public

Purposes Loan Bill all of this is listed under the Minister of Public Works, and not under the Minister of Education.

It could be argued, on the one hand, and it is quite valid, that the wrong Minister was answering the questions on the Tuesday evening. On the other hand, it could be argued, and it is also quite valid, that the member for Glenelg should have been assisted to be on that Committee on the Tuesday so that he would not be placed in the position that he was in on Wednesday, frantically scampering around trying to find some sort of justification for asking questions which, on the insistence of the Minister of Public Works, had to be answered on the Tuesday evening.

That is the situation in which we found ourselves, and the Government will have to sort this out. The obvious way is to have the Minister of Education on hand when the Public Buildings Department vote is being examined. There would have been no problem about that because, as I understand it, the Minister of Education was in the building. The only problem was the ego of the Minister of Public Works, who wanted to do it all himself. So far as I am aware, he hardly turned to the public servants for advice. He attempted to answer all the questions himself, certainly earlier in the day in the area of industrial affairs. I rather imagined that, as he brooked no interference from public servants, he brooked no interference from colleagues, either. That is unfortunate, and it did not help us to a proper examination of an important aspect of Government expenditure.

I reiterate what I said in the Budget debate some weeks ago about the diminishing nature of expenditure in this area, which I regret. Despite that diminishing nature, it still remains, I am glad to say, a significant aspect of Government expenditure. It is still about 15 per cent of the total expenditure covered by the Public Purposes Loan Bill, and we have the right to proper advice from Ministers, and that means that the correct Minister must be in a position to answer our questions.

I quizzed the Minister of Public Works on the significant under-expenditure, the \$4 000 000 under-expenditure, which had occurred in the last financial year in the school Loan programme. He somewhat contradicted himself in the way in which he answered my question, because he began with information about where specific under-spending had occurred. One was, of course, the Government's decision not to proceed with the Thebarton Community Centre, which is not under-expenditure in the sense in which I was chasing it up, or in the sense in which he otherwise answered the question. It was a policy decision to do away with what the previous Government had seen as a very important initiative. He went on to talk about where money had been saved in certain areas by the way in which payments had been made, and so on, and when one tallied up these specific savings they did not amount to the total by which the line was being written down. The point I was trying to make was that the Education Department had been penalised by the under-expenditure which had occurred with this aspect of Loan Account.

When the Committee further remonstrated with the Minister, he changed his tack entirely. Instead, he came out with a statement similar to that delivered to me by his colleague the following day in Committee B, which amounted to the fact that the Government had priorities elsewhere. I thought that was a very honest statement to make, and also a rather deplorable statement in another sense, in that I want education to retain the sort of commitment that it had in expenditure when I left office. Nevertheless, it was an open and frank admission, but one

which tended to contradict the information previously given to the Committee.

So far as I can see, what really happened last financial year was that the school building programme suffered as part of the Government's phoney attempt to bring down a surplus, which it did by deliberately taking decisions in certain areas that construction projects would not proceed, and then adding the Loan Account and the Budget together and looking at the total surplus or deficit on that combined account, something which, the Leader of the Opposition has made clear, is a rather dangerous sort of approach to take, and something which might have been regarded by the Liberal Party in the past as being a rather radical sort of step to take and one which is a step back from responsible financing.

In any event, I would invite members who view what I am saying with a little scepticism (and I do not want to go into too much detail here because there is not a great deal of time) to turn their attention to the Premier's statements on the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 1980, as reported in *Hansard* at page 2161 onwards on 3 June 1980, because it is clear what is going on. At one stage the Premier talked about the money that had been saved, and at page 2162 stated:

The main details of the expected savings are about \$7 000 000 on water works and sewers—

That was partly at the expense of my constituents, because part of that saving resulted from the fact that there was a considerable delay in the time table set down for the Seaford sewerage project, which I and local residents are now glad to say is under way, but the delay that occurred in that time table saved the Government some money in the last financial year, although in the long term I guess it will turn out to be more expensive. The Premier also mentioned a saving of \$2 000 000 on school buildings, \$3 000 000 on other Government buildings, \$5 000 000 on hospital buildings, and so it goes on.

It is clear that they were deliberate policy decisions that were taken. They did not arise as a sort of windfall because of changes in the tendering climate or anything like that. The Premier simply said, "Irrespective of the demands and needs in those areas we will simply not spend that money." The effect of that is that certain people have had to wait longer for the provision of sewerage facilities, certain schools are having to wait longer for their upgrading, and certain schools are having to wait longer for the provision of new capital facilities.

All of that has happened because the Premier wanted a surplus although it was not a real surplus. It was not a surplus on Revenue, but one that was obtained by putting together the Revenue and Loan Accounts. That was the first thing that happened. The school building programme suffered by at least that amount, as indicated in the Premier's statement in June and, rather more than that, as shown in this Budget. Of course, the Premier and his advisers then say, "Seeing that the school building programme was able to get by with that reduced amount last year ("get by" under their definition), that is all it needs, or round about that amount this year. Early in this session I predicted what the Loan allocation would be for the school building programme this year, and I was not too far wrong. How did I make that prediction? I worked it out on the basis of what the Government had spent the year before, and I was close to the mark. I contend that the Education Department was penalised because of the under-expenditure that occurred last year, but it was not its fault—it was deliberate Government policy.

I want to turn now fairly quickly to a rather more specific area, that is, the share of the Commonwealth and State moneys going into the Department of Further

Education line. It is possible that the Minister is being very consistent in this area, because of course about two years ago he accused me, as the then Minister, of having an obsession with the construction of "palaces" for the Department of Further Education. If he has carried that sort of attitude into the education portfolio, one can see why the D.F.E. is now suffering. I pointed out to the Committee that, in terms of the documents that we had before us of the \$12 000 000 that was to go into the D.F.E. building programme, only \$1 100 000 was coming from the State and \$10 900 000 was coming from the Commonwealth. I regarded that as a fairly deplorable sort of effort.

The Minister of Public Works remonstrated with me on this and said that my calculations were wrong. Of course, no calculations were involved at all—all I had to do was read what was down in the Budget documents, both the official document and the briefing document. I pointed this out to the Minister, who then went into a huddle with his advisers and finally told me what the Minister of Education could no doubt have told me straight off if he had been there, that in fact there was a confusion with these Commonwealth payments between calendar and financial years; if one looked at it on a proper basis, the State was making a subvention of \$2 500 000 to the total building programme, and the Commonwealth \$9 500 000.

That was a little better, but not a great deal better. It is not too long ago that the State was making the major contribution to the D.F.E. building programme and the Commonwealth was making the minor contribution. Now things have turned around. In a sense, I do not blame this Government for that. One has to say that in the past the Commonwealth has been pretty niggardly in providing capital finance to the TAFE area, and it has only been in the last couple of years that there has been any sort of significant increase, but I warn this Government that it could well be in trouble with the TAFE Council in relation to this matter.

I would be interested to know some time from the Minister, for example, whether a penalty clause is involved: whether there is a basement below which a State can fall and, if it falls below that basement, then it starts to have money knocked off the Commonwealth moneys that are available to it. If I were the Commonwealth Minister for Education or the Commonwealth Treasurer, that is the sort of condition that I would want to put on the subvention of money to the States. I would be saying to the States, "We are giving you money for the TAFE area, not in order to save your Treasury money but to provide a higher standard of accommodation in the TAFE area and, if all you are doing is commensurately dropping your advances of money to the same area, there is no improvement going to occur, none at all, so we will have to take some sort of punitive measure against you." I would be very surprised if there was not something like that in the agreement, in the legislation or in the Commonwealth reports on these matters from the TAFE Council and the Tertiary Education Commission itself.

Again, I do not blame the Government if all it is doing is retaliating against the Commonwealth for the way in which the opposite picture has operated in the childhood services area, because of course we see there that the State has increasingly had to pick up the tab for the massive repudiation of responsibility of the Commonwealth in that area. All I am saying to the Government is that I do not think it can get away with having a go back. It may be very well for the Commonwealth to be able to gradually retreat from responsibility in the childhood services area and to shrug its shoulders and say that the States will have to pick up the tab. As soon as the States try to retaliate in another area and retreat from the responsibility of providing

capital facilities for TAFE, I doubt that the Commonwealth, which after all finally holds the purse strings in these matters, will allow them to get away with such action.

To compound the matter, we then go on to look at some specific areas of problems that I can see arising because of what seems to be under-funding in this area. I asked the Minister of Public Works a question about Port Pirie and the community college there and what was to happen, because during my time as Minister I went to Port Pirie and saw the problems there, and I was determined that as soon as possible it would get some sort of a go on the D.F.E. building programme. So, I asked the question, and the reply was, "We are going to make an application to the Commonwealth for the next triennium, and if they come forward with the funds then something will be done about it." I have absolutely no sympathy at all for the Commonwealth Government in these matters, but when the Commonwealth Government receives such a submission it may well look at it and say, "We're not too sure about this." In the 1980 calendar year (I am still a little confused about which calendar year the Minister was talking about, and I rather imagine he is; I am sure the Minister of Education would have been able to tell me straight away, but he was not on the committee) the Commonwealth may well ask why it should view favourably a submission from South Australia when during this financial year it is providing \$9 500 000 anyway, and the State, on its own admission, is providing only \$2 500 000. That is the problem. Will the State, in view of what seems to be a very poor effort in this area, be able to sustain an argument before the TAFE Commission that additional funds should be made available for Port Pirie, where they are so obviously needed?

I also asked a question about the South Coast, because that is another area where TAFE facilities of a different type need to be provided and were to be provided under the South Coast education development plan which was ditched by the present Government. The people down there were fobbed off with a bit of a redesigned and rebuilt high school, which no doubt will occur when the Minister says it will occur; I do not doubt that, but it is rather cold potatoes in comparison with what these people were to have received. The most the Minister of Public Works could tell me concerning that aspect was that the whole attitude towards the provision of TAFE facilities on the South Coast was being re-examined. Again, I am anxious to hear what the Minister of Education has to say about this at some time, because quite obviously that was a question that the Minister of Public Works could not answer, as he was not set up to answer that sort of question.

It is clear that there is under-funding going into capital facilities in education and D.F.E., and that in the school-building programme this seems to be part of a deliberate Government policy to beef up its surplus because of this interesting accounting procedure that it has adopted in looking at surpluses and deficits. Secondly, of course, this in part arises from the fact that this Government seems to be happy to sit back and accept whatever sort of largesse may be coming from the Commonwealth, given that there is at present some sort of Commonwealth commitment in the TAFE area, and the Government therefore feels that it does not have to do very much itself.

Let us remember that it will not be very long before the Commonwealth says that TAFE has had its share. One of the reasons why TAFE is getting a little bit extra now is that the Commonwealth is clearly saying that the universities and the C.A.E.'s have had their go, so it is TAFE's turn. But the universities and C.A.E.'s did not

have their go for very long, and TAFE will not have its go for very long. When things change, as they may well do next week, now that Mr. Fraser has another three years ahead of him, the present Government will again have to bear the brunt of the major provision of capital facilities in the TAFE area. That means that it will have to do a darn sight better than the \$1 100 000 set down in these documents, or the \$2 500 000 which the Minister of Education's colleague assured me was the Government's subvention to this particular area.

Finally, I revert to the school-building programme line. I am not yet satisfied with the information I have received, either from the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Education, in relation to holding schools. By now there should have been some more specific time table commitments. The enrolment pattern at those schools is now firming, and I shall return to this matter at some future stage during this session with more specific details. Unless some decisions are taken fairly soon.

The Hon. H. Allison: I have a reply for you on the holding schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think I have seen it. I thank the Minister for the speed with which that information has come back. I have had a look at it. I do not have it here with me at present, but I do not think that it is specific enough, not so much to suit me but to suit the people in those particular schools. I have talked to some of them and, now that there is a school community, they are anxious that the promise be honoured that the school community would be actively involved in some sort of planning processes, not open-ended processes but some with specific deadlines. We hope that the Minister will be able to give us some assurances, perhaps later in this session, as to that time table.

My major concern is with the Committee itself and the unsatisfactory way in which it was structured. I hope that the Minister of Education will be able to sit in on that line next year and that in next year's Budget the somewhat disastrous trend that we have seen in relation to these two departments will have been reversed.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): I think it is a sorry comment on the Opposition speakers whom we have heard so far in this debate that they have been unable to make any commendable remarks about the way the Committee system which was used this year has worked. From my own experience, I see that it has some advantages on the previous Budget debate, in that all Ministers are given the opportunity to answer questions about the way in which within their departments it is proposed to spend money appropriated from public revenue. In addition, senior public servants from the various departments are able to give advice, either directly in answer to a member or through the Minister, according to the Minister's choice. Either way, information has been provided in more specific detail this year than last year.

The Constitution of this State recognises all members first and foremost to the extent that Ministers of the Government are accountable to them for the funds that are appropriated for the purposes of their departments. It is not the role of members grouped in Parties to take sides in a dog fight, such as I heard, when, without my naming any particular member, I heard one say, in response to an interjection I put to him, "We've got them in here to grill them."

I thought that to be an appalling comment on that honourable member's understanding of the function of Parliament in a democracy. The time which is allocated for the examination of each portfolio, each department, enables specified examination of those departments,

department by department, and that had not been possible in the atmosphere of last year's Budget debate, in my recollection, where, out of courtesy and consideration for the convention of allowing Opposition members the greatest opportunity possible to ask Ministers questions, I often waited until the early hours of the morning before asking my questions. On more than one occasion, I suffered the boring consequences of sitting for hours through their filibustering and attempted trite examination of the various departments they chose to examine at the lead of the Budget list leaving a large number, by far the greater proportion of the total Budget and related departments, unexamined at all.

Mr. Keneally: Because you gagged the debate.

Mr. LEWIS: It was the intention, I remind the honourable member for Stuart, of the Opposition to be able to claim that the Government had gagged the debate, even though the number of hours allocated 12 months ago for the Budget debate was far greater than the number of hours ever allocated on average by a Labor Government in this State during the history of this Chamber. I do not deny that as the system has operated this year there have been some disadvantages and the first and most glaring of these is that under the terms of the composition of the Committees and the Sessional Orders under which they have operated, it was not, and is not, possible for all members to participate.

Whilst some members consider that all one needs to do is include oneself on the Committees considering those portfolios in which one has a specific interest where one will be able to ask all the questions one wants to, I point out to members opposite that, if the limitation of their abilities is restricted to a few portfolios, and if their responsibility to their electors extends only to the capacity of their minds to cover those few portfolios, that does not happen to be how I feel about my responsibility here as an elected representative with the honour and responsibility of representing the interests of my electors.

I resent the term used by the member for Gilles of "sideliners". I do not see myself or any other member not fortunate enough to be named on the Committees as being sideliners. I am a member of this Chamber, and all members of it are charged with the responsibility of scrutinising the way public revenue is appropriated for the purposes of public expenditure in respective departments. At the time the operation of those Committees was discussed earlier. I had not understood the form to be taken in the Committees. I believe that most of the people who had considered those Committees and the way in which they might function had not fully contemplated or realised exactly how they would function. It was a matter of experience, and most members and Ministers who took the opportunity to comment on that matter said that this was, in fact, the position.

I now place on record again what I put on record on 30 September the very first day on which the Committees sat, Committee A in this instance. I note that other members complained about the same factors and the press took them up at that time, but not until two days after I made these comments prior to lunch on the first day of Estimates Committee A. My comments appear at page 9 of the Estimates Committee A report, when I rose, though not a member of the Committee, and stated:

As a member of this House, though not a member of this Committee, I understood that it was the prerogative of any member of this House to ask questions that they regarded as within the ambit of their responsibility as members of the Chamber. Is that right or not?

After receiving the Chairman's reply—

Mr. Hemmings: Which was?

Mr. LEWIS: It was as follows:

Any member has the right to raise any matter with the Minister through the Chair after the official members have concluded their line of questioning.

I had understood that, but I did not realise that it related specifically to the sums, and that if you, coincidentally, were not present in the Chamber at the time that other formal members of the Committee concluded their questioning and you were in the other place waiting for the opportunity to ask questions you (as an elected representative of this House), were denied the right to exercise your responsibility to your electorate to examine that vote, the Minister who sought the money and the public servants who advised the Minister about the purposes for which it was being appropriated. The *Hansard* report continues:

Mr. Lewis: That would include the situation if I were to come into the Chamber before the Minister of Industrial Affairs left the Chamber after the Committee had concluded its questioning?

The CHAIRMAN: No. Any member who is not an official member of the Committee would have to be in the Chamber at the particular time, because, once the Minister of Industrial Affairs, or any Minister has retired from the Committee, the Committee will not be coming back to that matter.

Mr. Lewis: I ask that you, in consultation with the powers responsible for the development of procedures in these two Committees (one here and one in the other place) that are functioning at the present time, make it possible for all members duly elected to this place to have the opportunity of scrutinising the way in which it is proposed by departments and their Ministers to spend money in the public interest, to ensure that questions can be asked by those members of the Minister responsible without it being necessary for me, or any other member, to run to and fro to find out when I have to be somewhere to ask a particular question before that line or that section of lines is passed.

Having made that comment, and not wishing to in any way anger the Chairman or delay the Committee, I let the record and the matter rest at that point, only to find, two days later, members of the Opposition, having realised the validity of what I was saying (along with members not belonging to the Opposition Party), bleating to the press about those very matters as though they had just come to those conclusions. I asked then that it be noted that I considered it personally an abrogation of my rights and the rights of the electors I have the honour and responsibility to represent to be denied the opportunity of examining the reasons why a Minister and his department are seeking an appropriation of funds from public revenue for purposes the department and the Minister has in mind, and that in future all members of the House should be able to participate in the questioning of Ministers about the reasons they seek the appropriation of public moneys.

It is unfortunate that members opposite do not seek information of that kind but rather seek to embarrass, wherever possible, more at a personal level than at a political level, the Minister whose department is being examined (or the public servants with the Minister). I believe that that aspect of the examination of the votes was regrettable and lamentably inadequate in terms of what I understood was the responsibility of members who are elected to this Chamber.

I can give examples of the kind of question which I would have liked to ask but which I was denied the opportunity of asking, first because Opposition members filibustered during the examination of the lines of the Minister of Mines and Energy. I would have liked to ask what liaison existed between the officers of the

department responsible for energy policy and other departments, such as the Department of Agriculture, in regard to the development of alternative energy sources from specific crops, that is, renewable energy sources, involving the use of crops such as sugar beet for alcohol production and the removal of excess salt from surface soil layers along the Murray swamps where, over the years, as most dairy farmers point out, large areas are decreasing in their productive capacity because of the apparent increase in salinity in the soil.

In the Netherlands, reclaimed soil that has a high concentration of salinity is, to use layman's terms, sweetened; the salt is removed by successive primary crops of sugar beet, which not only produce simple sugar that can be fermented for the production of alcohol but also remove large tonnages of salt from the soil on which they grow. Any such liaison (and this proposal has the dual benefit of producing alcohol and reducing the salinity level, thus increasing the likely yields in pasture in subsequent years), between officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Agriculture would be seen by me as a desirable exercise. I wanted information about whether such liaison was possible or taking place, but I was not able to ask that question.

Furthermore, I would have liked to ask the Minister of Tourism whether there is liaison between the department for which she is responsible and other departments, such as the Department of Mines and Energy, in regard to the development of South Australia's remote on-shore and gulf islands areas, which are scenically beautiful, climatically attractive and recreationally desirable in terms of activities that people could pursue, and which would have been developed had it been possible to obtain a cheap source of energy, a ready supply of acceptable water, and a simple means of disposal of waste, particularly sewage.

I would have liked to ask whether the Department of Mines and Energy had been consulted in regard to the possibility of using a Darrius rotor wind generator backed up with an oil-powered engine to provide the electricity in those circumstances, and whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department or any other department had been consulted about the possibility of using various methods of desalinating water taken from the adjacent seawater to supplement the rainwater that could be stored from the roofs of buildings in such instances where they are constructed to provide accommodation facilities.

Finally, I wanted to ask whether the E. & W.S. Department had ever made any examination of the possible use and application of the principle of the Clivus lavatory in handling the wastes. All these technologies are at present in use elsewhere in the world, although they are not in use in Australia that I know of. Certainly, they would enable development of such an industry if examination showed them to be adequate in these climatic circumstances and appropriate to cope with the specific problems that might confront any industry that could develop in that way. Having given examples of where the opportunity existed for me to find out whether such liaison within the total Public Service was possible and being undertaken and whether, in all instances, any cost-benefit analysis was being done by the other departments responsible and seeking funds about the way to apply those funds to determine how effective each dollar applied would be in achieving its result in the interests of the public. I was disappointed.

That is as much as I wish to say on this occasion about the Committees and the way they functioned. I trust that the advantages are seen by all members and acknowledged particularly by members of the Opposition, and that we

note the disadvantages and do not throw the baby out with the bath water but simply improve what we have begun, and accept the far greater benefits that can flow to us, as responsible elected representatives in this Chamber, in the way we are expected to accept the responsibility of analysing and scrutinising how we spend the tax dollars that we raise.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I congratulate the member for Mallee on his contribution. I also congratulate him on accepting the advice of the member for Napier to insist on his rights and not be bowed down by the dictates of his Caucus. I congratulate him for exercising his prerogative, as a member of this Chamber, in making that contribution. Even if I did not agree with all that he said, I respect his right to say it.

I refer to the provision for the Legislature and other items under that line, particularly the allocation for members' travel, which is not an exceedingly large sum. It is about 3 per cent of the total allocation for the Legislature. In that context I should like to comment on some things that the member for Mitcham said in connection with his rather petty action when he sought to refuse leave for the member for Price to go on an overseas study tour on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business. Many members in this Chamber at times seem to look on the member for Mitcham with total distaste. I do not share that attitude, certainly not totally. In fact, I often feel rather sorry for the member for Mitcham and his beard.

Mr. Slater: His beard?

Mr. TRAINER: He has a beard and perhaps that is one nice thing about him. I have also overcome other feelings and said nice things about the member for Mallee.

Mr. Keneally: You can't say that about the member for Mawson.

Mr. TRAINER: I would find it extremely difficult to say something nice about the member for Mawson but I think that, underneath all that, he is a nice chap and I am sure that some day I will be able to say something nice about him. The position of the member for Mitcham in the political spectrum is such that he has got himself into a rather lonely position here, something like a proverbial shag on a rock. I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, will accept that reference as not being an unkind comparison to make. It is certainly less offensive than the comparison made during a recent Oxford University Union debate, when the poor member for Mitcham was referred to as looking like a rat peering through a lavatory brush. I thought that description was exceedingly unkind, but it is the sort of thing that one must expect in a rather facetious debate of that nature.

This shag-on-a-rock position in which he has put himself is perhaps the result of his own fractious personality, causing his move from the Liberal Party to the LM, the New LM, and now to the Australian Democrats. He has been in several Parties. He has not been in our Party, and I doubt whether he would be accepted. There is still the Country Party for him to make his way into. This reminds me of Billy Hughes who, when someone said to him, "You've been in every political Party except the Country Party. Why not the Country Party?", replied "You have to draw the line somewhere."

He has some admirable aspects. I respect his past attitude on the Playford gerrymander and the fact that he has given about 25 years service here, but in recent years his service has deteriorated. He now concentrates on publicly denigrating the Legislature, and seeking cheap political mileage by doing so. On this occasion the avenue he chose was of attacking overseas study tours. I have no

motivation of self-interest in speaking on the topic of study tours, or of defending it from attack because of any expectation of going on one myself soon, or even for a long time in the future. As I am a new member, it will be a long time before I will be able to nominate, and I may not nominate even then.

Mr. Slater: You'll be here long enough to get one, not like some members opposite.

Mr. TRAINER: I hope to be here for another 20 years or even a quarter of a century.

Mr. Becker: After Saturday, I would not say that too loudly.

Mr. TRAINER: The honourable member should look at some of the figures for Saturday.

Mr. Oswald: Ascot Park looked all right, but I don't know about the others.

Mr. TRAINER: It is very kind of the honourable member to say that, as it vindicates my statement about hoping to be here for some time. Even if I were successful in obtaining nomination for a study tour, I think that the prospect of carrying out one of these demanding tasks would be somewhat daunting. Being one who happens to be fond of his children, I would find it difficult to be away from them for the period required for a study tour. I would also be rather fearful, not for any reason connected to election results but because I believe in looking after them, to leave my constituents without their elected member for two or three months, and fearful of the thought of the accumulated backlog of work, the current events that would have taken place, and even the Parliamentary debates I would have missed during that period. Nevertheless, I wish well those people who believe they can cope with one of these demanding educational experiences—and educational experiences they are.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The member for Price is riding the O'Bahn this week.

Mr. TRAINER: In that case, he will be able to give a report on whether it really works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the honourable member does not need any assistance.

Mr. TRAINER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I was hoping for some protection. On a lesser scale, I have taken my own little study tours, at my own expense, in having a look at this State and other States to learn more about South Australia and our neighbouring States. I have tried whenever possible to visit the Parliaments of other States which I have not seen before in order to familiarise myself with their arrangements and with the strengths and problems of the other States; to see the variations in urban and rural environment that exist within our State and compared to other States; to compare the life we live in Adelaide with that in the huge metropolitan areas of Sydney and Melbourne, and in smaller cities such as Hobart; to compare their transport facilities with ours; and to compare the provisions made for tourism, the cleanliness of the environment, and their social problems. I would hate, for example, to think that Adelaide would ever be blighted by the sort of high-rise Housing Commission apartments that exist in Melbourne; they are absolutely gigantic slums concentrated in a small area.

It is very easy at busy times for a member to lose touch with his family, whom he sees only at breakfast. To be overseas away from one's family for lengthy periods of time is quite an additional stress. Nevertheless, for those who are able to cope with that, undertaking a study tour is a chance for them to broaden their horizons and to return with new ideas (hopefully with ones that will be quite practical, as distinct from the O'Bahn), to be less parochial, to be less inclined to tunnel vision, to see how

people overseas have managed to cope with problems similar to ours, and to see how parts of Western Europe, North America, and so on, have coped with the energy crisis, problems of ecological deterioration and various social pressures; it is a chance for members to see these things for themselves, as distinct from seeing them through the mass media.

So much of our news is relayed from overseas, and so much of our television news is news as seen through British and American eyes. The news-gathering organisations of the world are dominated by English, French and American companies. I refer, for instance, to Reuter, which is from England, Agence France Presse from France, American Associated Press, United Press International, the Columbia Broadcasting System, and B.B.C. Visnews. These are the companies that show us the world. We see it through their eyes. Those companies stress only the issues that are important or of interest to them. Very often it is the trivial that is sensationalised and presented rather than that which is really important.

Our view of the world is distorted by the fact that these companies are presenting to us what is really of interest to Americans and Englishmen only. Very often, the news is not presented at all, especially in the case of television news, unless it has sensational pictures. Something that cannot be described without lots of spectacular pictures is not presented at all, and they tend to overlook much that is important.

The current turmoil in the Islamic world was, to anyone who has really studied the area, quite predictable some time ago, yet the events in Iran caught the United States and people in this country completely by surprise. They should not have done so. Occasionally, some small part of the world flares into prominence because of violent events that occur there. I refer, for instance, to Nicaragua. We heard nothing about Nicaragua before the coup and we have heard nothing since. We get no information in this country on how they are coping with their post-revolutionary problems.

Mr. Slater: What about Afghanistan?

Mr. TRAINER: Similarly, it has vanished from the front pages of the press since the Olympic Games. Members can be far better informed about overseas areas if they go and see them for themselves, as was pointed out in the *News* at about the time that the member for Mitcham made his rather unkind comments. I refer to an article entitled "Enriching experiences" by Stephen Middleton in the 19 June issue of the *News*, in which he said:

There are always three certain topics to break up a dull dinner party—football, religion and politics. Few of us ever can agree on any of these issues, so it was inevitable that Australian Democrat, Robin Millhouse and I should agree to disagree.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like a ruling on this situation of calling your attention to the state of the House when a clear instruction was given by a member of the Opposition to send his colleagues out of the Chamber, to disrupt the member who is on his feet and who is addressing the Chamber. Furthermore, in this instance I consider the calling of the quorum to be frivolous, particularly when the honourable member who called for it has just come into the Chamber this evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. It is the right of any member of the House to draw to the Speaker's attention that there are fewer members present than comprise a quorum. Whether it is facetious or

a reflection upon the member who makes the call is a matter for public decision, and not a decision for the Chair.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Sir, I should like a ruling regarding a member, when speaking to a motion, referring to or reading for long periods from a newspaper cutting which, in essence, is a written speech. He is spending a considerable part of the time for his speech in using a newspaper article as a part of that speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! In the direction given by the Chair to the House, it was clearly pointed out that, where a member identified the fact that he was referring to an article, whether from a newspaper or another publication, the Chair would use discretion in allowing the reading to take place. The member is required to construct his address as he sees fit. If in fact it relates to factual comment from newspapers or other information, it is his right to make that determination. However, I ask honourable members to recognise that the debate is never constructive if it is totally made up of other persons' views.

Mr. TRAINER: I am not quite sure why the member for Fisher saw fit to make that comment, because I had quoted only two sentences from Stephen Middleton at that stage.

Mr. Evans: Just making sure you didn't go too far.

Mr. TRAINER: I am sure that Stephen Middleton would be pleased to read in *Hansard* that honourable members actually wished to hear what he had to say on the matter of Parliamentary trips, just in case, perhaps, it was not noticed on a previous occasion. Mr. Middleton said that at one time he shared a widely held view that these are just perks that members share and that the money budgeted for that purpose is a grave misuse of taxpayers' funds.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you feel lonely over there with only the member for Gilles with you?

Mr. TRAINER: I consider it more important to be able to enlighten members on the Government side of the House, because they seem more in need of enlightenment than are members on this side of the Chamber. Stephen Middleton went on to say:

But Robin Millhouse and I are walking diverging paths on that issue in 1980. Having been lucky enough to see something else of this world, having been overseas, been there and done that, I find Robin Millhouse totally wrong, beard and all.

I am not quite sure why Stephen Middleton saw the necessity to make reference to people's facial appendages, although he has one of those himself. The member for Mitcham had said—and he is quoted here by Mr. Middleton—that the trips are for the personal gain, benefit and pleasure of the members concerned, and have nothing whatever to do with the business of the State or the Parliament. Mr. Middleton said:

Despite the fact that there is room for criticism in some areas, the plain fact remains that even somebody overseas on a holiday cannot help but learn from his or her experiences.

I know from my own travels that there are lessons we can all learn about public transport, community welfare, freedom of movement, standards of living, and lifestyles.

Those lessons are learnt without even attempting to look closely into the social and economic circumstances prevailing in other countries.

The member for Fisher got a rap-up, because Mr. Middleton in this article stated:

Countering Mr. Millhouse's challenge, Liberal M.P. Stan Evans pointed out that after a 94-day overseas tour in which he visited 20 countries he prepared a 164-page report for Parliament.

Obviously, that must have been a marathon effort.

Possibly it is just a dog-in-the-manger attitude that the member for Mitcham takes towards overseas trips, because he can never get a trip himself and, as a result, he does not want anyone else to go. More likely, he seeks a chance to make a bit of cheap political mileage, knowing what the public image of politicians is; he is cynically headline-hunting, deliberately appealing—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You're never very cynical are you?

Mr. TRAINER: Never. He is deliberately appealing to the ignorant knockers in the community. I refer to his response to a comment made that members drank too much. The screaming headline appeared on 5 September in the *News* "M.P.'s driven to drink, says Millhouse". When I first saw that headline about being driven to drink, I thought he was talking about Ministerial cars, but not so. The report states:

Some politicians drink too much, according to Australian Democrat M.P. Robin Millhouse. Mr. Millhouse, who drinks only occasionally, said today he knew of one or two politicians in the past 25 years who were verging on alcoholism.

Members interjecting:

Mr. TRAINER: If he only drinks when he is out of court that is not very often. The report continues:

There are one or two in State politics at present who are tending that way.

That was a bit rough, because everyone in here started looking around to see who the other one was. The report continues:

The controversial politician—says Stephen Middleton—and of course "controversial" is the word so frequently used to describe the member for Mitcham as meaning that he is good at finding headlines—was commenting on claims by visiting American psychiatrist Dr Harvey Reubens that some politicians had a "win at all costs" attitude which caused broken marriages, drug abuse and alcoholism.

Dr. Reubens was quoted as saying:

Politicians, like entertainers, live for the sound of applause.

Members interjecting:

Mr. TRAINER: Perhaps by living for the sound of applause he meant that some of them were expecting "the clap". The report continues:

Once they begin to hear that sound it becomes difficult for them to live without it.

The sort of comments that were made by the American professor may be valid in the United States, but members opposite will agree that they bear little validity (some validity perhaps) but overall, very little validity in the Australian political scene. American politics, unlike ours, tends to be non-ideological, and candidates and legislators do not really believe in anything at all, except themselves, and their own desire to win. They will not cling to an issue out of any belief in that issue, but simply because just for the moment it seems to be a winner. Their main purpose in entering the political arena seems to be one of self-aggrandisement but, as a result of the attitude of the press and the actions of people like the member for Mitcham, and as a result of failings perhaps on the part of members of the Legislatures early in the years of our State and nation, the reputation of members of Parliament is not high; our status in the community is not what it ought to be.

Mr. Mathwin: They think I am pretty good down at the Bay.

Mr. TRAINER: This is something that I have already observed: an individual member can be respected, and people at the Bay may say that the member for Glenelg is

O.K., as one whom they know, but they do not like politicians generally. Politicians in general are held in low esteem by the public. Going back in history we find that this has always been so. Shakespeare used the immortal phrase "the scurvey politician", and later in the nineteenth century, Artemus Ward said "I am not a politician and all my other habits are good".

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Who said that?

Mr. TRAINER: I think it was Artemus Ward, but at the conclusion of this debate I shall go to the Parliamentary Library and check that for the benefit of the Minister of Environment. The activities of members of Legislatures overseas have not helped improve this public image. An article in the *News* of 20 December last year, headlined, "The trouble with British M.P.'s is everyone wants to keep them company," quotes a whole series of eventualities with lascivious, lascivious females throwing themselves at members of the House of Commons. If I were to lapse back into a partisan attitude I would say that one of the significant features of the article is that they all seem to be Tory members who are on the receiving end.

Mr. Mathwin: Does the Tory Party have the most women members?

Mr. TRAINER: It is not the women members who are participating in this, but it says the members had better watch out because the K.G.B. has files on every politician in the west.

Most of the public do not have the faintest idea of the work load encountered by the average member of this House. I think members on both sides would agree with that completely.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Did you serve on an Estimates Committee?

Mr. TRAINER: I did indeed.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I thought you might have wanted to talk about that.

Mr. TRAINER: No, because that might put the Minister back into his coma again. I wanted to have the satisfaction of snapping him out of it for a while tonight. Even Party members who are people directly interested in politics, as distinct from most of the population who are quite disinterested, do not have that much idea of how much work is done by the members whom they throw their efforts into electing. One or two people have approached me since my election and asked me whether I was going to give up teaching, seriously thinking that the majority of members of this House have so little to do with their time that they can still have another job. That is just not on, although the member for Mitcham apparently thinks that that is quite acceptable.

Mr. Mathwin: What about kissing babies and that sort of stuff?

Mr. TRAINER: I would shudder to think of the member for Glenelg kissing any baby in the community.

Mr. Mathwin: What about patting the mothers on the head?

Mr. TRAINER: I have heard that he does not pat them on the head; he pats them on the back and rather low down.

Mr. Mathwin: No, I kiss the mothers and pat the babies on the back.

Mr. TRAINER: I suspected that was in the wind. Most members of the community think that we only work on occasions such as this when Parliament is in session. Most of them do not have the faintest idea of what constituent work is, or of the amount of community activity in which one has to take part. For that matter, they have little concept of the numbers of people who have to be looked after in an electorate.

Mr. Lewis: Or the distance one has to drive.

Mr. TRAINER: Or, in the case of rural members, the distance that they have to drive in order to look after the needs of constituents. There may be 17 000 constituents in an electorate, yet some of them feel that they should be individually visited once a week for a regular chat. Members are frequently confronted with the difficulty of having to choose between two, three or more functions that have to be attended on the one evening, as the member for Glenelg pointed out at a meeting at Sturt C.A.E. one evening where we had a certain amount of unanimity of interest. Members have to be on duty 24 hours a day. One receives calls at the most ungodly hours. The only day off a member is supposed to have is Christmas Day. Because of this, I resent the way in which the member for Mitcham exploits the lack of awareness in the community and uses it to gain cheap political mileage.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): It surprised me that during the two weeks of the Estimates Committee we had impassioned speeches from Government members saying that they needed to speak on the matters before the Committees. It is rather surprising that, before I cajoled the member for Mallee into speaking (and I do apologise for doing that tonight because I inflicted on this House one of the worst speeches we have ever heard), there have been no Government speakers, and there will be no Government speakers tonight or tomorrow night because they are getting rather tired, so the Minister of Industrial Affairs has said, "Let Opposition members speak and then we will come to a vote". I am sure that the member for Mallee fell for my blandishments because he is easily cajoled. He made his point, but other members are not going to make any comments at all. That is rather a pity.

I would like to make a few comments about the way in which the Estimates Committees have operated during the two week sitting. I agree with the Leader that what the Government said prior to the Estimates Committee meetings, and the Government's attitude during those two weeks, were completely different. This, in effect, reflects on the strength of the Government, because the most obvious case of where the Government was completely led astray by one so-called middle order member of the Government was when there were only two Ministers present in the House on one day—the Minister of Health in this Chamber and the Minister of Agriculture in the other Chamber.

The Premier was in Japan, imploring a Japanese interest to take over the petro-chemical plant at Redcliff; the Deputy Premier was in the United Kingdom, imploring people there to buy our uranium; and the member for Hanson seized his chance to become the senior member in the House. He looked alongside him and saw inexperienced members, a couple of oncers, who are due to go out in 1982. The member for Rocky River was sitting in the Chair and really did not know what was going on. The member for Hanson, in effect, saw his chance to make the big play and be the big man of the House.

I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, were in the House, but no-one approached you to ask advice, and I believe that members were remiss because, if they had done so, they would have received correct advice. Guidelines were laid down quite clearly that the nine members of the Committee would question the Minister and his advisers on particular matters. We know that a certain member uses this Chamber as a part-time occupation: he comes here when the courts are not sitting and has his name marked up.

Mr. Trainer: Who's that?

Mr. HEMMINGS: We know that it is the member for Mitcham, and I am sure that the member for Hanson will

talk about that member when he makes his speech. The member for Mitcham approached the member for Hanson and said, in his usual way, "I have a very serious question that I want to ask the Minister; is there any chance that I could get it in?" If I had been a bank robber in the old days, I would have robbed a bank at which the member for Hanson worked, because I would have got away with it. The member for Mitcham came to our side and said, "I want to ask a serious question of the Minister. Can I stand in?" We told the member for Mitcham exactly what he could do with his question—that he must wait until the end of questioning.

This was brought to the notice of the Acting Chairman who, quite correctly, made the decision, after I objected that, under the guidelines, any member who wished to ask a question must wait until examination of the line was finished. The member for Hanson, who was obviously aware of the content of the question, said:

I want to test the feeling of the Committee. I would like to ask a question on behalf of the member for Mitcham, who, I know, is keen to seek information on a certain matter.

The member for Hanson was perfectly aware of what the member for Mitcham wanted to ask.

Mr. Becker: That's not true.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The member for Hanson has proved time and again in the past couple of days that he was made a fool of on that occasion. The member for Hanson further stated:

I believe that he has details of that information, and I ask him to supply it now.

To his credit, the Acting Chairman showed a bit of sense in the morning, (but not later in the afternoon); he upheld the objections of the Opposition. The members on the Government side and the member for Mitcham had obviously met over a malted milk and \$1.20 lunch and decided that they would put it over Opposition members.

Immediately we resumed for the afternoon session, the member for Hanson, then the senior member in the House and obviously really revelling in it, in his diplomatic and senior statesmanlike voice moved that members other than Committee members could move in at any time and ask questions. All the Government members (those elected in 1979, those with 13 months experience) gave the same old story about democracy, about this not being a political matter, and about the fact that other members should have their say and be able to ask questions of the Minister, and not have to wait until 9 p.m., 9.30 p.m. or 9.45 p.m. Then they all said it was important that, if any member had a question to ask, it should be asked of the Minister.

You know the way the vote went, Mr. Speaker. We lost. The Acting Chairman gave a ruling in favour of the Government Party, and I do not blame him for that. He has a great future in this Parliament, but he has been a member for only 13 months. What was that great democratic thing that the member for Mitcham wanted to ask the Minister? I am sure that every member of the Government Party will have seen in *Hansard* what the member for Mitcham asked the Minister of Health.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS: It was about dogs. It was about the Institution of Medical and Veterinary Science.

Mr. Slater: He is a "hard paw cornographer".

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right. All that the member for Mitcham was trying to do was score cheap publicity to get a line in the *Advertiser* on the following day, and he did get that. He was not interested in any way in Mr. Duncan Sheriff. I hate to say this, but I have to go on side with the Minister here. The Minister answered him quite adequately, but he got a line. I am sure the member for

Hanson must have realised. His face must have gone red. The others would not have realised, because they are too stupid and too inexperienced.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask that you request the member for Napier to withdraw the reflection on members on this side in referring to certain members as being stupid.

The SPEAKER: The member for Eyre requires, on behalf of himself and other members, the withdrawal of a remark that has caused him concern. I ask the member for Napier to withdraw that term.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for you but—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The member for Eyre was not in the House when that debate was taking place. I was saying nothing against the member for Eyre.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has indicated that it is a reflection upon himself and other members of the House. He has asked, in terms of the direction that I gave to this House, that the words be withdrawn. I ask the honourable member a second time to withdraw those words unconditionally.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, I will do that. I think I have outlined to the House that the Government members were completely conned by the member for Mitcham because he wanted to bring up one particular subject on which he felt he would get a cheap line of publicity. As I have said, he is in no way interested in the affairs of Mr. Duncan Sheriff. He just uses the position at I.M.V.S. to further his own publicity in this State. When I moved a notice of motion in this House some weeks ago dealing with the situation at I.M.V.S., at the same time, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mitcham was going to put forward an urgency motion.

Because my notice of motion took precedence, the urgency motion to be moved by the member for Mitcham lapsed. As a result, I wrote to the member for Mitcham and offered to pool our resources (those of the Opposition and the minority Party, the Australian Democrats), so that we could put an effective case to the Government for holding a public inquiry into the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. All I got from the member for Mitcham was a rather petulant scrawl on the letter I had written saying, "Yah! I thought of it first. Why did you upstage me? I don't want to be a part of it." That is his whole attitude, and that is what happened again on the day when the Estimates Committee met. He just wanted to do a little publicity seeking as regards the institute, with no regard to its members or to its credibility, but only with regard to getting a cheap headline in the press.

Unfortunately, Government members and the Acting Chairman fell into that trap. If it had not been for the opening of the Tarcoola line, I do not think that this situation would have occurred. I will leave that matter of putting things on record about what the member for Mitcham wanted to do on that day. I think I have made the point that, as far as we are concerned, the Government was duped. Perhaps, when the real leaders of the Government come back, those who were guilty of making the decisions on those days will be reprimanded.

There is another point which in the remaining 15 minutes I will canvass; namely, the health situation in South Australia. I said briefly during the Estimates Committee that the Minister, perhaps through some feeling of infallibility, felt that she could give what information she wanted to us on this side and still manage to weather the storm. Perhaps the newspapers have said that she has weathered the storm, but I think that in future

the people of South Australia will measure the health budget as the start of the demise of this Government or, if not the demise of this Government, then the demise of the Minister. We have had some confidential information that, as a result of the way in which the Minister has reacted during this session, another Minister of Health will attend the next Estimates Committees. I would not like to take credit for being responsible for that, because I think that she has dug her own grave and will have to live with it.

I said during the Estimates Committee that, if this statement that the Minister gave was ever an indication of the philosophy of this Government as regards health matters, we are unlikely to see anything better. I will read the second paragraph, which underlines the lack of compassion that this State Government, and perhaps the Federal Government, shows in relation to providing health services to the people of Australia. The statement says:

On the one hand, there is an expectation on the part of the community that an increased investment in health services will result in better health. On the other hand, there is taxpayer resistance to increased public expenditures to which the Government is obliged to respond by the way of costs containment programmes.

That sums up this Government's attitude to health. The Government is worried not about providing adequate health delivery services to the people but about the way in which people will react to what they must hand out from their pockets. The Government is not worried about the delays that occur in public hospitals or the inconvenience to people therein; nor is it worried about the nursing and medical staff in public hospitals having to work overtime without pay, or having to work excess hours and do all the other things that they did not have to do under the Labor Administration. The Government is merely worried about cutting costs.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will not answer the comments being made by Government members. I merely hope that they stand up and contribute to the debate. The Opposition is perfectly happy to stay here until 6 a.m. or 7 a.m., and, if Government members want to defend their conservative system, by all means let them do so. The Budget shows that wherever there is a public hospital, teaching hospital or metropolitan hospital vicious and savage cuts have been made. Indeed, cuts of up to \$3 000 000 have been made in relation to major teaching hospitals. However, nowhere have cuts occurred in relation to country hospitals. In fact, there have been increases in the budgets for such hospitals.

When the Minister was asked during the Committee sessions about this matter, her advisers replied that those hospitals had received savage cuts in 1977-78 or 1978-79. However, there is no proof of that. Opposition members showed that there was no proof that those hospitals had experienced such cuts. In effect, the Minister is saying that in those country hospitals where the Government gives a subsidy and where the majority of people on private insurance go, it will maintain the subsidy and ensure that those patients receive the best care. However, in public hospitals patients get only what they receive.

Opposition members and I receive countless letters from patients who state that their period in hospital was a disaster, that it was something that they regretted, and that it did not mean anything in relation to the illness from which they were suffering. Every time that Opposition members have referred such matters to the Minister, we have received a reassuring confirmation that everything was all right. However, everything is not all right.

Mr. Becker: It happened when you were in Govern-

ment.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is not so, and the honourable member knows it. If he was honest with this House, could he say that he has not received one letter dealing with problems experienced in the public hospital sector? The Minister has even acknowledged in letters to patients (of which I have received copies) and in copies of letters that the Minister has sent me that there are deficiencies in hospitals. However, there are deficiencies only in public hospitals: in areas where people cannot afford hospital insurance. Those people must go into public hospitals, and this Government and the Fraser Federal Government are relying on the fact that, because people are going into the hospitals free of charge, they have no right to complain. I refer to a letter that the Minister wrote to a patient named Mrs. Barbara Hughes, in which the Minister said, "You have no right to complain, because there must be cost containment." Basically, that is what the Minister said.

[Midnight]

Mr. Trainer: My constituent was justifiably incensed.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right. We hope that, when our following speakers talk on this subject, they might perhaps quote that letter. That lady was told that she had no right to complain, that if the treatment she required was met it would mean increased taxation. This is what the Minister said in his statement:

There is a choice to be made.

Mr. Trainer: What compassion!

Mr. HEMMINGS: There is no compassion within the Liberal Party, none whatsoever. The Minister continued:

Governments were faced with increasing demands for costly intervention programmes which were identified in the public mind as basic to the fulfilment of their aspirations for a longer life with less suffering.

What is wrong with that concept?

Mr. Lewis: Who said anything was wrong with it?

Mr. HEMMINGS: The member for Mallee has decided that he agrees with that. If he reads the statement from the Minister, he will find that the Minister and his Government do not agree. Next time we move to reduce the health vote, perhaps the member for Mallee will join us on this side. There is nothing wrong with that; I agree. We all have that basic right to the health care that is needed. I agree that there are certain requirements that should be faced by the Government of the day in placing its priorities. The difference between my side of the House and the Government side is that the Government's policy has always been, "Cut it across the board. Tell them what they have to spend and they get nothing more". Our policy has always been that, where there is a need, we supply it; if we can rationalise, we do.

The Minister has made a few statements in this House about rationalisation. We heard the story about rationalisation at the Queen Victoria Hospital, and I was castigated by the Minister, who said that I did not know anything about health rationalisation, health planning, gynaecological care, obstetrics, and so on, when I was saying that the Queen Victoria Hospital should be maintained. People outside were saying what I was saying in this House, and they were ridiculed, too.

The Minister said, "I will not bow down to pressure". We know that, two weeks ago, the Minister realised that what I was saying in the House was correct, and she instructed the Health Commission to retain the Queen Victoria Hospital in its present state. The Minister was giving out stories to the Australian Council of Women about building a little block situated on the Royal Adelaide Hospital car park and calling it the Queen

Victoria Wing to satisfy the women who had good reason to be proud of what the Queen Victoria Hospital had done for them. Those stories were unfounded. We on this side are proud that we have convinced the Minister that she should rethink her attitude, and I am glad that she did follow our advice as well as the advice of the Friends of the Queen Victoria Hospital. We accept that this Government will be in power at least until 1982.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It is nice that the member for Mallee can add three to 1979 and get to 1982, as I did. I am concerned, as are many members on this side, that the Minister, unfortunately (whether it is her idea, or the idea of the Health Commission or of the Government) is hell bent on reducing standards in the public sector of South Australian hospitals.

We have already been forewarned that renal services will be transferred to one individual hospital, as will specialist services also, with no regard to the problems of patients getting from one place to another. The problem that we must face in 1982 when we become the Government is the necessity for a massive injection of expenditure in the health field. Otherwise, the people of South Australia will suffer. I am sure that Government members would not worry about that, as they probably all have 100 per cent hospital and medical cover and mix in the kind of circles where everyone has that cover.

I doubt whether any of them mix with disadvantaged and unemployed people but move, as the member for Price said, with the silver-tail set who really do not know what it is all about. However, Opposition members know what it is all about: we know what it is like to talk to people who cannot afford health insurance and who, if they are sick, have to go into a public hospital. They are the kind of people who are suffering under the policies of this Government, and they are the people we represent. I ask the Minister of Health to at least show some compassion. I have given the Minister a few words of praise in the past couple of weeks, and I ask her to rethink the health budget so that next year it helps all people and not just an elite group.

Mr. TRAINER: On a point of order, I refer to Standing Order 141 and seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with general practice, the brief explanation will be made at the end of this series of debates, as in the case of Question Time if a point arises during Question Time. In ordinary debate it is made immediately following the appropriate debate rather than interfering with that debate. The member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER: I rise on the same point. I, too, want to make a personal explanation. I understood, Mr. Speaker, that you would allow that personal explanation at the first opportunity that arises. The member for Napier reflected on me, and without going to the trouble of taking points of order and the like, it would be best covered by a personal explanation. The best time for making such an explanation is when the matter arises.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Hanson, as I pointed out to the member for Ascot Park, that it has been my practice to grant such leave at the end of a particular debate or series of matters that are in train at the time. Members will recall that the member for Salisbury and the member for Florey made personal explanations at the end of Question Time today, and there have been a number of other occasions when members have been called. The member for Todd will remember being asked recently to make a personal explanation at the end of a particular debate in progress. I will see both the member for Ascot Park and the member for Hanson prior

to the conclusion of this evening's session. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I entered into the spirit of the Committees in good faith. Being a newcomer to the House and having seen the way in which the Estimates were dealt with last year, I had no idea what to expect. I must say, however, that I am somewhat disappointed in the way the proceedings eventuated.

I do not think the people of South Australia benefited from the exercise, nor do I think that back-benchers gained anything much from it. However, I think it was a boon to the Ministers. Last year, when dealing with the Estimates, I saw the way in which it was possible to place pressure on a Minister and extract from that Minister some reasonable answers to questions. If the Minister wanted to be a little evasive and play around, the opportunity was there to keep him under pressure for some time until he decided to come across with some semblance of an answer. Unfortunately, my observations of the Committee processes this year led me to believe that the Ministers, knowing that they only had to sit it out until 10 o'clock on two nights and 5.30 on Thursday, engaged in what can only be described in a number of instances, as filibustering, aided and abetted by back-benchers on the Government side who were particularly voluble during the Committee proceedings. They are extremely quiet tonight, with the exception of some noisy interjectors from time to time, and also the member for Mallee, who has staked a claim for independence. I do not know how popular he is with his own Party, but nevertheless he has put a spoke in the wheel of the Government on a number of occasions, and I imagine that it will not be very long before he gets pulled into gear rather solidly.

There was a great fanfare in the press prior to the introduction of the new Committee system, and we were told that this policy implementation was going to make great changes. However, the *Advertiser* on Thursday 2 October was not particularly complimentary, and I must say it was rather amusing by referring to "the proposal to replace the old Committee phase of the Budget debate with a pair of inquisitorial committees". I would like to see some of the Ministers in the hands of the Spanish Inquisition; they would have made considerably more noise than they did during the Committees, and maybe to greater effect. We had great trouble in getting them to come to the point. In particular, I object to the way in which the Minister of Industrial Affairs, to put it as kindly as I can, was untruthful in response to some questions that I asked of him. I asked the Minister about the 10 per cent of daily and weekly paid employees who were removed from the Government pay-roll. I also asked him questions about the application of that attrition rate to public servants and what the Government intended to do about people who were so removed and who then became mendicants on the State. The Minister replied:

In answer to the last of the three questions asked by the honourable member, I have already clearly answered that in reply to a question from the member for Brighton.

Prior to my asking that question, I can only find two references to the member for Brighton in the record, and the question asked by the honourable member has no relationship at all to the question I asked. In a roundabout way, the Minister did make a response (he hardly gave an answer) to the member for Brighton. The honourable member then made a statement, which is not really a question, but nevertheless the Minister did not bother to respond to that at all.

Quite clearly, in his answer to me, he did not tell the truth. He did not answer my questions. He said that he

had answered them in replying to the member for Brighton, but he did not answer the member for Brighton's questions, either. This is the sort of thing we had to put up with in the industrial committee, and it was hardly the sort of performance designed to engender amongst members on this side a feeling of faith and willingness to participate in the exercise. In fact, when at one stage during the proceedings a question was raised about the way in which the Minister was responding—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. O'NEILL: In response to complaints about the way in which answers were being given, the Chairman stated that it is not the responsibility of the Chair to rule on how Ministers answer questions or how members frame their questions. The second part of that ruling was not, in fact, borne out, because later in the proceedings there was some fairly definite advice coming from the Chair as to how members should frame their questions. Certainly, Ministers were able to answer in any way they liked. That was contrary to my understanding of the whole spirit of these Committees. My understanding was that, if we went into such Committees, we could ask questions and elicit information from the Minister or the Public Service advisers present. These were to be succinct answers relating to specific questions so that Opposition or Government members would be able to obtain information to put before the public in respect of the way in which the Government intends to disburse funds. That was not the case.

The Ministers, in some cases where I presume they considered answers were not important, did give fairly succinct answers, but in other cases they gave convoluted answers that related only slightly to the question, and there was no opportunity for the member asking the question to pull the Minister back to the question to get a succinct reply. All we had, in effect, was a filibuster by Ministers because they knew full well that all they had to do was hold out until 10 p.m. and they could then go home. Of course, the other boon for the Ministers was that they knew very well from the time table adopted at the beginning of the Committee proceedings precisely when they had to front up. Also, they knew that they had to put in only one day in the House out of the fortnight. Under the previous system, as I understand it, the Ministers, like everyone else, were required to be in the House carrying out their Parliamentary duties and being available to any member of the Parliament who wished to question them.

That brings me to another point relating to the problem of members not on the Committees. I had quite a lot to say about the situation that developed during the Committee hearing of the Health vote. That has been adequately covered by previous speakers. The motion moved by the member for Hanson, in my opinion, was clearly out of order and should have been ruled so at the time he moved it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that a vote taken in this House and disposed of may not be alluded to in the manner in which the honourable member is now alluding to it.

Mr. O'NEILL: I take the point, Sir. As I have just said, there has been considerable debate on that topic, so I will not delay the House any further. Whilst I was not a member of that Committee, I was in the House at the time and, as a non-Committee member entitled to be here, I took some small part in the debate. I make clear that the opposition members of the Committee were under a great deal of provocation and should not be condemned because

they walked out.

I now refer to the unemployment situation in South Australia. Opposition members did not have a great deal of success in trying to get across to the Minister that unemployment is a problem; he seems to think that the so-called initiatives taken by the Government have gone some considerable way towards resolving this problem in South Australia. Whether the Minister can see it or not, such is not the case. Unemployment is a very serious problem here, and up to 50 000 people are unemployed in this State. This situation is having a detrimental effect on the fabric of society. I refer to a letter that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 16 October that related to an establishment at Pooraka. The manager of that company complained that he had spent a considerable sum in trying to recruit workers, and he stated that he had no success. As a result of the letter, the 16 year old son of one of my constituents, who has been trying to get a job for some time, as soon as he read the letter in the paper asked his mother to drive him to the establishment at Pooraka so that he can apply for the job. He saw the foreman, but he was told that they could do no more than take his name because no jobs were available; the foreman did not know where he got the idea that jobs were available.

My constituent and others apparently rang the *Advertiser* to complain about the situation and, on 17 October an article by the industrial reporter appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Boss's blast pays off 33 times", and the import of that is, according to the article, that the firm, Claymore Holdings Ltd of Pooraka, received 33 applications from people interested in gaining employment. I object to the fact that the marketing manager, Mr. R. W. Collins, was reported in the article as saying, "The people we have got from the Commonwealth Employment Service have been rubbish, absolute garbage." I was annoyed about the arrogant attitude of that person, who apparently holds a managerial position in the firm, towards the unfortunate people in our community who are not able to obtain jobs.

I rang the Director of the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs and asked him whether he had seen the letter, and he said that he had. I asked whether he intended to do anything about it and he said, "My word I do". I was very pleased to see in yesterday's *Advertiser* a letter from that gentleman, in the following terms:

I read with disgust the remarks attributed to Mr. Collins of Claymore Holdings Ltd. (the *Advertiser*, 17/10/80). He describes people referred to him by the Commonwealth Employment Service as "rubbish, absolute garbage". The staff of the C.E.S. knows this to be untrue. The 40 000-plus unemployed in SA would doubtless regard Mr. Collins's remarks as insulting. Most fair-minded people would also object to the categorising of human beings as "rubbish, garbage".

The C.E.S. is an ethical organisation and cannot disclose any of its dealings with Claymore Holdings Ltd. For this reason, I can but invite Mr. Collins to make public the precise nature of his dealings with the C.E.S. What has been reported to date does not describe the situation as I understand it.

Anyone who was sent to that establishment by the Commonwealth Employment Service in recent times should consult a lawyer and consider suing that firm or that person for defamation of character, because I can only agree with the statement by the Director of the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs that it is disgusting.

These are the sorts of things that are building up in this community as a result of the failure of the Liberal Governments, State and Federal, to solve the problem of

unemployment. They have made a lot of noise about it, and I will not belabour this House with the promises of the newly returned Prime Minister. All I can say is, "God help the youth of Australia in the next three years after what he has done to them in the past five years". We have to come to terms with the situation created by so-called Liberals, the conservatives of this country, which will split the fabric of our society for all time.

There is another problem regarding unemployment to which I must refer, although I do not particularly like doing it. That is the veritable delight evident in the attitude of the Minister of Industrial Affairs when he talks about achieving his 10 per cent attrition rate in the Public Service amongst, I emphasise, the daily-paid employees. When I asked him about the application of it to public servants, he pointed out that there was a voluntary system operating for superannuation. That is an entirely different position from the one being applied so far as attrition amongst the daily paid is concerned.

"Attrition" is an interesting word: it means "to wear out". I think that is a fairly appropriate word to use in respect of some people in their 50's, because they are worn out after years of working for the Government, often in heavy manual work. They are in no condition to front up on the labour market to work for contractors who may be lucky enough to get some of the few contracts that are around now. Over the years I have seen the destructive effects of unemployment on men over 45 or 50 years, or in their 50's. They are shocked and appalled when they apply for jobs and are told that they are too old.

This applies in areas where it is claimed that there is a shortage of skilled people. The employers are still to some degree selective in taking people on. If a person has been unlucky enough to suffer an injury as a result of his service to employers in the past, he is often considered to be unemployable and, even though he has the skills, the employer refuses to acknowledge that he is a skilled tradesman, and ignores the person's existence. The effect of this, particularly on males who are heads of families, is devastating.

I have seen constituents of mine reduced to such a state that they have left home. One became a derelict, because he had been made redundant, could not get another job, and could not face the prospect of living at home with young adults who had work. He became a mendicant on them. The roles were reversed: instead of the father being able to provide for and make money available to the children, a healthy man, capable of working, whose only crime was that he was said by his employer to be too old, became a mendicant on his family. He could not stand it, and became a derelict. Luckily, in time, he was brought back to the fold and, with assistance from others outside the family, he obtained a job. This is a shocking thing that has been perpetrated on people, and it cannot be written off with the glib reference to dole-bludgers. People in this situation are ready and willing to work, but this society cannot provide them with a job. This, to me, is indicative of a sick society. There is a preoccupation with profit, and this is extremely dangerous to the whole fabric of Australian society.

If we go along the road we are on, under the evil influence of the economic policies being followed at present, the situation will get even worse. In Saturday's election the Government was severely chastised because of its handling of the situation in Australia (that has been admitted by the Prime Minister). Because the Premier went out of his way to endorse the principles and policies on which the Prime Minister went to the nation, we can include the Premier in that chastisement. The Liberal Parties, both State and Federal, have to do something

quickly about the employment situation and about social services in Australia.

I turn now to another matter that concerns me greatly. I was unable to elicit much information on this matter. In fact, I had no great success in finding out what efforts are being made by the Government to study the effects of radio-activity in workers in industry or what is being done by the Government to see that it has the necessary hardware to gauge the dangers and protect people from threat. I tried to elicit information from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I thought that, having an industrial inspectorate that is supposed to look after safety matters, he would be able to give me some information, but he referred the matter to the Minister of Health. I was not a Committee member and, as has been related, there was some frustration for members who were on the Committee in getting information.

Unfortunately, back-benchers did not get any opportunity to elicit information on this matter. I tried to obtain information from the Minister of Environment, but again without success. It seems to me that the Government is downright irresponsible in its approach to the radio-active hazards of the industries which it seems hell bent to bring to South Australia. First, we have to look at the matter of uranium mining, which seems to be the linchpin of the whole future of this State.

We hear much talk from the Premier about what it will do for South Australia. Of course, the management of Western Mining Corporation and B.P. are less optimistic in their short-term opinions on the matter. They seem to think that it is a matter of proving up at this stage, and perhaps in the long-term future some developments may occur there. It is also unclear regarding what type of mining operation will take place: whether it will be open-cut mining or deep mining. It is clear from the reading that I have done and from reports emanating from the United States that, regardless of whether open-cut or deep mining is carried out, considerable hazards that have not been noticed before exist in respect of low-yield radioactivity.

I can see that we are in for something similar to what happened in the asbestos industry, which is an indictment of the companies that were involved in those enterprises. It is now an historical fact that the companies operating the asbestos mines deliberately hid the hazards involved from the workers. It would appear that we are going into the uranium era. Both the Federal and State Liberal Governments are pushing us into it with indecent haste, and, as far as I can ascertain, this Government has committed no money to enable the hazards to be assessed or to enable the purchase of equipment that is capable of assessing dangerous situations.

The situation regarding people working in the industry now is questionable. It has been shown that the so-called badges that are supposed to be a safety check on the amount of radiation that the human body can stand are fallible. There is a need to develop a much more effective method of gauging the dosage that is received. In fact, it has just come to my mind again that earlier this year in this place I referred to a letter from the Premier to the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council, in which the Premier indicated clearly that there was no way of assuring safety in the industry and that a decision on minimum standards had to be taken based on the economics of the industry. That is rather concerning when one considers that the Deputy Premier said at one stage in 1979:

I repeat again what I said publicly and what the Minister of Health will say publicly: that no mining will proceed in this State until we are convinced that it is safe for miners to mine uranium and these problems in relation to the disposal are

solved.

It is clear from the Premier's statement that the Government is unsure whether or not the miners are safe. All members know that there is no safe way of disposing of the residues from the process. It is therefore rather amazing that the Government is charging on with gay abandon. Indeed, the Deputy Premier is overseas now to try to drum up sales and to get commitments in relation to the industry, yet the Government has not put aside money in this Budget to ensure the safety of the workers that it is intended to get into the industry. That is disgraceful. We could not elicit an important thing like that from the Committee, and, if the Committees are to continue, Ministers will have to change their attitude, give succinct answers to questions, and stop beating around the bush and filibustering, as has been done.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I understand that the House is still sitting at this late hour of the night (or the early hour of the morning) because the Minister of Industrial Affairs cannot be here tomorrow, as he is going up to Alice Springs hunting daisies or some such thing.

We were assured at the commencement of the discussions in relation to the new Committee system that late nights would vanish and would no longer be the order of the day, but here, on the first night, no gag is being applied and I understand that we will be here until later than 3 a.m., merely to suit one Minister, whose duty, I believe, is to be in this House, and not in Alice Springs, especially for two days. I know that on occasions Ministers must be away. I have been away, as a Minister, on a Thursday afternoon, or at some similar time, but I have never caused this House to sit beyond the normal times merely because I had to attend a conference in Alice Springs, Sydney, Melbourne, or elsewhere.

Mr. Lewis: Didn't they invite you?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was invited, and I was very welcome at most of the conferences. Even my opponents were pleased to see me, and at least I stirred the conference up. It is beyond my comprehension that, because one Minister will be away tomorrow and will not be here to respond to the debate tomorrow night, he can dictate the terms and the hours that this House will sit tonight. I do not think this augurs well for the future of the Committees or the co-operation of members of the Opposition if, because one Minister is away, we are to be told when and how we will speak.

I think my complaint is a legitimate one. I had intended to speak in this debate tomorrow night and, irrespective of what the circumstances were, the Minister told me in conference this morning about the time allocated in this House, but said that he would be in Alice Springs on Thursday and I understood that he would be here tomorrow. Now, I understand that he has told my Whip that he will be away for two days. He will be away on Wednesday and Thursday, and that is not good enough.

Most members who have spoken in this debate, including one from the other side, have had something to say about the conduct of the Committees. I do not want to go over the ground that my Leader covered adequately today in his criticisms; they are not only his criticisms, but the criticisms of the Opposition on the performance of the Committees. Neither do I want to go on record as saying that I do not believe that the Committees are a non-workable system. With the proper mechanism and co-operation, I believe there could be some success. I doubted this early in the proceedings as I saw the Committees developing but, as time went on, and as my inquiries revealed from Labor members who have participated in similar committees in other States, it is apparent that, if they are worked properly and in

accordance with at least some of the desires of the Opposition, fruitful information can be obtained from Ministers.

I believe that, on this occasion, the Committees were almost a farce. I cite as the most glaring example of the greatest deficiency that I have seen within the system the fact that members are gagged before they begin the debate. There is no doubt that, if a time limit is placed on any Committee function of this nature, the members are gagged before it starts. Government and Opposition members were given the right to ask alternate questions, but obviously there was an attempt by members of the Government to stymie almost completely, in some circumstances, members of the Opposition who wished to pursue a line of questioning.

Mr. Lewis: For example?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There are numerous examples, and I could cite plenty of them. The honourable member is as guilty as is anyone else on the other side of the House.

The other thing that I found with which I disagreed in relation to the functioning of the Committees was the fact that Ministers themselves were filibustering most of the time. In one Committee it took 17 minutes to extract from a Minister (the Minister of Agriculture) a response to a question asked by one of my colleagues. I do not think that is good enough. That sort of grandstanding was taking up valuable time, especially as the time allocated was short in the first instance. In that very Committee, there is no question but that I would have moved a motion of no confidence in the Minister, or a similar motion of condemnation, had it not been for the very small time allocation for that Committee. I merely had the opportunity of condemning that Minister, who had misled the Committee. To anyone sitting in the Committee, irrespective of whether he was a member of the Government, a spectator, a member of the Opposition, or a public servant, it was intensely clear that the Minister had either lied or deliberately misled the Committee. That was revealed clearly, and for that the Minister ought to have been condemned by way of a motion, but time did not permit that.

I only wanted to make those three points in relation to how I observed the functioning of the Committees. I believe that the Government ought to be cognisant of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition today setting out in much more detail than I have time to do exactly what needs to be done, that is, setting up an all-Party Committee to give the opportunity to all members of the House, irrespective of their political persuasion, to formulate a report recommending how these Committees can work to the betterment of everyone in this House. If that is done, the future functioning of the Committees could be greatly improved. If it is not done, then I fear for their future. I believe that the Committees could become a disrupting force within the Parliamentary system rather than fulfilling the purpose for which they were established, that is, mainly to serve as a source of information. I move:

To insert after the words "agreed to" first occurring the words "except that the vote 'Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$6 124 000' be reduced by \$100".

I so move, because I believe that, of all the social rights, the right to work is the most basic of which I am aware. I do not think that anyone can deny that statement. It appears to me that, if the human being has not the right to work in our community, it is a tremendous waste of human resources, and that is what is happening at the moment, not just in South Australia but in Australia, although more predominantly in this State. I do not believe that the present Government is doing sufficient about it.

One must feel completely rejected by society if one is disadvantaged by not being able to work. As I have said, the right to work is the most basic of all social requirements, and if one has to compete on the open market to purchase goods and services which surely are not luxuries but the necessities of life then it is clear that the person who is unemployed is at a great social disadvantage. The polls proved, and I believe the voters established clearly, that unemployment had become one of the major issues in last Saturday's Federal election.

I can recall attending several meetings when I was Minister to speak to unemployed people at the time when there were many unemployed in South Australia. Only a few people bothered to turn up and express their view about the unemployment situation. We hardly heard any member of the Liberal Party talking about it, but I think they will be talking about it and be concerned about in the future, particularly after the 6 per cent swing against the Fraser Government which has just been recorded in the Federal election, although I realise that there were other issues such as the personality and arrogance of the Prime Minister, as well as certain policies enunciated by the Labor Party.

I wish to refer, however, to the performance of the present Government in relation to its unemployment policies. The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics unemployment figures are clearly an indictment of the Government's so-called job creation policies. The figures for September (the latest available to me) show that the infamous South Australian job rot is accelerating. Those figures show that in the 12 months from September 1979, the time of the last State election, to September 1980 unemployment has worsened from 7.6 per cent to 8.2 per cent. Of those seeking full-time work, the percentage has risen to 8.7 per cent. That is not a very happy birthday present for the present Government which has been in office now for 12 months.

During the Committee discussions the shallowness of the Government's policies on the unemployment position in this State came through very clearly. The programme Budget details released in those Committees revealed that the Government's youth employment scheme had entirely collapsed. The answers given by the Minister of Industrial Affairs made that quite evident, and I shall deal further with that in a moment. What were the people of South Australia promised by this Government leading up to the last election? They were promised that if the Government was elected 7 000 jobs would be created immediately. After being elected and after seeing a very slight increase for the three-month period that the Labor Party remained in Government, the Premier showed great confidence by suggesting that the 7 000 jobs would be 10 000 jobs. One can only couple that con trick with that of Malcolm Fraser's tax cuts—both the biggest con tricks that I have ever seen.

The Government allocated \$2 000 000 for pay-roll tax rebates for employers who took on young people, a scheme that was introduced with a great fanfare and publicity, but what do we find was spent in this area? All the fanciful figures that were given by the Minister of Industrial Affairs in reply to questions we had asked were interesting, until we found by persistent questioning of the Minister on the Budget that in fact of that \$2 000 000 only \$129 000 was actually used on job creation, amounting to only 6 per cent of the total allocation. One could describe the whole scheme as a sham and nothing but a publicity stunt by the Government.

It is clear that youth unemployment has worsened since the last State election. This financial year \$1 000 000 has been allocated for the rebate scheme. This is a cut of more

than half, because last year's allocation of \$2 000 000 was for only nine months. To maintain last year's level of assistance \$2 700 000 should have been allocated this year. What I am concerned about is this: if last year only \$129 000 out of the \$2 000 000 could be spent on job creation, how can the Government justify a scheme of this nature continuing and then allocate another \$1 000 000 for the rest of this 12 months. One would not have to be a mathematician, or Einstein, to work out that that \$1 000 000 will stand idly by not being used unless this Government changes its policies very quickly in relation to job creation. The money will not be spent on the scheme that now exists. There is no way possible for it to be spent on that scheme unless the Government is going to hand it out willy-nilly, as I said it probably would in the first place and give it to employers, whether or not they are entitled to it, as some sort of subsidy. I am concerned that people are not getting jobs under this scheme. This scheme has not worked, and will not work. No scheme of this nature has ever worked throughout the world; it works marginally, but does not work to the full effect.

Let us just get away from that for a moment. The scheme only applies to youth; it is a youth incentive scheme. The whole purpose of the scheme was to create jobs for young people under 20 years of age. What has the Government done about the situation of people aged over 45? What sort of jobs have been created for people 45 and over who are still quite able to work, still capable, still physically strong and still wanting to find employment in our society? As I said in the first place, it is their basic right to find that employment. There has not been one job created in that area, not one, by this Government, because the Government's only job creation scheme, if one can call it that (and I doubt that that is its proper name), is a scheme for youth. There is nothing for people 45 years old and older.

I was reading an article the other day, which I unfortunately omitted to bring tonight (I will certainly be tabling that article in this House at some future stage). It states that the percentage of people over 45 who are looking for work is higher than the percentage of people under 26 years of age who are looking for work. That was quite a shock to me, because the last time I took an intense and close look at the statistics the reverse was the case. That is not happening now. The situation is that people are being put off, or losing their jobs because of a close-down, in the 45 to 60 years age bracket, and because of the very fact that they are that age employers do not want to employ them, and younger people are being employed at their expense. That is the fact of the situation. I will not quote the figures from memory, because I might be wrong, but the percentage is at least 2 per cent higher than that recorded for people under 26 years of age. This Government has failed dismally in that area because it has made no attempt to find work for people in that category.

What has this Government done about migrant workers? This Government has not given an incentive to a migrant worker at all. There is no scheme operating in this State as the SURS scheme operated. Migrant workers and unskilled workers could and did find work in great volumes under that scheme.

There are literally thousands of migrant women in South Australia who are looking for work and who cannot find it, but nothing has been done by this Government in regard to migrant women or in regard to any women. Migrant women are most decidedly disadvantaged. The factories in my district are not running at full force and, in these factories, women were able to find employment some 18 months ago, but they cannot find it now.

I attended a function on Sunday and was told by the

Headmaster of the Thebarton school that there is a crisis in that area because parents cannot provide all of the things that the school requires, because of lack of finance. It is an illustration of how bad the employment situation is in South Australia when parents have to deny their children some of the little luxuries that school can provide. Of the children at the Thebarton school, 42 per cent are the sons and daughters of migrants. The Government has failed not only in that area: in relation to the youth programme, the programme Budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report expose the Government's attempted smokescreen. The Minister tried similar tactics in replies to questions in the Estimates Committee by blurring all three aspects of the pay-roll tax reforms and by claiming that nearly 2 000 jobs had been created under the scheme in just 10 months.

Let us look at the fine print. The first of the scheme's three components was the raising of the minimum exemption level. The second of these was pay-roll exemptions where employers employing additional youth (as described in the Act) do not pay pay-roll tax for those additional youth workers. The third part of the scheme provides a refund on pay-roll tax of \$600 for one additional youth worker, and \$1 800 for two or more.

The amount provided for in the Budget relates to the third part of the scheme, namely, pay-roll tax refunds. These refunds are provided quarterly, if an employer maintains an additional full-time youth for a period of three months.

The second part of the scheme provides exemptions on a monthly basis. I know this because our research staff has checked it. It is all very well for the Minister to claim that an extra 2 000 jobs have been created by referring to pay-roll tax exemptions; however, what he has failed to explain is why those so-called 2 000 extra jobs have resulted in refunds totalling only \$129 000 over a six-month period.

That is the question that goes begging. How can the Minister tell the people of South Australia that 2 000 jobs have been funded under the pay-roll tax rebate scheme when only \$129 000 has been expended? It is a mathematical impossibility. I do not care how good the Minister, his staff or anyone else is at arithmetic: those figures do not tally. We are being led a dance by the Government: we are not getting the facts.

The refund system requires the employers to retain the so-called additional youth workers for a period of three months. That, of course, has not been happening, and employers have been able to obtain funds for about 600 additional youth workers. Therefore, even on the Minister's own generous definition of additional youth workers, he cannot claim that more than 600 additional teenage jobs have been created. That is the figure that goes into the \$129 000 in regard to the assistance programme, not the figure of 2 000, as we have been told by the Minister. Six hundred jobs have been created, and for young people only.

That is discrimination, if you like, for those people over 45 years of age about whom I have spoken earlier. No thought has been given by the Government to creating temporary, casual or permanent work for those people. So far as the Government is concerned, they are thrown on the scrap heap. They become a non-statistic, because many of these people do not register for work. They know that, in society today, with no help from this Government, it is very difficult to obtain work. They become part of the hidden unemployment and, in my view, it is possible that that hidden unemployment could increase the actual unemployment in South Australia by 25 per cent or 30 per cent, because those figures correspond to the national figures.

The only other alternative for the Minister is to assume that his business colleagues are a bit thick between the ears and do not bother to apply for money to which they are entitled. In view of the Minister's publicity campaign and the fact that many of these business men provided such active support and publicity for him during the last election campaign, I am sure he would not want to conclude that South Australian businessmen were ignorant of Government policies and would not wish to accept Government incentives that put more money in their pockets. It certainly is baloney to claim or to try to imply that the refund scheme has been any force for job creation. It should not take too much argument or logic to persuade the Minister that \$129 000 will not go too far in creating 2 000 jobs, let alone the 7 000 and 10 000 that the Premier promised.

I now come to what I consider a very important part of this debate and of the questioning in the Committees. It is clear, not on my say-so but on the say-so of the Premier, that the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment has made a very close examination and scrutiny of just how successful this scheme has been. Unfortunately, I have not access to the results of that examination but, if public money is being spent (and that is what this money is, not that much was spent: an amount of \$129 000 spent was not a great load) and if the public purse is being used in this way, and the Government has allocated a further \$1 000 000 to this cause, I ask the Minister whether he would make the results of that examination and the report available to me and the House.

I do not think anyone on this side does not want to see job creation work. It may be that people on the other side do: I do not know. We want to see it work, whether it is the Government's system or our system. Not one person on this side would criticise the Government if it found the 10 000 jobs about which it has spoken. We would be entirely happy with that situation.

The Minister has refused not only me and other members of the Opposition but also the public of South Australia the opportunity to sight a report that I know, on the Premier's say-so, has been done by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. If the department is as good as it was when I was there, it would do an enormous job, a first-class job, and have all the facts, figures and answers provided for the Government. What is wrong with making that document public? Public money is being spent in this area, and surely it is a right and proper decision for the Government to make that document available. It has not done so. What has one to ask oneself? Is it a shonky report?

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I thought for a moment that someone from the Government benches was going to enter the debate, because on my count I am the 13th member on the Opposition benches to contribute to this Budget debate, which is an important debate in every Parliament. We had had only one contribution from a member on the Government benches.

I support the censure motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, in case the House has forgotten, some 10 hours ago, earlier yesterday afternoon. I suggest to the member for Fisher, who has obviously forgotten, that, if he takes the trouble to refer to one of his colleagues, he will be told that the motion moved earlier by my Leader was in relation to Moore's building, the law courts, and the remand centre. There are several reasons why the Leader should have moved such a motion, not the least being the total arrogance with which the Minister of Industrial

Affairs and the Attorney-General treated the Opposition, the House, and the truth in their contributions to the Estimates Committees, particularly the Attorney-General, who I was unfortunate enough to see giving evidence to the Committee. He was most arrogant, as the member for Playford has already pointed out, and he gave the absolute minimum of information. It had to be screwed out of him, with great diligence.

That brings me to comment on a statement made by the member for Mallee, and it was made frequently by Government members during the Committee proceedings, namely, Government members believed that the Ministers were not under attack, but were simply present to provide information to the Opposition. I point out to those new Government members that Ministers are on their mettle during Budget discussions. It is the Ministers, not the public servants, who are responsible to Parliament. It is during the Budget debate that the Parliament of this State is able to determine whether a Minister is capable of controlling a Government department, or whether the Government department controls the Minister, and it became apparent during the Committee discussions that a number of Ministers are clearly controlled by their public servants. That is a matter of concern to the Parliament but, because of the system that the Government has introduced, those Ministers who are controlled by their public servants can be protected by their public servants, whereas, under the system that applied previously, inept Ministers had their ineptitude clearly shown during the debate on the budget lines.

Mr. Evans: In the previous Government?

Mr. KENEALLY: In any Government. I am not going to say that there are not competent Ministers or that there are not incompetent Ministers in the current Government. Obviously, the member for Fisher would agree with me. Before I discuss the Estimates Committees, I will comment briefly on the censure motion moved by the Deputy Leader, again on the Minister of Industrial Affairs. When speaking about employment in South Australia or in Australia, our political opponents are apt to try to point to the increase that has taken place in employment. The Prime Minister is wont to say that there is no real problem with unemployment, because employment has increased by about 200 000 jobs over the past year, and that is a clear indication that his policies are working. If that is the attitude that the Liberal Governments wish to take in Canberra and in South Australia, let them explain how it is that, in the private sector in South Australia, there are 2 000 fewer jobs today than there were at the corresponding time last year.

Thousands of school leavers will be coming on to the employment market at the end of this year, and at the same time there will be a reduction in the number of private sector jobs. Also, there is a deliberate reduction by the Government in public sector jobs. It is the South Australian Government's policy to reduce our employment base, and this will be absolutely disastrous to the fabric of society as we know it in South Australia. What disturbs me more particularly is that this is a deliberate policy by the Government.

One needs merely to look at the Budget lines and to read the information that has been gleaned from Ministers to see that there is a clear Government policy to redistribute the wealth of this State from the poor and low income earners to the well-off and rich people in our society. That policy will create much divisiveness within the community, and Government members' Federal colleagues have been warned of this.

Sir Roderick Carnegie, who is not the most noted socialist in Australia, has voiced his concern about what is

happening as a result of the policies of the Federal Liberal Government. Those same attitudes are being expressed in the most callous way within the Government's Budget lines that the House is now debating. There is a redistribution of wealth away from the low income earners into the pockets of the rich people in South Australia.

The taxation deductions, of which the Government is very proud, are a simple indication of what I am saying. The concessions will not benefit any working person in South Australia but rather will benefit the more affluent in our society. Of course, the difference must be picked up somewhere, and it is being picked up by an increase in charges that falls evenly right across the community and is, to that extent, a regressive tax that falls more heavily on the working people of this State. That is a matter about which Opposition members are concerned and about which I am increasingly being convinced that Government members have no concern at all.

I now refer to the performance of the Committees. I was a member of Committee B, and hope to make a contribution to the discussions on that Committee's performance. However, I also had an opportunity to be a back-bencher while Committee A was sitting. Only one Government member has been prepared to participate in this debate, although I am led to believe that others will enter the debate later. I do not know whether this could be called a debate, as I understand a debate to include the cut and thrust of views across the Chamber. However, we are not having any of that, although, after 13 or 14 Opposition members have contributed to the debate, Government members now wish to participate therein. One wonders what has caused their change of mind. It would have been a much better course of action for Government members to have contributed to the debate earlier, unless, of course, they are afraid that what they have to say will be challenged by the Opposition. Perhaps Government members think that the later they wait the less likelihood there is of that happening.

The member for Mallee expressed his concern and discontent regarding some of the effects of the new system, and I share his concern. It is impossible for a member of Parliament who is not on a Committee but who has a vital concern about matters that are being dealt with concurrently by the two Committees to participate effectively in both Committee debates.

Of course, that means that the member has to make a choice as to which Committee he or she wishes to participate in. Under the system we are quite obviously wanting to get away from, the opportunity was there for all members at all times to ask the questions they wished of all Ministers. That no longer exists. To that extent, the rights of members of the House of Assembly have been reduced. One of the areas that most concerns me about that reduction in the rights of members is that, because of the gag which is implicit in the new system, the Committee is encouraged to ask questions of Ministers who would not otherwise be questioned extensively. At the same time, the opportunity of members to question Ministers whom they wish to question at considerable length is reduced.

Under the old system, the members, the Committee, or the Parliament itself could determine the length to which any Minister could be questioned. Under the new system, with the gag, that right is taken out of the hands of the Committee. So, we are encouraged to question at length Ministers whom otherwise we would not desire to question at length. If we were questioning the Minister of Agriculture, for instance, and we had completed our questions at 2.30 p.m., we could not call in another Minister to be questioned until the 10 p.m. time slot provided for the Committee. We would have to wait until

the next day and start afresh with another Minister. That seems to be a problem with the Committee system, and I hope that the Leader's suggestion of a bipartisan investigation will be considered.

Before moving on to discuss what I consider to be the utterly hypocritical attitude of this Government, I want to say that incessantly over the past 12 months the new Government has criticised the state of the State finances it inherited in September last year. We are encouraged to believe that the Government itself is about to work some economic miracle, that it inherited a State whose economy was sagging, whose industrial relations were poor, where the cost of living was high, where the cost of housing was outstripping equivalent costs elsewhere, and where the cost of land was excessive, and so on. That was the rhetoric of the Liberal Party in Opposition, and it has been the rhetoric of the Liberal Party in Government. So, Sir, you can imagine my surprise when I had posted to me, I suspect by courtesy of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has just entered the Chamber, a glossy pamphlet entitled *South Australia: An Investment Profile*.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It's a bit more than a pamphlet.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is, and it certainly costs considerably more than a pamphlet would cost. I am sure the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be quite happy, when he replies to this debate, to inform the Parliament of the cost of producing this document.

Under the heading "A Summary of South Australia's Comparative Advantages" to my surprise are listed 12 advantages. In addition to those 12 advantages, there is another section listing the cost advantages that we have in South Australia, and there are a number of other headings which also indicate the good state that the South Australian economy is in. Among the 12 of South Australia's comparative advantages I see that the availability of industrial land in South Australia is advantageous compared to the position of our competitors interstate.

I see that industrial land in South Australia is about 70 per cent less expensive than similar land in Melbourne and Sydney. One could probably hazard a guess that the existence of the Land Commission in South Australia may have in some way been responsible for that advantage that the Government now wishes to promote. This is the Land Commission which the Government has been so critical of and which it has done its best to dispose of, even though it is the instrument that has provided the Government with the advantage which it now wishes to promote.

The Government claims that building costs in South Australia are lower because of the lower incidence of industrial disputation, which leads to another of our advantages in South Australia. We have the best industrial record in Australia. Advantage No. 6, under "Industrial disputes", is as follows:

South Australia has a good industrial record with a lower incidence of industrial disputes in all sectors of its economy compared with the other States.

In Victoria and New South Wales more than two-and-a-half times the number of working days are lost per employee than in South Australia.

To the credit of the authors of this document, they have not suggested that any of these advantages have derived from the change of Government in September 1979. These are advantages inherited from that terrible socialist Government that this Government would have us believe left it with an inheritance that it would find difficult to overcome in the short term, namely, an economy that was in a bad state.

Power, water and sewerage costs are compared with similar costs in other States and are cheaper in most cases.

The cost of transport in South Australia is cheaper. Incentives to industry in South Australia are better, and the cost of living in South Australia is lower than in Victoria or New South Wales. Advantage No. 11, dealing with the cost of housing, is as follows:

In Adelaide land for housing at a comparable distance from the city centre can be less than half the price of equivalent land in Melbourne or Sydney. The median sale price of comparable houses in Adelaide are some 32 per cent less than in Melbourne, and 45 per cent less than in Sydney.

These are the conditions applying in South Australia, concerning which the Government has claimed the people were voting with their feet, streaming from the State, so we were being told in 1978-79. We find, however, that people did not start to stream from South Australia until 1980, because the statistics are clear on that. People are leaving the State and have left this State in greater numbers as a result of the change in Government in 1979, resulting in the present Government, which clearly, as I said earlier, in its Budget policy has disadvantaged those already heavily disadvantaged and advantaged those who are already advantaged. There is no secret about this. This is their policy. The Government believes that if it fattens the rich man's table enough crumbs will fall off to help those who are disadvantaged. Basically, that is the philosophy of the Liberal Party in Australia—it makes those who are already rich and affluent more rich and affluent because, if it strengthens the strong it strengthens the society, and there will be more benefits for the poorer people. I have not seen that occur, and it will not occur if the Budget we are debating continues to be the policy of this Government. I do not believe that the Government can afford to continue it.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You're a cynic, aren't you?

Mr. KENEALLY: That is the pot calling the kettle black. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, when in Opposition, was one of the most vitriolic cynical members in this place. Now he has the effrontery to accuse me of cynicism. It would be amusing if it were not for the fact that he believes that cynicism is the prerogative of Liberal politicians and that it must not be indulged in by their political opponents.

After reading *An Investment Profile in South Australia* prepared by the Government, there is not doubt that it inherited an economy and a State that was in very good shape indeed, because it is that economy and that situation that the Government wishes to promote to encourage industry to come here. I hope the Government is successful, because we desperately need industry and jobs in South Australia. We have needed them desperately during the last 10 years and that is the case now, but it is becoming quite apparent that the would-be saviours of the employment situation in South Australia do not have the answers. The Liberal Party knew that they would not have the answers but said that it was the Labor Party's policies in this State that were discouraging job creation in the private sector.

The Liberal Party is now well aware that it had nothing at all to do with the former Government's policy. In fact, I think it is becoming increasingly aware that private industry related more closely to the former Government than to the current Government's activities. There has been a reduction of 2 000 jobs in the private sector during the past 12 months, which is a clear indictment of this Government's policies. There is no more critical or important problem for us all to face up to than that of job creation. It is absolute fantasy for the present Government to suggest that if employment in the public sector is reduced somehow or other the private sector will pick up. If the Minister can point to an example anywhere in the

world where this has occurred, I shall be interested to know about it. I know of no example that he can point to that will prove that those policies are correct. In Port Augusta, in my electorate, over 70 per cent of the male employment is generated by Government. What effect do the policies of Malcolm Fraser's Federal Liberal Government and the policies of David Tonkin's State Liberal Government in reducing the public sector have upon a community such as Port Augusta? Those policies threaten the very livelihood of everyone of those people who work in Port Augusta and who are employed by the Government. In Port Augusta they know that if there is a reduction in public sector employment there it will not be picked up by the private sector.

The private sector in Port Augusta depends almost entirely for its employment on the public sector. If we had no public sector in Port Augusta we would have no private sector in Port Augusta, none at all. Port Augusta is, in a sense, a microcosm of the Australian economy at large, with this very close inter-relationship between the public and private sectors. This Budget that we have been debating is quite clearly based on the philosophy that, if there is a reduction in the public sector expenditure, this will benefit the economy and we will have an explosion in private sector jobs. It has not occurred, and will not occur. I believe that this document, as attractive as it is, as expensive as it is, as glossy as it is, is a clear indictment of the hypocrisy of those who would purport to promote South Australia with this document.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Very well received that document.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am absolutely sure it is well received, because it is a good document, stating quite clearly what the Labor Government in 10 years in Government in this State was able to achieve; that is what this document states. It ought to be well received. What I am criticising is the hypocrisy of the Minister. For eight years in this House he criticised the previous Administration and then, as a Minister in this Government, works to take advantage of all those good things done by the previous Government and to claim them as his Government's own. He wishes to promote them interstate, asking people to come here because the Liberal Party, somehow or other, has created a Mecca for private investment. That is what I am critical of.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: It is no good the Minister, because I have touched him on the raw, trying to interject. He has his opportunity. He is back in the House and can speak, if his back-benchers now give him an opportunity to do so. I am criticising the hypocrisy that is inherent in this Government's presenting this document as its own when I, along with my colleagues, had to spend many years in this House listening to the vitriolic cynicism of the Minister who now graces (if that is the correct word) the front bench in this House.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): Like the member for Stuart, I thought for a moment that there was going to be a speaker from the Government benches. I thought that the Minister of Industrial Affairs had come into the Chamber to deliver his address, but apparently that is not the case. I have pleasure in supporting the previous speakers in this debate. As we emerge from the new system of Estimates Committees, we are supposed to have scrutinised the 1980-81 Budget. I believe that much is to be desired, and I want to make a few general comments about this new system of Estimates Committees. Many members from both sides felt frustrated and annoyed with one thing or another and, if we are to make these Estimates

Committees work effectively and successfully, a number of changes are necessary. It has been said that teething problems were expected and that is fair enough; I accept that. However, that being the case, it is essential that improvements to the system are made.

Procedure was one matter that caused concern. Different approaches were adopted by both Chairmen of the Committees, and the procedure was not clear: much time was wasted in arguing about this matter. Ministers' long-winded answers, participation by other members and time limits were other factors that caused a great deal of anxiety, especially to members of the Opposition, who found that they had no time, or insufficient time, to ask all their questions. These are only some of the problems experienced by members that must be examined.

Several Ministers and their departmental advisers gave long-winded answers. One example occurred in Estimates Committee B in the examination of the proposed expenditure for community welfare. The Leader of the Opposition commented earlier on this point in his address, and I fully support the comments that he made. A Government member took eight minutes to ask a question; the Minister took seven minutes to answer; the Minister then passed the matter to his Director-General, who commented for three minutes; the Minister then indicated that the Acting Deputy Director-General would comment, and he took a further seven minutes; the Government member, pursuing his question, followed up the matter for a further three minutes; the Minister commented for another minute; the Acting Deputy Director then commented for a further four minutes. All in all, a total of 33 minutes was spent on one question that I and my colleagues considered to be of no importance. Possibly, the member to whom I refer considered that the question was of some importance, and that is accepted because that is his right.

I believe that this situation indicates a waste of the short time that was available, in view of the time limits, and this kind of thing occurred on a number of occasions. Many of the answers were of a repetitive nature, and one could go on and on giving examples of this kind. I and my colleagues spent many hours in preparing and studying the proposed expenditure, and this work went down the drain. We dealt with no more than several lines and, had we not been allowed an extra half hour to the agreed time before the change of Committee members and the examination of the consumer affairs lines, we would not have dealt with the important miscellaneous section of community welfare. As it turned out, we had time to ask only two or three questions. We stuck by the agreement that was reached and we concluded questioning at the agreed time, and that is more than I can say for Government members, who continued questioning for some time, thus cutting into the time allocated to the important area of consumer affairs.

A quick check of *Hansard* shows that I was able to ask only nine questions of the 70 that I wanted to ask about community welfare; the member for Salisbury was able to ask only six questions; the member for Albert Park asked only three questions; and the member for Peake asked only two questions. All members wanted to ask more questions but did not have the opportunity to do so and, in my opinion, that is wrong. Had we not agreed to extend for an extra half hour, the member for Peake and the member for Albert Park would not have had an opportunity to ask any questions. It is ridiculous that a lot of time and work was simply wasted. Worse still is the fact that members did not obtain the information that they sought.

To sit in Committee for most of the day and get very

little opportunity to probe and scrutinise the all-important Estimates of Expenditure is hard for any member to take, and I think we need to have a hard look at this situation. The Government has a mandate to extend the number of Committees scrutinising the Budget and the amount of time available for the scrutiny.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ABBOTT: I feel that many changes are necessary to make the Estimates Committees work efficiently and effectively, and this must be done as soon as possible.

I want to refer briefly to youth homelessness. A working party on youth housing was conducted by the Youth Bureau in the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment but, apart from a press statement by the Minister of Transport in the absence overseas of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, it was indicated that the report was expected to be completed by June last. However, nothing has been heard of the report or any recommendations. From my questioning of the Minister, I have learnt that the working party has reported and that the report has been sent to a subcommittee of Cabinet to be looked at before the question of its release is considered.

I wonder how long it will take that Cabinet subcommittee to look at the report, as was stated, and how long it will take it to consider the necessary recommendations on this very important issue. In view of the high priority claimed to be given to this matter by the Government, I was amazed to find that the Budget provided no specific allocation to meet this very real problem. When I directed that question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, whose department is responsible for the Youth Bureau, he replied:

I can assure the honourable member that there is no line in regard to the construction of housing under the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and I believe that any such allocation would obviously come under another Minister, such as the Minister of Housing or the Minister of Community Welfare. It would be quite inappropriate for any allocation to be made in the "Miscellaneous" line of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is not my intention, despite what some people may hear as rumours, to put up a housing project under these lines. The short answer is that it would not be appropriate, and there is no allocation under these lines.

The Minister also said:

The report is being produced by the Youth Bureau, but because the Youth Bureau is involved in preparing that report for me as Minister responsible for the bureau does not mean that there will be any allocation under these lines to solve those problems. It is a multi-departmental submission; it affects other departments. From my recollection, from some of the material going into the report, there is a representative from the Department of Community Welfare, from local government and the Housing Trust, and I believe that one should look to other Ministerial lines for an allocation.

I looked at other Ministerial lines, but could find no allocation for that matter.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Do you think it's logical to decide what the recommendations should be and what action you should take before you decide how to spend the money? I thought that would be fairly logical. You have just admitted that the report is still being considered.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ABBOTT: If the Minister would like to make a speech, he can follow, when I conclude mine, and tell us all about what he is yacking on about. The Minister would no doubt be aware that the Woodville Youth Accommo-

dation Committee Incorporated has been struggling for many months now to establish a youth accommodation centre at Woodville. This centre, when established, will accommodate only up to six homeless youths, yet recent surveys suggest that there might be up to 9 000 young people in need of some sort of accommodation in Adelaide annually. I will explain in some detail about this centre. The Woodville Youth Accommodation Committee has been founded to fulfil three purposes: (1) to establish an accommodation centre that will provide clean, wholesome, short-term accommodation for homeless young people in the western region of Adelaide; (2) to act as management committee for the overall operations of the above-mentioned centre and to support the live-in management personnel and (3) to help organise programmes and activities as well as local resources that may be of use to the guests at the centre.

The membership of the committee is, for the most part, made up of people who work and reside in Woodville. Therefore, the committee is neighbourhood oriented in outlook and approach. The committee is a constituted and incorporated association. At the moment, one of its main tasks is to raise funds for the establishment of the centre and to be accountable for the finance of the centre. One of the aims of the centre is to teach young people to become as self-reliant as possible. The centre is not being established to spoon feed helpless youth so that they remain that way. The management and the committee will take every opportunity to encourage the young guests to take part in life and not merely be an observer-consumer.

I believe that the efforts of this committee should receive strong Government support but, unfortunately, that support and, in particular, financial support has not been forthcoming. Many months ago, the committee launched an appeal for funds. I contributed to that appeal, and I know that many other Opposition members also made financial donations. However, I understand that it still needs working capital for the basic requirements, such as telephone, power, food, etc. It has thus far received about \$365, whereas it requires a total of about \$750 (a mere \$750 that it is unable to obtain from the Government). This is a disgraceful state of affairs.

The committee applied to the youth services programme and, for some reason or other, its application was not successful. I can see no reason why it was unsuccessful, because the profile for the youth services programme is as follows: the youth services programme is a three-year programme operating in all States from 1 July 1979. The programme represents a joint Commonwealth-State initiative, and has been introduced as a result of Government concern for the problem of homelessness among young people.

The Youth Services Programme is cost shared on a \$1 for \$1 basis by Commonwealth and State Governments. For 1979-80, the Commonwealth has offered a total of \$1 000 000 to all States and Territories, South Australia's share of that sum being \$92 580. Yet, when the Woodville Youth Accommodation Centre applied to the department for \$750 so that it could try to assist in the serious problem of youth homelessness, its application was rejected. As far as I can see, the centre's application complied with the guidelines, to which I will now refer. Under the heading "definition", the guidelines state:

A youth shelter programme with support services to be focussed on youth aged to 18 years. At the discretion of sponsoring agencies, youth aged 18 may be assisted through the programme, when appropriate.

Under the heading "Emergency accommodation", the guidelines state:

This can be provided in residential units offering short-

term emergency accommodation for periods ranging from overnight to three months, as well as providing for youth in exceptional circumstances requiring accommodation over longer periods or on an intermittent basis. It is not intended that this programme provide long-term accommodation, however.

I believe that the centre's application complied with the guidelines and that, therefore, its application should have been granted.

Earlier this evening, I attended the 22nd annual general meeting of the Service to Youth Council Incorporated. The Minister of Industrial Affairs was also present, although he stayed for only a very short time. That is a great pity, because it would have done the Minister good to remain at the meeting and to hear the various speakers and the various comments that were made.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I had certain responsibilities in Parliament which I am sure your colleagues would have pointed out to you.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Minister was not the only one who had responsibilities in Parliament, because I also had some. The guest speaker at this annual general meeting was Mr. Jim Hullick, the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association, and the topic of discussion was the role of local government in youth affairs. It was a most interesting address. Mr. Hullick referred to such matters as youth affairs, which he considered was becoming a major industry. He also considered that, with all the problems that confront the community in today's society, welfare was becoming a major industry.

The President of the Service to Youth Council (Mr. Graham Crawford) drew attention in his report to one of the council's major problems, namely, finance. In his report, Mr. Crawford said:

With regard to finance, we have learnt that, even when one hires the experts, fund raising for an organisation like the Service to Youth Council is very difficult. The Operation Springboard Campaign, designed to raise \$250 000 over three years, has taken a great deal of time and effort of many devoted helpers to produce \$80 000 in cash and promises in its first year, and there is still a long way to go.

Regarding youth and unemployment, it was stated under the heading "Skills maintenance programme" that 1979-80 had been a busy and rewarding year for the programme. New activities were commenced and proved successful.

Established activities were expanded and developed. A third project officer was appointed to respond to the increasing work load. Evaluation techniques showed that the project was more than achieving its stated objectives. The waiting list evident earlier in the funding period was drastically reduced. However, the most rewarding outcome of the year's activity was that 73 per cent of those participants who resigned from the programme did so to take up employment. There are many other interesting comments in the annual report of the Service to Youth Council of South Australia.

I support the remarks by the Deputy Leader in relation to the lack of proper job training programmes by this Government. We can read something about this in nearly every daily paper. Today's *Advertiser* carried a story about a South Australian firm which has been required to look overseas for skilled workers. That was the Adelaide-based firm of T. O'Connor Holdings Limited, which has been forced to recruit overseas after a solid advertising programme locally showed a dramatic shortage of skilled labour.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You know why—your Government did absolutely nothing.

Mr. ABBOTT: I know why—because this Government's

training programmes are simply not working, and the Minister knows it. He knows that the Government's job training and employment programmes are simply not working. All the Government is interested in is cutting funds in nearly every area possible, especially in relation to employment. We read about the bleak future of the Youth Council. The Federal Government adopts a similar attitude, cutting every possible area in employment training and employment programmes. It would do the Minister of Industrial Affairs good to read the latest edition of the *Herald*, which contains stories about how the Belgians and the Canadians have created many thousands of jobs.

With the State confronted with these serious problems, it is no wonder that the report by the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on the delivery of community welfare services contained 90 recommendations to provide adequate assistance to people in need, the unemployed, and the many others in extreme financial difficulties. If this trend continues, more and more assistance programmes will need to be introduced to allow for the community to survive during these difficult periods.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I want to deal first with some of the remarks of my Deputy Leader in his contribution to this debate. He pointed out that, of the \$2 000 000 allocated last year for job creation programmes, an appalling situation eventuated in which only \$120 000 was spent. Over a long period I have pointed out on numerous occasions that the unemployment problem in our society which has particularly existed since the Fraser regime—

Mr. Lewis: What about the 35-hour week?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Mallee can be assured that I will come to that point in a moment. I am saying that the unemployment problem in our society is the most vital problem facing us today. One of the great inhuman aspects of this problem is that some people in society may never work at all in their lifetime. That is fast becoming a reality.

I have often said that we should have job creation schemes in real terms with proper planned employment being initiated within those schemes and, secondly, we should be developing a society acceptance of early retirement based on a proper plan, and I refer to retirement at the age of about 60 years. As an incentive or a start to the proposal, perhaps the age should be reduced from 65 years to 63 years, but this is a matter society must face up to. For the benefit of the member for Mallee, I refer also to a shorter working week in specific industries. Although a 35-hour or 37½-hour week in all industries may not be practical, I believe that it can be applied to certain specific industries.

The conservative elements in our society, including the Government and its members, and the newspapers in Australia, especially the Murdoch press, have not, in my opinion, pursued any really purposeful policy in respect of easing the unemployment position. All we get from them on the question of such things as the shorter working week or a shorter working life is a complete barrage of statements that it will not work or that it will cost too much. The present high unemployment situation, involving dole payments to people who are producing nothing, is costing us plenty. I believe it is more realistic to look at a work creation programme, a shorter working week and a shorter working life span which will lead to possible production and also value for the taxpayer. It is as simple as that.

So far the Government's policies have not worked, and they will not work, because the Government is not looking

at the real problem. I have lived with the problem of unemployment in my district now for some years, and I can assure honourable members it is not easy. I make the plea tonight that Government members look at the issue and come up with some reasonable solution to the unemployment problem. I do not accept the Government's attitude that we must live with the unemployment problem. I will not live with it and I think we should do something about it.

The new system of dealing with the Estimates was an experiment, the success of which, as I said in Committee, was questionable, as was the belief that such a system would lead to more open government. I want to refer in some detail to the absolute shemozzle that occurred when dealing with the health line, and I shall be quoting from the *Hansard* proof provided to us which is nevertheless an accurate record of the debate. I believe that there was a complete turnaround by Government members when dealing with the health line. I stress "health line", because there was only one line.

The Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, wanted to introduce a system of dealing with Estimates which would streamline procedures and afford more open government, with less red tape and unnecessary debate. On that basis, the Opposition accepted the proposal on a trial basis, but the trial had its moments. I believe that the experiences of Estimates Committee A in dealing with the health line on the Estimates, if for no other reason than as an example of frustration, was certainly an experience in frustration which drove home to the Parliament the pitfalls of the new system.

First, I point out, like others have in this debate, that the health lines were submitted to Committee A as one vote covering some \$178 000 000. I will quote what the Minister said because I think that what she said at that time exactly fitted the situation. The Minister said:

The Health lines as presented in the Estimates are quite clearly difficult to deal with in so far as they are single separate lines embracing complex and diverse activities. As a consequence, the Committee may find that it is helpful to deal through the Provisional Estimates Resource Allocations booklet and also to use the figures which I tabled in the House in regard to the Appendices in the Estimates.

I, for one, was grateful to the Minister for tabling that statement. I point out that it was necessary, because we were dealing with the one vote. After the Minister said that, the Committee proceeded but again stumbled, as it were, when the member for Mitcham indicated he would like to get what I will call his headline remark in early in the debate. I presumed that he wanted to talk to the Committee and then go home, as he usually does. At that time the Acting Chairman, the member for Rocky River gave his ruling.

It is important that we go back to this occasion, bearing in mind that it was at the beginning of the Committee meeting. What he said was very accurate, as follows:

... because the vote is so large and because, as the Minister indicated earlier, there are no defined lines comprising a particular sequence, whereas in other portfolios there has been a particular vote before proceeding to give unofficial members of the Committee an opportunity in which to participate and ask questions. This portfolio, because of its size, does not quite afford that opportunity.

That was very important, and very true. The Acting Chairman said later:

It will be difficult for me to determine when we have finished a particular phase and are going on to the next phase, in keeping with the ruling that the Chairman gave earlier in the proceedings. If there is no objection from the Committee, I will therefore give the call to the member for

Mitcham at a time when I can best determine whether we have finished a sequence of questioning. Is there any objection to that?

Of course, we know now that there was an objection, which came about simply because it was difficult to interrupt debate on one vote. How could we do that? The member for Napier quite rightly said:

I object to any member, other than official Committee members, coming in, in effect, before the line is finished. Mr. Chairman, the point you are making is true, and I will say something later in the proceedings to the effect that the Health line has always been inappropriate; perhaps it is rather unfortunate. There is a definite vote in the Estimates of Expenditure on page 95 of Parliamentary Paper 9, which deals with the vote of \$178 141 000.

Strangely, there was agreement at that time. I felt then, and I certainly feel now, that the remarks of both the Acting Chairman and the member for Napier represented an accurate assessment of the predicament. The member for Hanson endeavoured to ask questions on behalf of the member for Mitcham, who would not provide the appropriate information so that questions could be asked. At this point, the real problem developed. I bring to the attention of the House a concern raised by the member for Mitcham in regard to the health items being incorporated in the vote. We let the member for Mitcham have a say, and he said:

The problem about this vote is that it is one line for the whole of the \$170 000 000-odd and, as I have pointed out, it means that, if the practice (and it is only a practice) which has obtained up till now is to continue, I will have to wait, probably until late this afternoon or into this evening, before I get a chance to open my mouth.

If that is how the game is to be played, that is what I have to do.

That is absolutely correct; the member summed up the situation well.

Mr. Hemmings: But the member for Hanson was conned.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will come to him, and I agree with what my colleague says.

Mr. Mathwin: You will have to speak louder than that because he will not be able to hear you.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Glenelg has woken up. The situation developed into what one could call a saga. I will now cite what was the real meat in the whole sorry, sordid exercise, as follows:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I take it that, because of the background given, the honourable member for Mitcham prefers not to supply details to other members of the Committee to ask questions on his behalf. Therefore, in view of the objection that has been lodged, I will call upon the member for Mitcham when questioning has been completed so that he is able to participate in the Committee's proceedings.

Mr. Millhouse: That means that I do have to wait right until the end of the Health line, does it?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Mr. Millhouse: It is extremely frustrating, and I ask you to reconsider that, because it is not necessary under the Sessional Orders to make me wait like this forever, as it were.

I believe that this is really what it is all about. The Acting Chairman ordered the member for Mitcham to be quiet and stated:

I do not think it is appropriate to debate that at this stage.

Are there any questions of the Minister?

It was then that the member for Hanson entered the saga on a point of order. He asked the Acting Chairman to give a ruling, and the Acting Chairman said "No": he would

not give a ruling and he indicated that the ruling made by the Chairman would stand. The ruling, in effect, made by the Acting Chairman, on which he later did a complete flip, was as follows:

With regard to members other than Committee members, it is my intention to give preference to members of the Committee until such time as they indicate that their consideration of the vote is completed, and I will then invite other members to participate. I am aware that other members may have some difficulty in determining when they might be given the call, but I point out that they may overcome this problem by requesting a member of the Committee to raise their particular matter of interest. Alternatively, they may seek to be appointed by substitution to the Committee for consideration of a particular vote.

That ruling was correct at that time.

Mr. Lewis: So far, you've been very agreeable.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am an agreeable person. If that ruling had not been deviated from, the shemuzzle would never have developed.

From the moment of that ruling until our luncheon adjournment, the committee appeared, at least to me, to function with some sort of decorum. Unfortunately, the decorum was not to last, because a short time after the resumption after lunch the member for Hanson decided to move another motion, which in my opinion would have reversed the previous ruling of the Acting Chairman.

Mr. Hemmings: Is that why he didn't get a Ministry?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That may be so. It was obvious to Opposition members that there had been discussions between the member for Hanson and the member for Mitcham during the lunch break. I suspect that the member for Mitcham and the other Government Committee members also had a discussion, because we immediately saw a closing of the ranks and an exercise after that lunch break. I will quote the member for Hanson, who has so much to say at the moment. As the second motion, which was a complete flip from the previous motion, he moved:

That any member present in the Chamber may ask a question at any time during the vote "Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$178 000 000." after prior consultation with the Chair.

I assumed at that time that this prior consultation was that someone would jump up and dive to the Chair, have a pow-wow, come back, and say, "We have had prior consultation: let the member for Mitcham speak." That was ludicrous, to say the least. If I remember correctly, I described the member for Mitcham as a maverick, and I make no apology to this House for that description. I was serious. All who have been here for any length of time know the role of the member for Mitcham, and I suspect that, even in the short period of stay by the member for Mallee, he has suspicions that the member for Mitcham is a maverick.

Mr. Mathwin: I suspect he's in bed now, sleeping.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I could not agree more with the member for Glenelg. That is the point I am making, because the exercise that we went through was completely for that purpose. He was going to ask about three stupid questions to get headlines in the *Advertiser* or the *News*, and go home to bed.

As I have pointed out, he was a wellknown maverick and he used members of the Liberal Party, when that Party was in Opposition, in a cavalier fashion. He did what he liked when he liked to members of the Liberal Party. I suspect further that the member for Hanson has some role in this blasted maverick concept. I am beginning to form a suspicion at least that the member for Hanson, in his own right, is a type of maverick, particularly after this exercise,

because, if ever I saw anyone line up as a maverick, I saw the member for Hanson do that.

I think that the only difference between the two types of maverick is that the member for Mitcham is an individualist in his own right. Let us not kid ourselves that he has any more allegiance to the Australian Democrats than he has to the Liberal Party or to any other Party. He will do things in his own way. If it suited his purpose, he would give the Democrats away tomorrow. I have no doubts or illusions about the role of the member for Mitcham. I suggest to the Liberal Party that the member for Hanson is a different type of maverick. What he is doing is acting as a maverick within his own Party, and that is even worse.

We have two different types of maverick in this House, and I stress on my colleagues not to forget that situation. We must realise that it is there. At that time, the member for Napier voiced his opposition to the Committee on the Health lines, and opposed the motion that the member for Hanson had moved, and quite rightly. I support his reasons, which were as follows:

There is nothing in the Sessional Orders or your ruling, Mr. Acting Chairman, concerning questions being asked by members other than the officially appointed Committee where they are denied right to ask questions. On behalf of my colleagues, I gave the member for Mitcham and the members of this Committee a clear time when that member or any member who wished to ask questions could be in the Chamber. We gave the time between 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. when, so far as we were concerned, we would have finished asking questions of the Minister.

In other words, what we were affording the member for Mitcham the opportunity to do was no different from that of any of our colleagues who were not Committee members. If they were around at 8 p.m. or 9 p.m., they would have been afforded the opportunity to ask questions. I do not think that anything could have been fairer than that situation. To go on with the absolute bunkum with which we finished up and after (and I am reminded by looking at the member for Henley Beach) Government members, according to the member for Henley Beach, had intimately cross-examined the Minister on her own budget—

Mr. Randall: You were on strike.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Henley Beach would not know what he was talking about when talking about strikes, because he has never been in a union.

Mr. Randall: You had four hours off, and then returned.

Mr. MAX BROWN: While the honourable member was intimately cross-examining the Minister—I bet that she was shivering in her shoes. I conclude by saying that it was a shemuzzle from start to finish.

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

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I did not intend to speak in this debate but, following the remarks of the member for Napier and the reflection that, I believe, he cast on the Chair and the deliberations of Estimates Committee A, I felt that I had no alternative but to respond.

In addition, the selective quotations by the member for Whyalla leave something to be responded to. I am amazed also by the duplicity of the Opposition's arguments this evening. Several members have drawn attention to the fact that mainly Opposition members have spoken in the debate and that Government members have not participated in it. I suggest that, had it been the other way around, Opposition members would have complained that Government members were depriving them of the right to

participate in the debate, just as they did through the Estimates Committees' debates during the past couple of weeks. Opposition members cannot have it both ways. Their argument ought to have a little more foundation than that advanced by the member for Stuart and one or two other members this evening.

I return to the decision made by the Chair in relation to Estimates Committee A that prompted the spontaneous walk-out by Opposition members. After the motion had been moved and placed before the Committee, the Chair had a decision to make in terms of that motion. It could make a determination only in accordance with the Sessional Orders which dealt with the procedures of that Committee and which had been approved and adopted by the House of Assembly.

Members interjecting:

Mr. OLSEN: If the member for Napier will wait for a moment, I will go on to explain about the explanation given after I cast that vote, which the member for Whyalla deliberately skirted. That was the only basis on which a Chairman could make that decision. The member for Napier has, like myself, had experience in meeting procedures over a number of years, and would know that, when a Chairman must make a decision, it must be made on the basis of the Sessional Orders laid down and approved, in this instance by the House of Assembly, not any private discussions or agreements that had been undertaken: the Sessional Orders that had been written and adopted by this House were the basis on which the Committee Chairman had to make that decision, and I did so.

I went on further to explain that decision, which the member for Whyalla conveniently overlooked. My explanation applied to Sessional Order 15, which states, among other things, that other members of this House may participate in the proceedings of the Committee. I draw members' attention to the debate which took place in the House of Assembly and which is reported at pages 686-8 of *Hansard*. In my explanation of the ruling that I made, I said:

If this motion is passed, I believe that the Chair will still have the discretion regarding when the call is given and how often it is given.

I went on to say that I intended to give preference to Committee members, which I believed, in accordance with the motion, I could still do as Acting Chairman, in giving the call. I therefore did not believe that in that respect the motion contravened the provision. The provision referred to was the understanding between the Government and the Opposition. I also went on in further explanation of my decision to say:

I do not believe that the motion alters the prerogative of the Chair to conduct the proceedings in that manner, and I will continue to do so.

Despite my having given a clear indication of how I, as Acting Chairman, was going to conduct the proceedings of that Estimates Committee, Opposition members rose and left the Chamber before they had an opportunity to test me to see how I would conduct the proceedings.

Mr. Hemmings: You let him in at any time. Why did you let him in?

Mr. OLSEN: I will explain that in a moment. The point is that the member for Napier had made up his mind that, if the vote went one way, Labor members would walk out of the Chamber. The honourable member did not take into account what I had said in explanation of how I intended to conduct the proceedings of the Committee after that vote had been taken.

I would like to draw his attention specifically to page 26 of the *Hansard* pull where, before calling on the member

for Mitcham to participate in the proceedings of the Committee, I said:

As no members of the Committee have indicated that they have a question, I ask other members of the House whether they would like to ask questions of the Minister.

I then called the member for Mitcham. This indicates that I continued, after the Opposition members had left the Chamber, to conduct the proceedings of the Committee in exactly the way I had outlined prior to their departure. I believe it was an immature action on the part of the Opposition members, and one they surely must have regretted after they left the Chamber, because I would have conducted the proceedings—and I believe *Hansard* records this—giving preference to members of the Opposition, as I had explained.

Mr. Slater: That's what we were not sure about.

Mr. OLSEN: The member for Gilles indicates that he was not sure, but the Opposition members could have stayed in the Chamber and tested the Chairman on how he was conducting the proceedings, and then the honourable member would have been sure, and he would have been able to participate in the proceedings. After the Opposition members had got themselves in this embarrassing position of being out of the Chamber, perhaps the Government should have left them there, but in fact it did not do so. To his credit, the member for Todd agreed to the Opposition members' coming back into the Chamber, but they had been absent for three hours and, in addition, had wasted an hour or more debating the issue before the Committee, three or four hours in total, during which time they could have been putting pertinent questions and points to the Minister, questioning her in accordance with the procedures of the Committee.

Reference has been made to the one vote covering the health area, and I have no doubt that that will be taken on board. There was a motion of the Committee in relation to that. I believe that this is a Parliamentary reform introduced by the Premier which will ensure Government accountability to Parliament. It has been yet another election promise honoured by the Tonkin Government and I think that South Australia, as the first State to introduce this type of accountability to Parliament, can draw great credit from it, and can stand high in Australia in terms of accountability in financial terms for that fact.

The HON. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I suppose that I could cover, at great length, the many petty, trite, and in many cases misleading comments of the Opposition in this debate. It is unfortunate that, in coming up with the points they have raised, Opposition members have not been able to quote accurately from the answers given in Committee. It is rather disappointing to have sat here this afternoon, this evening, and this morning and, having gone through Committee, and having spent an entire day in this Chamber giving the information to the Opposition, I find that members opposite still do not wish to listen to the information or put it to use in debate. It reflects rather sadly on the Opposition.

I should like to raise two points. The first relates to the so-called reduction of the line moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the line that he had quite incorrectly to start with. For some time, he floundered around like a fish on a muddy surface without any water, trying to find out exactly what line he should be reducing. Obviously, he had not given it much thought. I raise the first pertinent point: here is the Opposition in this debate in Parliament moving that there be a reduction in the line, which one generally interprets as a rather weak attempt at a vote of no confidence in the Government, yet in Committee not one single question was directed to me, as Minister of Public

Works, on the Moore's proposal or the remand centre—not one single question.

How can the Opposition have the effrontery today to move for a reduction in the line when it did not even bother to raise one single question on this line during the Committee stage? That shows how hypocritical the Opposition is. I take up the first point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Elizabeth and other members opposite, that they were opposed to the remand centre occupying the Supreme Court site or an adjacent site.

Throughout all their speeches they assumed that the Government was going to place the remand centre on such a site. We had a study undertaken by Hassell Planners which came up with two long-term options. There was one fundamental difference between those two options. One put a remand centre adjacent to the Supreme Court and one did not. We asked for public comment as to—

Mr. Crafter: For 11 days.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Many of the parties had already been consulted, and it was appropriate, seeing that they had prior warning and consultations with Hassell Planners, for the period of comment to be reasonably brief. The interesting thing is that we asked for public comment on which of those two long-term options should be adopted. All the tenor of the Opposition's debate has been that the Government has made up its mind and is putting the remand centre adjacent to the Supreme Court site. That is not the case. We would not have bothered to ask for public comment if the Government had made up its mind. For some hours today we have put up with a poor quality debate with one fundamental flaw throughout, that is, that the Government has not made up its mind on the site of the remand centre. Comments have been received and they will be considered by the Government, and an appropriate decision made. There is no need for the public to become concerned and hysterical that the Government is to put a remand centre on the Supreme Court site, because the Government has not yet made a decision. We floated that as one of the options.

Mr. Crafter: What are the other options?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That the remand centre did not go there. It is interesting that one of the great participants in the debate, who spoke for half an hour today, is now asking what the other options were; he supported the reduction in the line and has not even read the report. That shows the lack of substance in all the Opposition speeches. It became obvious that even the Leader of the Opposition, who moved the motion, had not bothered to read the report, and I will come to his contribution shortly. The fundamental point was raised concerning what the Government had done about a remand centre. The Government has done considerably more in pushing the remand centre forward as an immediate project to be taken on by the Government than the former Government did in the previous 10 years. The only thing it did in the previous 10 years was to choose a site. What site did the former Government select? The very site adjacent to where the standard gauge rail link will pass through Adelaide—the very site where a loading yard would be required; the very site that is the life blood to industry in this State—the standard rail link into Adelaide from Crystal Brook. The former Government wanted to put a remand centre on that site, yet this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition criticised the Government for deciding not to proceed with that proposal.

Anyone with any sense, realising the importance of the standard rail link from Crystal Brook to Adelaide, would also realise that that would be by far the best and most logical site for industrial and transport purposes, especially

in terms of establishing a potential large goods handling facility similar to or a possible replacement for Mile End.

Mr. Crafter: And showgrounds?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No. The Leader of the Opposition in his stupidity, turns around and asks what is wrong with a remand centre there and why are we not proceeding. That shows the level of planning done by the former Government, which took 10 years to choose one site for a remand centre that happened to be the very site needed for the standard rail services of this State.

Mr. Crafter: Architects of your department have been overseas looking at remand centres and planning for them.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am talking about something constructive. All the Labor Government did for 10 years was pick a site, which was the wrong site at that. It is perhaps fortunate that the former Government did not proceed with the project, because if it had done so it would need to have been stopped because of the unsuitable nature of the site.

I shall now turn to other factors, now, having made the point that the Government is not committed to building a remand centre adjacent to the Supreme Court site. We have asked for comment, which we will consider. A number of points were raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Elizabeth, and other speakers concerning Moore's. Let me get straight to the fundamental facts concerning Moore's. Retailing throughout the whole of the city of Adelaide square mile is suffering a decline because of the extent to which regional shopping centres have taken over from the city square mile as the prime areas where growth in retail sales is occurring. It is not the Government's moving in and buying Moore's that has suddenly crushed retailing in Rundle Street. Retailing there has declined in exactly the same way as retailing in the Central Market area has declined. Retailers have complained that retailing is not going well in the city centre. The Adelaide City Council knows that and knows that that situation has been continuing for a number of years under the former Government as well as under the present Government.

It is a fact of life; people now drive to large shopping centres where they can get free parking with no traffic hassles of the sort that are encountered in the city centre, and they shop as close as possible to where they live. Most people live in the suburbs where the regional shopping centres are and not adjacent to the Central Market area. Shopping has increased in the regional shopping centres, and that is the reason why marketing in the city of Adelaide has declined. Listening to the drivel of members opposite today, trying to scrape up reasons why the Government's actions have caused this drop in retailing really shows how desperate they are and how, again, they fail to appreciate the fundamental facts involved.

I spent an hour and a half with Mr. Jack Weinert, and Mr. Bambacas and other people from the Central Market area on Monday afternoon, and I listened to the points they had to make about the Hassell planning study report. Mr. Weinert said that the most important need in the Central Market area is parking. He said the most critical factor affecting trade in that area is the lack of parking, not the fact that the Government had bought Moore's. As one would expect, he was critical of the Government's purchasing Moore's. That is saying nothing, as he has criticised the Government publicly, but he said that the lack of parking in that area was of more importance than the Government's buying Moore's. I accept that, and the obvious question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was what had the Government done about it. The Government has put in a new bus ring route which, free of charge, collects people from a large area around the city of

Adelaide and takes them straight past the Central Market area. I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has now come into the House to get some wisdom at last.

That bus stops outside the Central Market area, thus substantially increasing parking facilities and enabling people to get to the market area free of charge. Following the talk last night with the Central Market traders the Government made certain proposals and will assist them, if possible, in trying to find suitable additional parking in that area. We will be looking at other areas. The traders are grateful for what the Government has done with the bus route. There was some disagreement as to how the car parking should proceed, but I have left that up to the Central Market traders. The Government is trying to assist them in identifying where that additional parking should go and is encouraging the city council to make decisions so that the parking can be installed as quickly as possible.

The other point raised by the Leader, who continued at considerable length, was about Moore's. He picked up a quote from the Hassell Planners study and asked why the Government was going to proceed with this building. I forget the exact quote from the report, but it says something to the effect that it might be inadequate in five years time.

Mr. Bannon: Page 27.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes. That highlights the very reason why the Government has proceeded with Moore's. The need for courts has been so great, that the number of courts must be substantially increased. The previous Government increased the number of courts by dotting them all over the place, in Grenfell Street in the Grenfell Centre, in the G.R.E. Building, in Sturt Street, and in Mill Street. The previous Government had no comprehensive plan where it was putting courts. It also had some courts in King William Street in a building south of the Supreme Court, the City Court building.

When the need for another court arose the previous Government found the next piece of vacant accommodation in Adelaide and put a court there, irrespective of where that building was in relation to all the other courts.

When this Government sat down and looked at a plan of the City of Adelaide and of the location of the courts they were almost like hundreds and thousands sprinkled across the plan. The first thing we thought was that it was only appropriate to try to consolidate those courts and to make sure that, in that consolidation, there was adequate space for growth and expansion. The very point that the Leader raised about the extent of the growth of the courts, and the demand for courts being so great that in five years time even further accommodation may be necessary, highlights the wisdom of the Government. First, the Opposition has not looked at the logic of the point; if you are going to further expand the courts, where do you expand them? That is the reason for the so-called Western courts site, which is the old Supreme Court Hotel site. If the Leader and his colleagues had bothered to read the report they would have seen that there were proposals there for additional Supreme Court buildings in the long term option, for additional Supreme Court criminal courts, for the Industrial Courts, and for high security car parking spaces everyone has agreed are required for judges.

The Leader of the Opposition did not work out whether it was possible to provide the appropriate accommodation. Not only did we need equivalent space to the Moore's building but we also had future demand and had to put it in a building on the Supreme Court hotel site and within the guidelines laid down by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. I point out that assumptions are based on the fact that there will be a multi-storey building similar to the

western courts proposal, eight storeys high. The facts have changed since then. The City of Adelaide Planning Study indicates that there should be no buildings more than four storeys high in that location.

Mr. Bannon: There's enough room on the site.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There is not sufficient space on that site to meet the demands of Moore's and the future needs of the courts. That is quite clear.

Mr. Bannon: Commonwealth land could be utilised in a joint project, if you had any imagination.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Commonwealth Government has indicated that it will not sell the land to the State Government.

Mr. Bannon: It need not sell it; it would be a joint enterprise.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We suggested that a joint library facility be set up.

Mr. Bannon: A library is not sufficient. What about a joint court facility? The Commonwealth has announced that it intends to build a facility in three or four years. Why not work in with the Commonwealth instead of proceeding with this ludicrous plan?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I find that amazing, because the study was done on the basis of integrating the Federal court site with the State court site. Other points were raised by honourable members during the debate. Frankly, the debate lacked substance. I point out that, for 10 years, the previous Government did absolutely nothing to solve the critical court shortage in this State, apart from renting old buildings in Sturt Street and other accommodation in the City Court building that was quite unsuitable for courts. Courts were scattered all over Adelaide. The previous Government did nothing, and hoped that it received no criticism. This Government had to try to sort out an incredible mess in relation to the court proposals. The previous Government sited courts in cheap Samcon buildings, which are prefabricated buildings, not really transportables.

Mr. Mathwin: They are relocatable.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That is a suitable way in which to describe them. The previous Government did nothing. I also point out that the previous Government (and when one talks about a previous Government one includes the public servants) made a commitment to use Moore's building and initiated studies on the use of that building for courts. The head of the Premier's Department and other senior public servants under the previous Government invited and encouraged these studies to proceed. The previous Minister of Planning received a deputation from representatives of Civil and Civic, and supported and encouraged investigations.

Mr. Bannon: It did not have Cabinet approval.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The previous Government encouraged Civil and Civic to go ahead with planning for four or five months. An option was taken out and it was quite clear that, if the previous Government had continued in power, it would have bought Moore's building and developed it for courts.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Except that there was a bit of a fight whether it would use it as a hotel.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, the Premier corrects me. There was some reasonable suggestion that they may also have used it for a casino or an international hotel, and that was the other proposal they had. I have gone through the documentation. It was quite clear, and Civil and Civic has discussed it with me and pointed out to me that it was the previous Government or its public servants (and that means the previous Government) that had given certain undertakings to Civil and Civic, as a company, to proceed with its proposal.

Mr. Bannon: That's nonsense.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is not. Undertakings had been given to the very point where they felt that they had a moral right to go ahead and prepare the plans. It is interesting that the former Minister of Planning has been very silent on this matter, because he knows that he would be acutely embarrassed if he stood up and opened his mouth, because he met the deputation. I have had an account of this from the people who went along and saw it. We find that, before we came to office there had been detailed discussions between the Superannuation Fund and Civil and Civic for the construction of courts on that site, yet the present Leader of the Opposition, who was a Cabinet Minister at that time, is criticising us for even using superannuation funds for constructing courts on that site. That shows the sheer damned hypocrisy that we have heard all afternoon and night from the Opposition, and it stands absolutely condemned.

Mr. Bannon: You won't get away with that. You made a bad decision, and you can't live with it.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader cannot deny that it was his Government which, for four months—

Mr. Bannon: That's got nothing to do with it.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It has everything to do with it. There is the fact that the Superannuation fund had been having detailed discussions for four months on that proposal and the fact that the Minister of Planning had encouraged people to proceed with the design of law courts on that particular site. He said, "As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to courts going on to the Moore's site." They took out an option on Moore's. Why did they take out an option if they were not going to convert the site to a casino, an international hotel, or courts? The only other assumption is that they were going to go into retailing based on their present arguments, and I have grave suspicions about whether they would be very successful as retailers.

Mr. Bannon: Talk to your donors to the Liberal Party about the decision.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I think they will find it very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition made certain statements at a public meeting last Thursday in the Central Market area, when they find that for four months his own Government was planning to do exactly the same thing, but it was fortunately thrown out of Government by the Liberal Party. I must correct the Leader of the Opposition on details of the lease. At the end of 40 years, the Government, in fact, will own the building, after paying the rental for 40 years. The suggestion this afternoon was incorrect. We do not own the land. We can take the building by simply buying the actual piece of land for the value of the unimproved land.

Mr. Bannon: What will you do with the land?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We will have the building. With the rental arrangements; at the end of 40 years we will own the building and simply have to buy the land for the unimproved value of the land.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What rubbish is that? How can you possibly own the building without owning the land? You know they are indivisible in law.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We own the improvements on land, and the member would know that that is quite a common method of leasing property. I have four minutes left to deal with the argument put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for reducing the line for Minister of Industrial Affairs, and it probably deserves only four minutes. He criticised me for going to Alice Spring tomorrow, claiming that I am simply going to hunt daisies and that I should not go. What he is saying is that this State should not encourage trade with the Northern Territory. I

will point out to about 150 business men there tomorrow and Thursday that the Opposition in our State believes that trade with the Northern Territory should not be promoted.

It will be an interesting response, I am sure. They will probably say that that is about par for the Leader of the Opposition, because that is a sort of cynical negative remark he is always making.

Mr. Bannon: You're going to go up there and lie about the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to withdraw the word "lie".

Mr. BANNON: I withdraw, Sir.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The second point I raise is the criticism by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition concerning the employment schemes. I gave figures to the Committee and pointed out that under the pay-roll tax incentive schemes for youth employment offered by the Government, over 2 000 people had been taken on. I gave those facts to the Committee, but he says that he could not work out how or why or anything else. He has been given the facts, and he cannot dispute those facts or produce any evidence to prove that they are wrong, and I challenge him to do so. He also asked what the Government was doing for people aged 30, 40, or 50 years and unemployed. The Government has offered an establishment payments scheme incentive and the motor vehicles industry assistance scheme. We have offered decentralisation pay-roll tax concessions and general pay-roll tax concessions. All of those put together amount to \$6 000 000—about six times the sum allocated by the previous Government in that entire area. We are offering \$6 000 000, compared to the previous Government's \$1 000 000 or \$1 500 000, as industrial incentives, not only for those under 20 years of age but across the board for people over the age of 20 years and who are unemployed.

Mr. Bannon: How much has been spent?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: This year the amount to be spent will be \$3 000 000 in the first six months on decentralisation grants. I have given the answers in *Hansard*. I know that the Leader was not present. The Leader also asked what we were doing for migrant workers. What did the previous Government do for migrant workers? Absolutely nothing. He also raised a few other points. He said that the pay-roll tax incentives were not meaningful, because only \$139 000 was spent. However, the point is that we did forgo revenue as part of that scheme.

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Once again, we have heard from the Minister his usual cant concerning everything the Leader has done. Since the Leader has been here he must be doing well; otherwise, Government members would not be having a shot at him all the time. He has been so right with people outside. Everywhere you go, people are saying that John Bannon will become Premier of this State, and it will not be long before that happens.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: If Government members were to look at last Saturday's election results, they would realise how some Government members would go. The Premier lost more votes than did anyone else this time. There was a swing against him. You could run a duck in Bragg, and it could not help winning, if it had won the plebiscite. Government members know the seats that they can and cannot win. Several Government members, as a result of last Saturday's election, are not going too well, and neither is the Government. I am pleased that they specialise in having shots at the Leader, because he has always been

nice. It will be difficult for Government members when they decide to go to the electors in 1983.

I will not be a runner at the next election, as I will be too old. However, every time that I have submitted myself for election, it has been said that I would be defeated. It is marvellous that I have always won. I do not know how this happened; I must have been reasonably popular. Indeed, once I got 60 per cent of the votes. Once, I ran against the Hon. Mr. McLeay, and I knocked him off with no trouble at all. However, as I said, one could run a duck in Bragg or Boothby. I do not intend to go further with that matter.

I listened intently to the Committees' deliberations, and was lucky enough to sit in on one Committee when the Minister of Health appeared before it. It was interesting to note at that time that the rules were changed slightly. I had been before both Committees, and, during the course of that time, Opposition members did not have an opportunity to question the Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: If the honourable member says that we were on strike, he should look at the rules of the game. The guidelines stated that members had to wait until after Committee members completed their questioning before they could ask questions. I am not complaining about that, as politics is a numbers game. However, the procedure before Committee B was totally different from that before Committee A, and I want to complain strongly about that. The member for Mitcham was able to take over from Opposition members, and I am sure that that was wrong.

Mr. Randall: He was the Opposition for four hours.

Mr. LANGLEY: He could have been; the honourable member can speak as much as he likes tonight. However, in a couple of years he will not be able to speak, for the simple reason that he will not be here. The member for Henley Beach had the opportunity to speak earlier in the session; no-one would have stopped him from doing so. As has been stated, the member for Hanson decided to make a move in order to give the member for Mitcham an opportunity.

Although I sat in on the Committee when it had the Minister of Recreation and Sport before it, I did not get an opportunity to speak, for the simple reason that I had to wait until Committee members had finished their questioning. However, on this occasion the procedure was changed completely. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that changes must be made in this respect.

I now refer to the Moore's building, which is causing much trouble. I was pleased to see the Minister of Public Works trying as much as possible to say that certain things would not happen and that the Government did something about it during its regime. Let us look at the facts. We must consider planning before anything is done. Surely, however, ultimately Cabinet must make a decision. In this case, Cabinet did not make a decision, and the Minister of Public Works cannot say that at any stage this matter was finalised.

The Minister said this evening that more car-parking areas were needed. Anyone who goes to the market or anywhere in that area knows that much parking space is available. People park in the market area, but the spaces would not be fully utilised on non-market days, although it may perhaps be used fully on Friday nights and Saturday mornings. I go to this area, as I shop at a certain store, and I know that it is not always full.

The Government is in trouble with the Moore's set-up. I know Myer Solomon, and I know a lot of people who are very strong Liberal supporters who are not happy with the situation. The Government is trying to get out of this situation. I am waiting for the Premier—

Mr. Gunn: Is he one of your cronies?

Mr. LANGLEY: He played for Sturt-South, but he is not one of my cronies. I know many people in all walks of life, Liberal and Labor. I look after my district. The member for Glenelg had trouble when a fellow stood against him, but now that gentleman has a seat in the Legislative Council.

The Minister of Public Works and the Premier have mentioned nothing in this debate about unemployment. Every time questions were asked in the Committee, they said that they were reducing the number of people in the Public Service or that they had not had an opportunity to fill vacancies. It was stated that seven or eight people had voluntarily resigned, and I thought that was very good, although it was hard to believe, and of course no names were mentioned. There is no doubt that this Government has a go-slow attitude. Unemployment in this State is increasing, but the Government is not replacing people who should be replaced, and the Premier says the vacancies are not there.

I am sure people on the other side have several pages of information about what is happening in relation to the A.G.W.A. Private enterprise has supposedly moved into some areas, and people now are fearful of their jobs. South Australia is holding its own in relation to unemployment; there is no doubt that the position will decline. Looking through the Loan Estimates, we see that the Government is not spending money. I am waiting patiently for the Premier to open a building that has been built by this Government. He has opened many buildings recently, all built by the former Government, but I am waiting for this Government to spend some money and to get on with the job. So many people are out of work. Only today I became aware that skilled tradesmen from other countries are being asked to come to South Australia.

Mr. Randall interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: If the honourable member looks at the statistics he will find that the former Government did its best in regard to apprentices.

Mr. Mathwin: Have you trained any apprentices?

Mr. LANGLEY: Of course I have. I trained three apprentices. I am no longer in the business, so why worry, but I trained them and looked after them.

Mr. Mathwin: You were under quota. I bet the union didn't know about it.

Mr. LANGLEY: It is a five-year apprenticeship, and surely in 15 years in business one can have three apprentices. They are all skilful tradesmen, still in the job, and earning good money. An electrician today can earn \$16 an hour. I would not mind getting \$16 an hour. The Government trains apprentices, who then go out into private enterprise (there is no doubt about that), and someone else gets the benefit. The building trade is going further and further down the drain.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I think the honourable member was a painter and docker—I am not sure. He used to be very hot on unions. I cannot think that Government members do not belong to some type of union. I bet the Premier is a member of some union.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The Adelaide Club!

Mr. LANGLEY: The United Farmers and Stockowners is not a union! Members opposite would not be in an organisation unless they could get some benefit from it. I was a member of the Electrical Trades Union. I do not know of many Government members who are not members of some union or association. I was happy to be a member of the Electrical Trades Union, because it looked after me, and I was happy about that. Certainly, if you do not pay, you should not get it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I did not realise that Government members had such minds. I am sure that the Minister on the front bench joined the L.C.L. to get some benefit, just as I joined the A.L.P. which I did through my union. I am sure the husband of the Minister of Health is a member of some type of union, as are many Government members. Members may laugh, but I am not worried. One only joins such organisations to get benefits. I have benefited from certain actions I have taken throughout my life.

Mr. Mathwin: Whenever you're paid, you've always got it, though, haven't you, Gill?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not perturbed by members opposite; I have been on both sides of the House.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You've been insulted by experts.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister has hit the nail on the head—insulted by experts, namely his mates up in the press gallery. I have been insulted by them, the Minister's greatest mates. I would have been Captain of the Australian cricket team if I had received as good a run from the press as Government members receive. I would have been made Captain overnight. Some of the Government's supporters could not possibly sleep, because of some of the things they say.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to relate his debate to the lines.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I was very happy to be the Government representative on the Sports Advisory Council for a number of years.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I point out the sporting lines come under Committee B, not Committee A, which we are debating at present.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. I ask the honourable member to come back to Committee A.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have been very perturbed during the course of the Committee debate about unemployment, which is indeed disturbing when one looks at the figures in this State of the number of people who are out of work, and also when one looks at the way the Government is carrying on in this matter. After listening to the Committee proceedings I have no doubt that the Government is in a very awkward position. Despite the Premier's promise concerning unemployment and also the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that this Government has not honoured its promise of creating 7 000 jobs, increasing to 10 000. More than 40 000 people are out of work in this State at present.

In England 2 100 000 people were out of work when I was there recently. Both Governments which are of the same complexion, are still continuing in this way, and they think the situation is quite all right. People in my district are doing their best and are willing to work. Although I have heard Government members say that this is not the case. There were previously several communes in my area, but I can assure members that I hardly know of one in my area now. The people in my area are willing to work but they do not have jobs. What has happened to the promise? People are wondering, and so many people are now out of work that it is just an impossible situation. The Government has made these promises but I do not know how it can solve the problem.

The Premier is opening something at Bowmans next Thursday, which is most likely a very good step.

Mr. Russack: In the electorate of Goyder.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. I got an invitation to that, and I am pleased about that because I know a little bit about the

E.T.S.A. That will employ only one man. We are getting to the stage that we have to live with this type of thing. The fact is that the 7 000 jobs promised have never come forward, and never will come forward the way things are going on. I hope that the Government will do something about those jobs.

An Honourable Member: Is that why they dug that hole?

Mr. LANGLEY: That is where they are going to bury all the Government's broken promises. I listened carefully to the talk about buses in the city. We heard about the Bee-line bus, which provides a good service, and then the Minister mentioned the city loop bus. I have not seen too many people on that service, but the Minister used it in talking about the parking problem in the Central Market area. I doubt that that service has the patronage of the Bee-line bus. I hope that route becomes as popular as the Bee-line bus route.

The Minister tried tonight to say that he is not in trouble with the Moore's building proposal and that it is a good thing. I am waiting for the Minister to answer the questions that the Leader put to him today concerning any work being done by the Public Buildings Department. The Minister's denial today is misleading the Parliament. The Leader did an excellent job this afternoon. The Minister said that he spoke for too long, but I can assure the Minister that the Leader will be the next Premier. The more the members opposite call the Leader things like the "little kid" the worse they are doing. The first thing the Premier does when he speaks is rubbish the Leader. I am doing a little bit of homework, and I can assure members opposite that I know how good a job the Leader is doing, and he will be the Premier in two year's time. However, I will not be here to congratulate him.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you going to his party?

Mr. LANGLEY: Too right, and we will be having a party in Unley because we will win that seat again. We have not lost that seat for 31 years, so I suppose we will win it again. I support the motion.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BECKER: I wish to refute the slanderous allegations made by the member for Napier against me this evening in relation to my moving the motion to allow non-members to ask questions during the proceedings of Estimates Committee A when the Committee was discussing the health vote. My reasons for moving the motion were sincere and are recorded in *Hansard*. Before moving the motion, I made the same offer to the member for Mitcham as I had previously made to the member for Flinders that, if he wanted a question asked, I was prepared to ask it on his behalf.

During the examination of the health vote, the member for Mitcham explained to the Committee that he wanted to raise an involved issue. The Acting Chairman replied that he would accept a motion on the issue. I had prepared a motion but decided to delay it until after lunch so that, if it was carried, the member for Mitcham could be catered for at about 2.30 p.m. The honourable member had assured me that morning that the issue that he proposed to raise would take 10 to 15 minutes at the most, depending on the reply he received from the Minister.

I was not concerned about what issue he would raise,

because I was confident that the Minister, with the help of her advisers, could adequately answer the questions, and in fact, she did. I do not wish to hold up proceedings, but I refute entirely any untruthful allegations made against me in regard to my moving the motion, that there was an agreement or an arrangement, or anything else, I totally deny, and I ask the member for Napier to repeat these

allegations outside the House so that I can take the necessary legal action to prove them slanderous.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.43 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 October 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HERITAGE MATERIALS

22. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has the Government received any representations from any bodies to enable the purchase of a wool store building at Port Adelaide for the purpose of storage and restoration of heritage materials and, if so, what consideration, if any, has been given to such a request?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: From the limited information available in the question, it has not been possible to identify that any representation has been made.

CASEY UNIVERSITY

44. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What response has the Government made to a telex sent by the Hon. Peter Jones, Minister for Education in Western Australia, on 2 January 1980 concerning the Commonwealth's proposal to build the Casey University?

2. Does it support the Hon. Mr. Jones's objections to this planned initiative and, if so, has it made its objections known to the Commonwealth Government and, if not, why not?

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

1. and 2. Objections to the planned Defence Academy were expressed to the Federal Government and the current situation is that the Federal Government intends to allocate the funds for the new defence academy from defence funds, with an assurance that this will not further restrict Federal funding towards normal tertiary institutions in Australia. Additional information concerning this subject can be found on page 2496 of *Hansard* of 11 June 1980 when I responded to this question without notice.

"CORE" SUBJECT

46. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is a "core" subject in the school curriculum?

2. Is it the Government's intention to include history as a "core" subject and if so, how, when and at what levels and, if not, why not?

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

1. There are many different interpretations of the term "core", and many apprehensions arise when that term is used. In most education systems attempts have been or are being made to define "core" curriculum or "core" subjects. The Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra is also addressing itself to this task with a view to developing a national statement on "core" curriculum.

2. The Education Department is currently developing a policy statement entitled "Into the 80's". At present it is in draft form and has been circulated to schools and other community groups for comment. The draft statement describes a curriculum framework which indicates essential components of a balanced education for children. One of the curriculum areas included is entitled "Human Studies" and this involves studies of people as individuals or members of a social group, their values, history, institutions, etc., and quite clearly history is seen as an important part of this curriculum area.

It is not possible at this time to give definite advice as to when and at what levels the framework described in the draft document will be introduced.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAMME

47. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Does the Community Outreach Programme at Marion High School include the provision of the sort of classes which are normally provided through the Department of Further Education's Stream 6 courses?

2. What subjects are offered at Marion High School, what is the enrolment in each subject, what fees are charged and what fees are paid to instructors?

3. Are any other schools offering similar programmes and is it policy to allow such developments at this time?

4. Has the Department of Further Education been consulted about those developments at Marion or elsewhere and what is its attitude?

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

1. There are some similarities between some of the components of the Marion High School community outreach programme and the Department of Further Education "Stream 6" courses, in that they are offered out of normal school hours and could be classified under the broad category of enrichment. However, the Marion High School activities cater for community clubs and interest groups and do not require a certain enrolment before the activity is offered as in the case of the "Stream 6" courses.

2. The word "subject" is inappropriate, as the Marion programme presently caters for 54 clubs or interest groups ranging from computing to Italian cookery. Enrolments vary from one to 30, and each participant pays 80c per attendance. The instructors or leaders all work on a volunteer basis. They may, however, be paid up to \$2 for out-of-pocket expenses.

3. Other schools do cater for activities similar to those occurring at Marion, but no other school offers such a comprehensive programme.

4. The Department of Further Education is aware of these developments. The Directors-General of Education and Further Education have consulted and agree that, if any of the school activities are similar to "Stream 6" courses, they should be conducted under similar conditions. The Committee of Enquiry into Education has therefore been asked to examine and comment on the issue as one of those matters affected by co-operation between the two departments.

ANCILLARY STAFF

50. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the formula currently being employed by the Government in the "rationalisation" of ancillary staff in schools?

2. In what respects does it differ from the formula used in 1979?

3. Are any forced transfers planned for ancillary staff in term II?

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

1. Three formulae are used as follows:

1. Primary Schools (including Rural and Junior Primary Schools): 20 + (5 x the teachers) as hours per week.

2. Area Schools (including Special Rural Schools): 50 x (5 x the teachers) as hours per week.

3. High Schools: 100 + (5 x the teachers) as hours per week.

Schools may negotiate for additional hours per week to meet special needs. Special Schools and Aboriginal Schools are treated separately and are not covered by the formulae.

2. The present formulae determine schools' entitlements to ancillary staff on the basis of numbers of teachers

employed. The previous formulae were based, in the case of primary schools, on student enrolment numbers and, in the case of secondary schools, on a points scheme under which points for each school were determined according to various factors including type of curriculum offerings, location and student enrolments.

3. No. It is anticipated that the rationalisation exercise will be completed on a voluntary transfer and attrition basis by the end of the 1980 school year.

COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSES

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Marree during the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Four years eight months, four years, eight months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Ernabella during the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Seven.

2. One month—two years 10 months, one year two months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Port Augusta during the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Two.

2. Eight months—four years, two years four months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Ceduna during the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Seven years, seven years.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Fregon during the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Two.

2. Seven months—eight months, eight months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Indulkana over the last two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Thirteen.

2. One month—six years, one year three months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Mimili over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil.

2. Nurses from Indulkana visit Mimili.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Yalata over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Ten.

2. One month—four years, 11 months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Nepabunna over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil.

2. Same nurse as at Marree.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Amata over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Fourteen.

2. Two months—one year eight months, one year two months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Gerard over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Six years six months, six years six months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Murray Bridge over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Six years, six years.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Point McLeay over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Same nurse as at Murray Bridge.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Coober Pedy over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Three years four months, three years four months.

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

1. How many community health nurses have been employed at Oodnadatta over the past two years?

2. What is the range and average length of stay?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Two years, two years.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH WORKERS

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Ernabella and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 26-8.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Port Lincoln and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 40.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Port Augusta and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 40.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Ceduna and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 40.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Fregon and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variation of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 24.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Indulkana and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 19-4.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Mimili and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variation of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 20, 21-75.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Yalata and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 20-8.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Nepabunna and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variation of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 20, 15-5.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Amata and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 36-7.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Gerard and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variation of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 36-8.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Murray Bridge and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 40.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Port McLeay and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variation of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 20, 20.

2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Coober

Pedy and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 35.3.
2. Community health nurse.

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

1. What are the hours stipulated in the conditions of employment for an Aboriginal Health Worker at Point Pearce and how many hours are actually worked?

2. Who authorises any variations of stipulated hours?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 40, 40.
2. Community health nurse.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH UNIT

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

1. Has the appointment of a Principal Health Worker in the Aboriginal Health Unit been made and, if so, what is the name and salary classification of the person appointed and are there any allowances paid?

2. If the appointment has not been made, when will it be announced?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not known.

NON-ABORIGINAL STAFF

139. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 877 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Oodnadatta—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 360 per annum.

140. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 878 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Coober Pedy—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 754 per annum.

141. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 880 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Point McLeay—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as

follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum.

142. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 881 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Murray Bridge—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I draw the honourable member's attention to question No. 141.

143. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 882 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Gerard—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Infant Welfare Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum.

144. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 883 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Amata—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 612 per annum. Allowance for after hours duties on remote reserve \$621 per annum.

145. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 884 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Nepabunna—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I draw the honourable member's attention to question No. 153.

146. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 885 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Yalata—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Infant Welfare Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 345 per annum. Allowance for after hours duties on remote reserve \$621 per annum.

147. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 886 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Mimili—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the condi-

tions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I draw the honourable member's attention to question No. 148.

148. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 887 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Indulkana—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 580 per annum. Allowance for after hours duties on remote reserve \$621 per annum.

149. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 888 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Fregon—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Infant Welfare Certificate \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 612 per annum. Allowance for after hours duties on remote reserve \$621 per annum.

150. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 889 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Ceduna—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Community Health Nurse—

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$119 per annum.

Health Surveyor—

- (a) \$14 899-\$15 734.
- (b) Remote Locality Allowance \$238 per annum plus Child Allowance \$179 per annum.

151. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 891 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Port Augusta—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Community Health Nurse—

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Infant Welfare Certificate \$331 per annum.

District Health Surveyor—

- (a) \$14 899-\$15 734.

152. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 892 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Ernabella—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Community Health Nurse—

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$1 612 per annum. Allowance for after hours duties on remote reserve \$621 per annum.

Health Surveyor—

- (a) \$14 899-\$15 734.
- (b) Remote Locality Allowance \$1 818 per annum.

Maintenance Worker—

- (a) \$173.20 per week.

153. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 894 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at Marree—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) \$10 376-\$13 498.
- (b) Midwifery Certificate Allowance \$331 per annum. Remote Locality Allowance \$238 per annum.

154. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to question No. 895 of the last session in relation to salaries of non-Aboriginal staff at head office—

- (a) what is the base salary range; and
- (b) what allowances are applicable with the conditions of employment and what amount is payable for each allowance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Acting Director—

- (a) \$37 207.

Senior Medical Officer—

- (a) \$26 620-30 149.

Senior Health Surveyor—

- (a) \$15 316-16 150.

Health Surveyor—

- (a) \$12 742-14 899.

Senior Nurse—

- (a) \$14 094-15 133.

Clerk—

- (a) \$11 392-12 188.

Clerical Officer—

- (a) \$5 604-10 907.

- (b) The same allowances are applicable to Headquarters staff as they are to field staff if they qualify.

GOVERNMENT TRANSFERS

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

1. How many employees have transferred between Government departments and authorities since the introduction of the Government's transfer system?

2. How many surplus employees in the E. & W.S. and P.B.D. have resulted from—

- (a) Government policies of directing work to private enterprise; and
- (b) other factors?

3. At what rate is this surplus of employees being reduced by transfers and natural attrition, respectively, and at these rates, will the surplus be eliminated within two years and, if not, what extra Government expenditure will be required to achieve such a target?

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

1. As at 31 July 1980, there have been 249 external transfers of weekly-paid employees between Government departments and authorities. In addition to this figure, a further 140 internal transfers, i.e., between sections of the same Government department and including resignation, death and retirement have occurred.

2. As part of a continuing review of the weekly-paid workforce requirements of the Government, the following numbers of employees have been formally declared as "surplus", in accordance with the procedures agreed between the United Trades and Labor Council and the Government—

- (i) Engineering and Water Supply Department—Nil.
- (ii) Public Buildings Department—78.

3. (i) The rate of attrition (including external transfers) for weekly-paid employees within the Engineering and Water Supply Department, as at 30 June 1980, was 9.1 per cent/per annum.

(ii) The rate of attrition (including external transfers) for weekly-paid employees within the Public Buildings Department, as at 30 June 1980, was 9.8 per cent/per annum.

No additional expenditure will be required for that part of the surplus which is reduced through attrition or transfer. It is not yet possible to estimate the cost of the early retirement scheme as it depends on the number of employees who chose to take advantage of the offer. For these reasons it is not possible to determine the period of time required to reduce overall numbers to an appropriate level.

PINE PLANTINGS

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

1. How much of the 388 hectares of pines to be planted in 1980 and the 482 hectares of pines to be planted in 1981 will be the replanting of clear-felled forest plantations?

2. Why is the Government planting the unused 4 160 hectares of land suitable for pine plantations at such a slow rate now that a good market exists for thinnings and other timber?

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

1. There has developed some misunderstandings surrounding this issue.

The department's "new land" bank is described in the reply to the honourable member's previous question.

The Woods and Forests Department currently, and for the next few years, has a tripartite planting programme.

- (a) new areas,
- (b) replanting following clear felling programme,
- (c) replanting Caroline fire area.

The total area for replanting during 1980 and 1981 is 1 871 hectares and 1 780 hectares, respectively. New land is scheduled at 388 hectares and 482 hectares for each of those years.

2. The answer to this question is complex, since it involves the basic tenets of technical forest management.

Good forestry practice requires that there be a reasonably even flow of log produce of all kinds and sizes, in approximately the same proportions, from year to year. Wood using industries are geared to handle the particular quantities of the particular kinds and sizes apposite to their particular product output.

To produce the larger sizes and better qualities, plantations have to be selectively thinned several times over a period of 35 to 50 years. This even thinning practice is most effectively achieved if approximately equal areas of first, second, etc. (up to seventh), thinning become due each year. This also provides the most stable flow of the required log size proportions.

Unduly excess plantings over even a short period of years eventually results in the thinning of a significant part of them being delayed. That inevitably results in a loss of growth in size which is rarely recoverable and only then at a cost of loss in volume growth.

The department varies its planting rate continually towards providing a series of plantation age classes calculated to bring the yield in the various required log sizes and qualities continually towards the maximum and even flow which is the maximum sustained yield of the forest.

It is even flow from successive age classes of controlled area which enables the department to operate its accounting upon the sustained yield basis which is now current, whereby it meets its operating costs from revenue which its forests generate.

PLANT VARIETIES

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

1. Does the Minister support the introduction of plant variety rights in Australia and, if so, does he support the European or the North American type of plant variety legislation?

2. Does the Minister support plant variety rights for—

- (a) cereal varieties;
- (b) pasture seeds;
- (c) horticultural tree crops; and
- (d) ornamental garden plants?

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

1. I remain to be convinced of the need for any plant variety rights legislation in Australia.

2. See 1. above.

KANGAROO ISLAND ABATTOIR

229. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the Minister requested any officer of the Public Service to change his previous report on the feasibility of the proposed Kangaroo Island abattoir?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Only to update marketing opportunities that will apply to existing and future abattoir trading into the Adelaide metropolitan area when the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980, becomes fully operational.

IRRIGATION

246. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. When will the Government commence providing "technical support and low cost finance to enable improved irrigation techniques to be implemented" to

South Australian Riverland growers as promised in the Government's election policy?

2. How much money will be provided and what are the details of the "low cost finance" to be provided?

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

1. Technical support and low cost finance is currently being provided to South Australian Riverland growers to enable improved irrigation techniques to be implemented.

2. Financial assistance is being provided to growers within the farm improvement provisions of the Rural Industry Assistance Act, 1977, and adequate funds are available to meet current and expected demands in 1980-81. The term of the loans is usually related to the life expectancy of the equipment, viz. 10-15 years and the interest rate is 7-8 per cent per annum.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFF

248. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is it the Minister's intention to review the allocation of guidance officers, speech pathologists, social workers and attendance officers to discriminate positively in favour of country regions?

2. How many such additional appointments are envisaged to satisfy any new criteria and when will these appointments be made?

3. Will city and suburban regions lose any staff as a result of such policy?

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

1. There are no plans at present to review the allocation of guidance officers, speech pathologists, social workers and attendance officers.

For some time it has been the Education Department's policy to discriminate in favour of country areas. To a large extent this has already been achieved. There are still small pockets which, as yet, are not receiving services at an equitable level. Therefore, it is not necessary to review allocation on any large scale systematic way but rather to continue present practice.

2. Six additional appointments have been made this financial year to enable appointments of Speech Therapists who were completing scholarships. This means that the Department is now two over establishment.

3. It is not intended that metropolitan regions will lose staff.

KANGAROO ISLAND ABATTOIR

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

1. Has the Government now considered the implications of the meat hygiene legislation in relation to the establishment of an abattoir on Kangaroo Island and, if not, how long will consideration of this matter take?

2. Does the Government intend to provide financial or any other form of assistance to the abattoir project?

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

1. The implications of the new meat hygiene legislation will need to be taken into consideration before any new abattoir is established.

2. No application for financial assistance has been lodged with the Government by the Kangaroo Island Abattoir Committee. However the State Government's new industries incentives payment could apply.

CITY

319. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has the Government received an application from the city of Noarlunga for the funding of a half time CITY worker to be based in the Noarlunga area?

2. Does the Government support this application and, if so, when will the money be made available and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. I have offered a grant of up to \$4 068 to the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga to meet one-half of the cost of employing a person on a full-time basis to organise CITY projects in the area for a 12-month period.

TENDERS

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

1. What tenders for the sale of stores and equipment from the Highways Department have been accepted by the Department since 15 September 1979?

2. What were the dates of tender announcement, tender closing and tender acceptance in each instance?

3. Who was the successful tenderer in each instance?

4. How many tenders were received in each instance?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department has sold approximately 120 items of stores and equipment (under \$200) by tender since 15 September 1979 under delegated authority from the Supply and Tender Board. A further 2 100 items were advertised for sale by tender through the State Supply Division on behalf of the department. The detailed information requested by the honourable member is not readily available, and to extract the data would require in excess of 40 man hours of work. It is considered that the time and cost of obtaining this information is not justified.

POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS

331. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware of the many health dangers associated with the use of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)?

2. Is it a fact that studies of workers exposed to PCBs in the United States have shown a number of symptoms and adverse effects including chloracne and other epidermal disorders, digestive disturbances, jaundice, impotence, throat and respiratory irritations, and severe headaches?

3. Is it a fact that there are now stringent controls on PCB use in the USA and most European countries and that the Congress of the United States in 1976 required the Environmental Protection Agency to govern—

(a) the disposal and marking of PCBs; and

(b) the prohibition, with certain exceptions, of the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, and non-totally enclosed use of PCBs?

4. What regulations, if any, exist in South Australia for controlling the manufacture, transport, permissible uses, disposal, handling, storage, and labelling, respectively, of PCBs and, if there are no regulations, why not, and what assurances can the Government give to workers coming into contact with PCBs that their health is not needlessly endangered, and will the Government urgently draft such regulations?

5. Which companies or Government departments or authorities in South Australia use PCBs, what quantity of PCB is involved in each case and are these users required to keep inventories of PCBs in use or in storage and, if not, why not?

6. How many employees are directly involved in handling PCBs in each of these users?

7. What guidelines, if any, do these users follow for the handling, storage, transportation, spillage, and disposal of PCBs and what supervision, if any, does the Government apply to ensure that guidelines or regulations on the use of PCBs are complied with and how many inspectors or other personnel are involved?

8. What medical tests are used and what routine medical screening is employed in the United States or other countries to detect health problems in workers coming into contact with PCBs?

9. What medical tests or screening, if any, are carried out or are proposed to be carried out in South Australia on workers using PCBs and have any such tests been carried out in the past and, if so, when and with what results and, if not, why not?

10. Is it a fact that PCBs can only be properly disposed of in special high temperature furnaces but that no such furnaces yet exist in Australia?

11. Is it a fact that the New South Wales Government is constructing such a furnace to dispose of chemical wastes including PCBs but that it will not come into operation for several years?

12. Where is PCBs waste currently stored in South Australia, what volume is involved, what procedures apply to prevent the public or employees from coming into contact with it and what steps, if any, does the Government propose to take to dispose of it?

13. Have employers and Government departments and trade unions been kept fully informed of the health problems associated with PCBs and what advice, if any, have they been given by Government authorities?

14. What expertise, if any, exists within Government departments in relation to each of the aspects of PCB usage in part 4, how many officers are involved and is the Minister satisfied that this expertise is sufficient to cope with the PCB problem and, if not, what action will the Government take to rectify the position?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Regulatory controls on polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in South Australia are as follows:
 - (a) Manufacturing—Nil.
 - (b) Transport—Nil.
 - (c) Permissible uses, handling and storage—Industrial Safety Code Regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. (Regulation 26—Safe use of harmful substances.)
 - (d) Disposal—Waste Management Commission Act and Regulations.
 - (e) Labelling—Regulations under the Food and Drugs Act, Poison Schedule 7.
 - (f) Specific legislation to control PCBs is not considered necessary in South Australia. If PCBs are handled in accordance with the recommended methods the health of workers will not be needlessly endangered.

5. The following are the quantities of PCBs in use in South Australia:

	litres
Actil Cotton Mill	2 850
Adelaide Cement Co.	77
Adelaide Wallaroo Fertiliser	6 800
BHP (Whyalla)	9 100
AMP Building	5 900
ETSA	131 000
Flinders University	2 200
GMH	35 900
ICI	2 420
Mason Cox	3 400
Perry Engineering	1 380
Philips Electrical	40
Tubemakers of Australia	1 360

Users are not required by law to keep inventories. Records are kept by the Commonwealth Department of Customs and the Waste Management Commission and Department for the Environment in South Australia. Close liaison is maintained with users of PCBs and their storage and use is kept under surveillance. Controls in South Australia are therefore considered to be satisfactory.

6. The number of employees who handle PCBs in South Australia is not known. PCBs are used in closed systems and are rarely handled directly. When such handling is necessary special precautions and surveillance measures are used.

7. (a) Manufacturers' guidelines which contain specific information on the handling, storage, transport and disposal of PCBs are followed.

(b) Storage is co-ordinated by the Waste Management Commission and the Department for the Environment. Since there are no disposal facilities for PCBs in Australia at present, waste PCBs are being stockpiled.

(c) The Department for Industrial Affairs and Employment administers regulations for the safe use of harmful substances through its factory inspectorate. Scientific and medical advice is available from the Occupational Health Branch of the Health Commission and both the Waste Management Commission and the Department for the Environment have officers who oversee matters relating to PCBs.

8. It is understood that medical screening is not required as a routine in the United States or other countries.

9. No tests have been carried out and none are proposed. The nature and conditions of the use of PCBs in South Australia do not warrant screening and surveillance of workers.

10. High temperature incineration is the currently recommended method of disposal but there is no suitable incinerator in Australia at present. It is understood that a chemical method has been developed and is currently being evaluated in the U.S.A.

11. Yes.

12. The following quantities of waste PCBs are being held in South Australia. They are held in steel drums, sealed, labelled and stored in controlled areas on the premises of the organisations concerned:—

	litres
Mason and Cox	2 300
Philips	130
ETSA	700
GMH	700

The Waste Management Commission and the Department for the Environment will co-ordinate the disposal when appropriate facilities are available.

13. PCB users in South Australia were surveyed by the Department for the Environment in 1978, at which time

advice on the hazards of use was provided. Advice on the health hazards of these and other chemicals is available on request from the Health Commission. Commission officers have met with employers and trade unionists to discuss the hazards posed by PCBs.

14. Officers from several Government Departments are involved in the many facets of assessment, use and disposal of PCBs. Sufficient expertise exist within these Departments to address the various problems posed by these chemicals.

PARAFIELD GARDENS HIGH SCHOOL

333. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister taken a decision with regard to the application of the Parafield Gardens High School for compensation from Education Department funds for the \$1 980 in unpaid school fees for the 1979 and 1980 school years?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am aware of the problem which some schools, including Parafield Gardens High School, are having in attempting to recover unpaid school fees. Funds are not available within the budget of the Education Department to meet any shortfall caused by non-payment of fees by parents. The matter is a complex one, particularly as the amounts owed in individual cases are relatively small and the use of legal force to recover may have a direct influence on the child's education and status within the school. The Director-General of Education has, nevertheless, sought an examination of this problem to be made by his officers with a view to determining what recovery options might be available. That investigation is still proceeding.

PESTICIDES

354. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is mirex used as a pesticide in South Australia and, if so, under what conditions is the product used?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No.

362. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is vinyl chloride used in pesticides in South Australia and, if so, under what conditions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No.

363. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is thallium sulphate used in pesticides in South Australia and, if so, under what conditions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No pesticides registered in South Australia contain thallium sulphate.

364. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to each of the following, is sale or use banned in South Australia and, if not, what restrictions, if any, are placed on usage—chlorodioxin, safrole, quaterary ammonium compounds?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: "Chlorodioxin" is not a specific chemical name. In respect to a group of chemicals which may loosely be referred to as chlorodioxins, these substances as a group are not banned nor are there any restrictions placed on the sale or use of them. However, there are restrictions placed on specific chlorodioxins appearing in very low traces as contaminants in pesticides. (In Australia, the proportion of dioxin in pesticides is restricted by regulation to as low as one part per 10 million.) There are no bans or restrictions on the sale or use of safrole as such, or on the essential oils containing it. The quaterary ammonium compounds are listed as schedule 5 substances in the poisons list and are subject to the packaging and labelling restrictions of that group of chemicals.

KLEMZIG PRIMARY SCHOOL

361. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Minister reply to the Member for Gilles' letter of 23 April 1980 regarding the ground maintenance grant to the Klemzig Primary School?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A thorough search has failed to find any record of this letter. However, the following information is supplied in relation to the Klemzig Primary School grounds maintenance grant. Grounds maintenance grants are paid on the basis of the number of students and the area of school grounds.

(a) 40 cents per student.

(b) \$36 per hectare (Cabinet has recently approved an increase of \$4, from \$32 to \$36, and this is to take effect in the 1981 school year).

The Klemzig Primary School next year, depending on actual student enrolments, will receive approximately \$350 as a grounds maintenance grant.

SODIUM FLUORIDE

366. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What restrictions are placed on the use of sodium fluoride for home use?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The most common forms in which sodium fluoride is available for home use are as follows—

(i) Toothpastes, which contain such a low level of fluoride that their sale is unrestricted.

(ii) Tablets of sodium fluoride, intended to be taken by children to assist in the prevention of tooth decay.

These tablets are restricted for sale by pharmacies or remote country storekeepers holding a medicine seller's permit. This is necessary to allow access by country people in areas which are not fluoridated.

DETECTION CAMERAS

367. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend installing red light spy automatic control cameras to detect vehicles whose drivers disobey traffic lights at busy intersections and if not, why not, and if so—

(a) when and where will the first cameras be installed;

(b) what is the cost of each and the cost of installation at one intersection; and

(c) who are the manufacturers of this equipment?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Firm proposals have not been developed with regard to the acquisition and installation of traffic violation photo-recording equipment at busy intersections in this State, although the idea is currently under review.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

369. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister of Health seen the letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* on 21 August 1980 from A. C. Davis relating to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, if so, what action is being taken in response to the allegations of "poor quality of patients' meals" and that "It is not

uncommon for patients to have to use alternative drinking methods after body washes because towels are not available.”?

2. What is being done to overcome the car parking problem at R.A.H.?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Every endeavour is made to maintain the highest possible food standard for the patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. However, with 1 000 patients per day there are a limited number of cases where the food is considered to be less than optimum. The standard will continue to be monitored in order to reduce complaints to an absolute minimum.

The linen shortages referred to occurred when the hospital was going through its busiest period in many years with an occupancy level as high as 95 per cent. An urgent review has been undertaken in connection with stock levels of linen items provided for the hospital and every effort will be made to meet the essential needs of the patients at all times.

2. Parking is available to visitors in the North car park after 4 p.m. on week days and all days on weekends. However, because of the difficulties in monitoring vehicle movement and parking in the hospital, such facilities are made available only upon application. No limitations are placed on the number of applications that can be submitted and approved.

NOARLUNGA BUSES

372. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What upgrading of bus services is to be provided to the residents of Old Noarlunga?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Old Noarlunga is presently served by two bus operators. Premier Tours Pty. Ltd. provides a morning service to Adelaide with mid and late afternoon services from Adelaide on week days (Monday to Friday). Mr. P. McArthur (Aldinga Beach Hire Service and Sales) co-ordinates a morning and afternoon return trip with rail services at Noarlunga Centre on school days and on Tuesdays and Thursdays during school holidays.

To establish whether sufficient patronage exists to justify an augmented service from Old Noarlunga to Noarlunga Centre, the authority is presently negotiating for the provision of trial supplementary services. It is expected that negotiations will be completed by the end of October.

MENTAL HEALTH

387. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many electro convulsive therapy treatments have occurred since the introduction of the regulations under the new Mental Health Act?

2. How many eucotomie operations were carried out in South Australia during the last twelve months and how many of these were involuntary?

3. How many lobotomy operations were carried out in South Australia during the last twelve months and how many of these were involuntary?

4. What safeguards exist to prevent abuse of or experimentation with the procedures mentioned in 1, 2 and 3?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. This information is not available since electro convulsive therapy treatments are not notifiable. However, a total of 1 239 treatments have been given in approved hospitals.

2. None in approved hospitals.

3. None in approved hospitals.

4. Mental Health Act, 1977-1979 Part II, Division I Section 7 (1); Part III, Division I, Section 16 (1, 2, 3, 4); Part III, Division IV; Part V; and, Part VII, Sections 44, 45, 46, 47 and 49.

WAKEFIELD HOUSE FUNCTION

394. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Did the Minister or one of his departments hold a function at Wakefield House on Friday 22 August 1980 and, if so—

(a) what was its purpose;

(b) how long did it last;

(c) who were the guests and what were their names;

(d) who or which firm did the catering;

(e) what was the cost of the function;

(f) how much of the cost was for drinks; and

(g) how much of the cost was for food?

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

(a) Yes. As it was not feasible to cater for other than a limited number of guests at the official opening, an open day was arranged for the families and friends of Public Buildings Department staff at the department's new headquarters in Wakefield House. Its purpose was to acquaint visitors with the diversity of the services provided for other Government departments and the community. Specifically, it enabled family members to gain an understanding of the work done by individual employees at the department.

(b) 3 p.m.-8 p.m.

(c) Visitors comprised families and friends of staff of the Public Buildings Department as well as some representatives of client departments. Visitors' names were not recorded, but it is estimated that there were approximately 1 250 participants.

(d) State Transport Authority.

(e) \$6 000.

(f) \$1 457.

(g) \$3 630 (including labour charges).

RURAL ASSISTANCE BRANCH

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

1. With the continued wind down by the Commonwealth of the rural adjustment scheme, does the Minister intend to change the administration of the Rural Assistance Branch and, if so, is a reduction in manpower intended?

2. What was the cost of the branch to the Government to 30 June 1980 and what amount of this will be recovered from the Commonwealth?

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

1. No.

2. For the period 1 July 1979-30 June 1980 total cost was \$372 154. Of this, \$73 700 is recoverable from the Commonwealth.

RURAL EXTENSION

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

1. Have some charges been reintroduced for extension material produced by the Department of Agriculture and, if so, what material is now charged for and what are the charges?

2. Is this contrary to the election promise of the Minister that extension material would be free under a Liberal Government?

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

1. The only charge reintroduced is 10 cents each for fact sheets ordered in excess of 10 copies.

2. My pre-election comments did not imply that charges for all departmental publications would be waived. However, it was and is my policy that the fact sheet information service should carry no charge. The charge introduced for copies in excess of 10 is to discourage unnecessary waste of publications.

MEAT

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

1. When will the South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Act, 1980, be proclaimed to enable meat quotas into the Adelaide metropolitan area to be abolished?

2. Have the discussions between the Minister and the Victorian Minister of Agriculture regarding the abolition of reinspection between South Australia and Victoria been successful?

3. What is the result of those discussions and if they have been unsuccessful, does the Minister intend to reinspect all meat entering South Australia from Victoria?

4. What is the estimated cost of such reinspection and what additional staff and facilities would be required to carry out the reinspection?

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

1. The South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Act, 1980, will be proclaimed on the same day as the suspended sections of the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980. This date is dependent on the preparation of the necessary regulations and recruitment of the necessary staff. It is unlikely to be before 1 January 1981.

2. Yes.

3. An exchange of Ministerial letters will confirm an agreement in principle to abolish reinspection between the respective States.

4. See 3.

ASBESTOS

407. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Are employees within Government departments who fabricate asbestos products required to wear personal dust samplers for checking by health officers and, if not, will such a scheme be introduced and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

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

1. No.

2. The Occupational Health Branch of the Health Commission has investigated processes used in the fabrication of materials containing asbestos in several Government workshops and has recommended specific precautionary measures. Where necessary sampling has been performed to identify and quantify the hazards in the work place so that appropriate control measures can be implemented.

LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE

414. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. In what hospitals, health centres or clinics are bi-lingual signs and directories posted?

2. In what hospitals, health centres and clinics are there any bi- or multi-lingual persons working at the information desks?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Queen Elizabeth, Modbury, Adelaide Children's, Mount Gambier and Lyell McEwin Hospitals and the Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre have signs or directories which provide for persons unable to read English.

2. The Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth, Adelaide Children's and Lyell McEwin Hospitals, and The Parks, St. Agnes, Adelaide Women's, Clovelly Park and Coober Pedy Community Health Centres do have bi- or multi-lingual persons stationed in their reception areas but not at all times.

Owing to the diversity of languages in our multicultural society it is virtually impossible to cater for every eventuality. However, in most situations it is possible to utilise other staff members who have the ability to converse with the clients in their own language.

DANGEROUS DRUGS

415. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What actions has the Department of Health taken to alert migrants to the dangers of using pharmaceutical products such as—

(a) barbiturates;

(b) opiates;

(c) hallucinogens;

(d) morphine derivatives;

(e) codeine derivatives; and

(f) other addictive or hallucinogenic drugs?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The policy of the South Australian Health Commission has been to treat migrants as part of the community, and to reach them through community and school drug education programmes developed for our multi-racial society. Drug education programmes run by the South Australian Health Commission deal not only with the pharmaceutical products listed by the honourable member but other drugs—legal and illegal—as well. An exception to this policy has been health education programmes run at three-monthly intervals for Vietnamese migrants. These programmes are aimed at teaching these migrants to utilise the health care facilities available in this State. Within this context the correct use of pharmaceutical products is covered. Special attention is given to the effects of pharmaceutical products on pregnant women and programmes are organised and conducted by a Vietnamese medical practitioner in consultation with the South Australian Health Commission.

FISHERIES RESEARCH

417. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What was the total cost of operating the *Joseph Verco* for the year 1979-80?

2. What research programmes were undertaken and what were the results?

3. What was the cost of operating on a per day at sea basis?

4. How many days was the vessel at sea for the year ended 30 June 1980?

5. Is the vessel presently undergoing a refit and, if so, what work is being undertaken and what will be the cost?

6. What is the research programme for the vessel for the 1980-81 year?

7. Will research work be undertaken in offshore fisheries?

8. Is research work being funded by the Government for potential offshore fisheries and, if so, how much and, if not, why not?

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

1. \$167 000.

2. Information and samples were taken for use in every marine research project.

3. \$1 621.

4. 103 days.

5. Yes. The refit was being undertaken to increase accommodation and reduce noise problems. Contract price \$181 755.

6. The sinking of the vessel is a severe blow to the Department of Fisheries research programme for 1980-81. Research through use of professional fishermen's vessels, charters, etc. is now being investigated.

7. No longer applicable.

8. The State Government has allocated \$2 500 to a further survey of the drop-line fishery in the South-East, and has requested matching funds from the Commonwealth.

ABALONE

421. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What has been the total abalone meat catch (in kgs), the hourly catch rate and the number of diver days in the Western and Central Zones, respectively, for each of the last four years?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The reply is as follows:

	Western Zone			
	Total kg	Days	Hours	Catch rate kg/hr
1975-76	379 941	1 125	5 581.0	68.1
1976-77	458 322	1 506	8 393.0	54.6
1977-78	486 297	1 588	8 433.5	57.7
1978-79	567 075	1 798	9 461.0	59.9
	Central Zone			
1975-76	131 838	343	1 856.5	71.0
1976-77	122 853	442	2 256.0	54.5
1977-78	148 305	449	2 531.5	58.6
1978-79	138 633	432	2 555.0	54.3

Figures for 1979-80 are not yet available.

HUGH CULLEN

429. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Government considered the prayer for the release of Hugh Cullen without further delay in the petition which I presented to the House on Thursday 21 August 1980 and, if so, what action, if any, has been taken so far or is proposed (and when) to have him released and if it has not been considered, why not, and when will it be considered?

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

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

433. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the article in the *Network* magazine of August 1980 on page 24 in relation to "a new type of prefabricated level crossing pavement that has been installed in New South Wales"

and, if not, will the Minister investigate the possibility of using this equipment on metropolitan road/rail crossings and, if the matter has already been investigated, what was the outcome of such investigation?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Officers of the State Transport Authority have examined a number of prefabricated level crossing pavements, including a type referred to by the honourable member. The principal feature of this type of crossing installation is the speed and ease of removal to facilitate the use of ballast tamping equipment when track maintenance is necessary. Prefabricated pavements currently being marketed are very costly and can only be economically justified where the volume of rail and road traffic over a level crossing is sufficiently dense to demand almost constant attention to the road surface and track. This condition does not occur in metropolitan Adelaide.

VANDALISM

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

1. What was the cost of repairs due to vandalism in the 1979-80 financial year on the S.T.A.—

(a) Rail Division;

(b) Bus and Tram Division;

(c) suburban railway stations; and

(d) bus stop signs and shelters?

2. What steps were taken by the Police Department and S.T.A. constables to curb the vandalism and what effective action has been achieved?

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

1. Detailed costs of repairs relating to vandalism are not maintained by the authority for any of the areas mentioned.

2. Uniformed State Transport Authority constables patrol areas of the authority's operation and attend to problems on authority properties and passenger carrying vehicles. Where necessary, the South Australian Police Department are requested to assist. The authority considers that the incidence of vandalism has decreased.

MOORE'S BUILDING

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

1. When will detailed cost breakdowns on the work to be done on the Charles Moore building in Victoria Square be available and will they be published and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. When will plans of the work to be done on the building be available, who is preparing them and will they be made public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. Is the work to be let out to private contract and, if not, why not and, who is to do the work?

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

1. It is anticipated that details relating to both plans and cost estimates will be available during November 1980.

2. See 1.

3. A. W. Baulderstone Pty. Ltd. has been awarded a contract as building consultants to provide construction advice to the design team and will also be engaged as construction managers for the construction phase. Under the construction management system, the construction work will be undertaken by a series of separate "trade package" contracts using private contractors.

MINISTER'S LETTER

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

1. Was the letter from the Minister to Mr. Wyatt (R&S 599/80 B9654) dated 29 August 1980 hand delivered to Mr. Wyatt and, if not, how did the Minister anticipate that Mr. Wyatt would be able to meet the request in that letter to "forward the receipts for the equipment before 31 August" when that day was a Sunday?

2. Will the Minister give an undertaking that future such notices of approval of grants will include reasonable deadlines for return of receipts?

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

1. It is regretted that, due to an unexpected delay, the letter to Mr. Wyatt was not posted earlier than 29 August 1980.

2. There should be no recurrence of this situation as in the future such notices will have reasonable deadlines for return of receipts.

S.G.I.C.

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

1. Where has S.G.I.C. got the money from to buy the shares in John Martins?

2. How many shares has it bought in John Martins, why has it bought them and at whose instigation was the purchase made?

3. How much have the shares cost S.G.I.C. and how is this amount made up?

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

1. The cost of the shares was met from the Commission's total investment fund of about \$275 000 000.

2. (a) 500 000.

(b) The shares were purchased by the commission as a long-term investment.

(c) The commission accepted an offer of sale received from Mutual Life and Citizens Assurance Company.

3. \$600 000 for 500 000 shares at \$1.20 each.

NORTH-EASTERN TRANSPORT

462. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many homes are currently owned by the Highways Department and occupied by tenants on the proposed route of the O'Bahn bus system?

2. Is it envisaged that arrangements will be made by the department when the homes are required for this bus route for the tenants to be relocated by the department or the South Australian Housing Trust?

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

1. 26. This figure includes any property totally required for the actual busway, embankments and associated car parks but excludes properties where only part of the land is required.

2. If the occupants or owners of homes affected by the bus route require assistance in relocation, this will be arranged by liaison between the State Transport Authority and the Re-housing Committee.

REDCLIFF

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

1. Is the view of the Department of Fisheries in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical project that "Before an E.I.S. could purport to evaluate the proposed complex, a

careful biological, chemical and oceanographic survey should be conducted for two complete seasonal cycles" and, if not, what is the department's view?

2. Does the Government accept the correctness of that view and, if so, will it undertake to delay an E.I.S. on the project for two complete seasonal cycles to allow a careful biological, chemical and oceanographic survey to be conducted and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. The environmental assessment by the Department of Environment has been accepted. However, marine studies need to be extended to 24 months (two complete cycles) to enable additional information to be collected.

ACT OF SETTLEMENT

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

1. Is the Premier aware of possible ramifications, recently reported on in Victoria, that may apply to public servants, policemen and Parliamentarians born outside of Britain and its former dominions because the English Act of Settlement of 1700 is still valid in Australia?

2. Is it correct that the chairman of the Victorian Environment Protection Authority stood down from his post and a member of Victoria's Town Planning Appeals Tribunal resigned her position because both persons were of American origin?

3. Is it correct that the positions of foreign-born members of the Victorian Parliament were placed in some doubt because of a possible interpretation of the same Act and does any similar doubt exist on the status of any members of the South Australian Parliament?

4. Is it correct that the alien status given by the 1700 Act of Settlement to citizens who were not born in Britain or a British dominion cannot be negated by naturalisation as Australian citizens and would all such persons therefore be ineligible to hold public offices of trust and, if so, approximately how many persons, such as those in public service positions, would be affected?

5. Has the South Australian Parliament any power to pass legislation to overcome this situation and, if not, is it correct that only the Federal Parliament can do so and, if so, what approach has the Government made to the Federal Government on this matter?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am aware of the reports about the application of the English Act of Settlement of 1700 to the State of Victoria. However, I am advised that there is no cause for concern in South Australia and no need for any legislative action in this State.

STATE ELECTION

472. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the report on the 1979 State Election been printed and is it on sale to the public through the Government Printer and, if so, why has it not yet been tabled as a Parliamentary paper?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is assumed that the "report" in question is the Statistical Return in respect of the 1979 State Election. This return has now been finalised and printed and will be tabled on 21 October 1980. It will then be available for sale through the Government Printer.

"AUSSIE POOLS"

473. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware that no results have been published for the last two rounds of the football season by

the unlicensed operation known as "Aussie Pools" and, if so, is the Minister able to provide any information on the awarding of the jackpot prize or on whether the entire operation is now defunct?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am aware that results have not been published on the last two minor rounds of the football season by "Aussie Pools" and, as far as I can ascertain, the jackpot prize has not been awarded. Investigations relating to "Aussie Pools" are continuing.

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

474. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Do any health funds provide coverage for chiropractic services?

2. Which health funds are declining to provide ancillary benefits for chiropractic services on the basis that there is no statutory register defining who is a chiropractor?

3. Was the legislation to establish such a register enacted in 1979 by the previous Government and, if so, has that Act not yet been proclaimed and, if it has not been proclaimed, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Medibank Private is the only health fund currently providing coverage for chiropractic services.

2. The other health funds decline to provide ancillary benefits for chiropractic services, but do not give specific reasons for doing so.

3. Yes. The Act has not yet been proclaimed, pending preparation of regulations necessary for the administration of the Act.

SALISBURY PARKING

475. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What car parks are controlled by State Government departments or authorities within the electorate of Salisbury?

2. How many of those car parks provide parking for disabled drivers according to specifications commonly recognised as essential for such drivers and with the appropriate identification of such spots and how many such spaces are provided in total?

3. Which car parks do not provide such parking spots, which of these have plans for provision at a later date and, if there are any without such plans, why is that so?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member can be assured that the Government is aware of the problems which exist for disabled people not only within the electorate of Salisbury but throughout the State and is endeavouring to heighten the awareness of the need for adequate facilities in new and existing buildings and environments to enable disabled persons to use them with ease and dignity. It will be appreciated that the implementation of this philosophy and the establishment of practical solutions are complex tasks which require co-ordination of the views of many persons and organisations and will therefore take some time to complete.

SALISBURY BUILDINGS

476. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What buildings are controlled by State Government departments or authorities within the electorate of Salisbury?

2. Which of these do not have features to assist the disabled as outlined in A.S. 1428 Building Code and what features are absent in each instance?

3. What plans are there for the provision of those features at a later date and in the buildings where there are no such plans, why is that so?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member can be assured that the Government is aware of the problems which exist for disabled people not only within the electorate of Salisbury but throughout the State and is endeavouring to heighten the awareness of the need for adequate facilities in new and existing buildings and environments to enable disabled persons to use them with ease and dignity. It will be appreciated that the implementation of this philosophy and the establishment of practical solutions are complex tasks which require co-ordination of the views of many persons and organisations and will therefore take some time to complete.

477. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What State Government departments or authorities rent office space within the electorate of Salisbury?

2. Are car parking spaces for the disabled provided at any of these places, which ones do not have such spaces and what moves are being taken to have such spaces provided?

3. Are the offices in question designed or modified to comply with A.S. 1428 Building Code to provide for the needs of the disabled and what features are absent in each instance where the offices do not comply either in whole or in part with that standard?

4. What plans are there for the provision of such features in these offices and in the offices where there are no such plans, why is that so?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member can be assured that the Government is aware of the problems which exist for disabled people not only within the electorate of Salisbury but throughout the State and is endeavouring to heighten the awareness of the need for adequate facilities in new and existing buildings and environments to enable disabled persons to use them with ease and dignity. It will be appreciated that the implementation of this philosophy and the establishment of practical solutions are complex tasks which require co-ordination of the views of many persons and organisations and will therefore take some time to complete.

DIREK PRIMARY SCHOOL

478. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Have corrective measures to doors of the type that caused injury to a student at the Direk Primary School on 28 July 1980, been completed at the school and, if so, what measures were taken and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Alterations to the Direk Primary School doors have been delayed while modifications to doors of the same type have been evaluated at the Mount Barker South Primary School. These modifications have now been evaluated and proved to render the door much safer. Modifications will now be implemented as soon as possible at the Direk school.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

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

1. How many allotments presently owned by the Highways Department—

- (a) are up for sale at this moment; and
 (b) have been announced as proposed for sale?

2. How many housing units (houses, flats, maisonettes) are on these allotments and how many of these units were occupied by tenants as at 1 September 1980?

3. Have tenants living in these units been advised that the premises they are in are either presently up for sale or proposed for sale and have they been invited to consider purchasing them?

4. What notice is it proposed to give these tenants at such time as the housing unit they are living in is sold?

5. Will tenants who are given notice be given priority for vacancies occurring in other housing units still under the ownership of the Highways Department?

6. Will contact be made with the South Australian Housing Trust to assist tenants given notice who are financially disadvantaged?

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

1. (a) 26.

(b) 113.

In addition, there are properties in the Hindmarsh Boulevard/North Adelaide connector area which are currently being examined with a view to their disposal in an orderly manner.

2. Nine housing units, five of which were occupied by tenants as at 1 September 1980.

3. The tenants have been advised that the properties will be sold and have been invited to consider purchasing them.

4. Varying periods of notice in accordance with the tenants' circumstances.

5. Yes. Satisfactory tenants are given the opportunity to relocate to alternative departmentally owned housing where this is available.

6. Yes, if the need arises.

SALISBURY DOWNS HOUSES

483. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Regarding houses for sale built by the South Australian Housing Trust abutting onto the northern side of Kings Road, west of Martins Road—

(a) is the Minister aware of correspondence sent by the City Engineer of the City of Salisbury on 4 June 1980 to the member for Salisbury concerning kerbing of those portions of Kings Road adjacent to the houses in question which stated in part, "The Housing Trust normally contribute in such a situation but, in this case, see themselves as landowners only and not developers," and does the quoted statement correctly reflect the attitude of the S.A.H.T.;

(b) who constructed the houses in that subdivision and for whom were they constructed; and

(c) who is selling the houses and on whose behalf is that being done?

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

(a) I am not aware of the correspondence. The trust purchased 60 allotments for single-unit housing for sale and rental in the subdivision abutting Kings Road, Salisbury Downs, from Waymore Pty. Ltd. on 10 August 1978. The trust bought the land as individual fully serviced allotments with individual titles. The trust has not participated in the development of the subdivision. It is usual for council to impose conditions of approval on the developer at the time that the land is being prepared for subdivision. Under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, a council may

refuse final planning approval, which would consequently mean that titles for the allotments could not be attained, if the conditions have not been observed. A condition which ensures that kerbing is provided is usually a standard condition for all subdivisions and when the trust is the subdivider of the land kerbing is provided. As the trust is not the subdivider in this instance but simply a purchaser of serviced allotments, there is no legal obligation that it pay for kerbing which ordinarily would have been included as part of the cost of serviced allotments. The trust also does not believe that it has any other obligation, under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, to pay for the kerbing as it more properly should be a matter between the original subdivider and the council.

(b) The houses on these allotments are being constructed in the first instance for the trust by private sector builders using the trust's tendering system.

(c) The trust is carrying out its own sales programme in this area.

CANNED FRUITS ACT

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

1. Has the Minister seen the report in the August 1980 issue of *Progress* concerning the Canned Fruits Marketing Act, 1979?

2. Is the assertion correct that the Act involves the "complete socialisation" of the products of fruit growers affected?

3. Is the Act affected in any way by the 1946 referendum on "Organised Marketing of Products" and, if so, how and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No, because the 1946 referendum to add "organised marketing of primary products" to the test of Commonwealth powers and to exempt laws made under that power from the operation of Section 92 was defeated.

CAR PARKING

485. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Further to the answer to question No. 203 in the last session, have priorities been allocated as yet and, if not, what did the Minister mean by the term "the near future" when he answered that question on 30 October 1979?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Work on this programme has commenced at Coromandel, after which upgrading will be carried out at other stations. However, as only a limited number of vehicles park at Greenfields station, the car park is not of immediate priority.

NEW BUSES

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

1. Will the new articulated buses on order by S.T.A. be delivered progressively commencing September 1980, as indicated by the Minister in his answer to question No. 386 in the last session and, if not, why not?

2. How will the buses be allocated between the Noarlunga and Elizabeth express service?

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

1. The 35 articulated buses on order by the State Transport Authority are now planned for progressive delivery commencing November 1980. My previous advice that delivery of the new articulated buses was expected to commence in September 1980 was based on preliminary production programmes as advised by the contractor. The revised dates are based on construction experience of the prototype articulated bus.

2. The allocation of the new articulated buses to services will be determined by timetable requirements from time to time.

MINISTERIAL CORRESPONDENCE

487. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware that on 20 May 1980 in correspondence MH M 232/80 she referred to me as Hon. M. F. Arnold, M.P., Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Irrigation, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, member for Salisbury?

2. Is the Minister also aware that on 10 June 1980 in correspondence she referred to me as Hon. P. B. Arnold, M.P., Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Irrigation, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, member for Salisbury?

3. Was the Minister exercising humour on the two occasions in question or was her office unable to correctly address the correspondence and the Minister inattentive in her reading of the letters before signing?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No. It was a genuine error that was regrettably undetected and for which an apology has been extended.

WATER FILTRATION

491. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. When were tenders called in relation to the installation of the water filtration plant at the Little Para Dam?

2. How many companies tendered and what are their names?

3. Did the Engineering and Water Supply Department put in a tender?

4. Who was the successful tenderer and was it the cheapest and, if not, what was the cheapest tender?

5. Will E. & W.S. equipment and labour be made available in the project?

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

1. 31 March 1980.

2. This information is confidential.

3. No.

4. The successful tenderer was Dillingham Australia Ltd. The subsequent information sought in this question is confidential.

5. Yes, if requested and subject to negotiation.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

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

1. Is the Minister aware that there is only one nursing sister who is properly trained in the High Dependency (Intensive Care) Unit of the Lyell McEwin Hospital and does this level of staffing provide an adequate standard of care for patients?

2. Is the Minister aware that this unit operates 24 hours per day?

3. Will the Minister increase the allocation to the Lyell McEwin Hospital so that suitable persons can be employed or to ensure that this unit is manned by properly trained personnel for 24 hours per day and why are such funds not available at the present time?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. This level of staffing for a four-bed unit is considered to be adequate for normal clinical needs and at times of considerable pressure, it is possible for assistance to be obtained by redeployment of staff from other areas. The senior sister in the unit has completed the Intensive Care Course conducted by the Royal Adelaide Hospital and on-the-job instruction is provided to all other staff on a continuing basis within this unit.

2. Yes.

3. The level of staffing in this unit is considered to be adequate.

DRUGS

494. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to the undertaking given by the Minister on Tuesday June 3 1980 that consideration would be given to—

(a) restricting the availability of hallucinatory substances including certain glues and aerosol packs;

(b) requiring additives to be included in such hallucinatory substances to render them offensive to smell; and

(c) instituting rehabilitative programmes to assist those addicted to habits caused by inhalation of such hallucinatory substances,

has an appropriate strategy been devised and when can the House expect recommendations from the Minister in relation to these matters?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

(a) and (b) Restrictions upon the availability of certain glues and aerosols which are capable, if abused, of producing hallucinations and/or intoxication, are currently under consideration by the South Australian Food and Drugs Advisory Committee, and the Poisons Schedule Standing Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council. It is expected that the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee will make recommendations on the legal controls over these substances in the near future. Depending upon the recommendations made, it should be possible to inform the House of legislative strategies to be adopted by the Government once the recommendations have been considered by the Government.

(c) Rehabilitative programmes are currently under discussion by an inter-departmental committee, a specialist committee of the Department of Community Welfare and a committee of the South Australian Health Commission.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

495. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: In relation to the nursing care audit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, has this quality control device ceased and, if so, for what reasons?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No.

REDCLIFF

496. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has the Government any proposals before it, or is any consideration being given by the Government to the use of the Redcliff area for activities in addition to the petro-chemical works and, if so, what are these uses?

2. Are there any proposals for or is the Government considering the possibility of using the proposed Redcliff shipping facility for purposes other than those associated with the petro-chemical works such as a loading facility for grain or l.p.g.?

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

1. There are no firm proposals.

2. Initially, the berth provided will be specifically designed for the loading of petro-chemicals, but other cargoes can be accommodated by adding further loading berths to the jetty. Accordingly, industries that can take advantage of this loading facility could potentially be located in the Redcliff area.

WEST LAKES

498. **The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Does the Department of Marine and Harbors have responsibility for the lakes and the lake banks in the West Lakes development and, if so, when did the Department assume this responsibility and from whom was it assumed?

2. Has the Department had to replace a large number of concrete bricks which protect the banks of the lake and, if so, how many bricks have been replaced and why have they been replaced and how much has this work cost to date?

3. Is it envisaged that eventually most of the bricks will require replacement and, if so, how much is it estimated that this work will cost?

4. How old are the original bricks and when were they installed?

5. Are the original bricks in need of replacement because they were made of inferior grade concrete?

6. Who supplied the original bricks and were they supplied in accordance with specifications and, if so, were they of merchantable quality?

7. Has the supplier been approached by the department with a request that all of the bricks be replaced with bricks of merchantable quality and, if so, what has been the response and if the supplier has refused to replace such bricks and undertake such work has the Department considered taking legal action to obtain damages?

8. Who let the original contract for the bricks?

9. Who installed the bricks?

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

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors is responsible for:

- (a) the maintenance of bank protection works;
- (b) the inlet and outlet works;
- (c) the control of flood levels arising from intake of storm water into the basin;
- (d) the control of water quality.

Responsibility was assumed in accordance with the Indenture in two stages on 2 April 1976 and 14 December 1976 from West Lakes Ltd.

2. Approximately 1 000 out of a total of 70 000 blocks have been replaced due to weathering, cracking and crumbling at a cost to date of approximately \$18 000.

3. The number of blocks that may require replacement eventually is not known.

4. Block manufacture and installation commenced in late 1973 and continued for approximately two years.

5. No.

6. Hollostone Ltd., supplied the blocks in accordance with the Australian Standard A87-1963: concrete blocks for masonry construction, and therefore they would have been classified as merchantable quality.

7. No.

8. West Lakes Ltd.

9. West Lakes Ltd.

STATE COMPUTER CENTRE

499. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. On 30 June 1979, how many persons were on the staff complement of the State Computer Centre and how many persons were actually employed in the centre at that time?

2. What are the comparable figures for 30 June 1980 and for 31 August 1980?

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

1. and 2.

	30.6.79	30.6.80	31.8.80
Staff employed by A.D.P. Centre*	105.5	104	105
Establishment numbers (positions existing)	113	116	116

*figures represent full-time equivalents, i.e. part-time staff have been included.

AUSSIE POOLS

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

1. Was a "small debtor's court" summons against Pro-Win (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., as organisers of the Aussie Pools competition taken out by a Mr. T. Crawford of 1/43A Fourth Avenue, Ascot Park on or about Monday 18 August and was the address on that summons against Pro-Win (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. made out as the registered address of that company, namely 375 Greenhill Road, Toorak Gardens?

2. When an attempt to deliver the summons was made, was it discovered that Pro-Win (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. had moved to 188 Greenhill Road and, if so, why was Mr. T. Crawford not informed of this by the Clerk of the Court so that he could authorise the summons to be served at the new address?

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

1. Yes.

2. The large volume of work handled by the court makes it impracticable to notify plaintiffs when a process is returned unserved. It is the responsibility of the plaintiff to inquire from the court the state of the action within a reasonable time after the summons has been issued. This has been the practice in local courts for many years.

FREE LOTTERY

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

1. Is the Minister aware of a free lottery organised by the *News*, Ansett Airlines and W. D. & H. O. Wills advertised in the *News* under the title of the "News-Ansett-Craven Mild Cup Contest" which offers a Melbourne Cup Holiday as the prize, and of the section of the rules which reads "Send as many entries as you like. Entrants must be smokers over the age of 18 years", and, if so, what action is proposed if such rules are considered illegal?

2. Has the Minister referred the stipulation requiring entrants to be smokers to the Minister of Health for consideration by her department?

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

1. Yes. The competition is free and therefore outside the ambit of the Lottery and Gaming Act and regulations.

2. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Health.

MORPHETTVILLE RACECOURSE

502. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of any proposals for a casino to operate in the Morphettville Racecourse grounds and what is the Government's policy regarding any such proposal?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is no proposal to operate a casino in the Morphettville Racecourse grounds, nor is it the Government's policy to legalise the operation of casinos in South Australia.

503. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Are any traffic problems in nearby streets in Plympton Park envisaged when the new Morphettville racecourse grandstand opens in March 1981?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The streets in Plympton Park adjacent to the Morphettville racecourse are the responsibility of the Corporation of the City of Marion. I understand that council will monitor the traffic situation when the racecourse is reopened.

CONTAINERS

506. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What tonnage of containers was unloaded at Port Adelaide Docks and Pelican Point, respectively, during each of the financial years, 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980 to date?

2. What are the projections for these depots in the next five years for container traffic?

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

1. Container imports—Port of Adelaide

	No. of containers *(TEU)	Contents (tonnes)	
No. 6 berth Outer Harbor	1978-79	3 655	30 818
(Pelican Point)	1979-80	1 296	8 407
All other berths	1978-79	2 976	25 976
	1979-80	1 170	23 295

Figures are not yet available for the current year.

*TEU—Twenty-foot equivalent units (i.e. 1 x 40 ft. container=2 x 20 ft. units)

2. It is believed that South Australian trade utilising sea transport would generate a container exchange of 60 000 TEU's annually.

DEBENDOX

508. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Who are the manufacturers of Debendox in Australia?

2. How many cases have been reported in South Australia of serious after effects of using this drug in the periods 1979-80 and 1980 to date?

3. How many prescriptions for this drug were issued in this State during the periods 1979-80 and 1980 to date?

4. Are there any reported cases of death directly attributable to this drug and, if so, how many?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. William S. Merrell Co.

2. Information received from the Drug Evaluation Committee on 25 September 1980 indicates that, since January 1979, no reports have been received from South Australia of birth defects or other serious Health effects related to the taking of Debendox.

3. For the year 1979-80, there were approximately 23 000 prescriptions for Debendox dispensed in South Australia. Figures for this year not available to date.

4. No reports of deaths directly attributable to Debendox have been received by the South Australian Health Commission.

LEAD POLLUTION

509. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister's attention been drawn to a report by the University of New South Wales entitled "Lead Burden of Sydney School Children" which raises serious concern about elevated lead burden in 1 500 school children?

2. Does the report show that 42 per cent of children at a Mascot school and 22 per cent of children at a Mosman school had levels of 25 micrograms of lead per 100 mls of blood?

3. Have overseas studies indicated that children with elevated lead levels in their milk teeth perform significantly worse on a range of I.Q. and other neuropsychological tests and have poorer concentration, oral skills and classroom behaviour?

4. What steps has the Minister taken to—

(a) screen South Australian school children at risk for elevated lead or lead activity;

(b) urge the Government to eliminate lead in petrol; and

(c) urge positive measures to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles?

5. If the screening referred to in part 4 (a) has been carried out, will the Minister advise—

(a) when the results were released and through what department; and

(b) the results for Hendon, Seaton, Woodville and Findon Primary Schools, Seaton North and West Lakes High Schools and Sienna College, respectively,

and if studies have not been carried out, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The results of the study were that in a survey in the spring of 1974, 42 per cent of children from the school in Gardeners Road, Mascot, and 26 per cent of children from the school in Mosman, had blood lead concentrations greater than 25 micrograms of lead per 100 mls of blood. A second survey was carried out in autumn 1975, at which time the percentages of children with blood lead concentrations greater than 25 micrograms per 100 ml of

blood were 18 per cent at Gardeners Road, Mascot, 14 per cent at Mosman.

3. Several overseas studies have suggested that low levels of lead in the body may influence child growth and development. Lead concentrations in teeth, hair, blood and other tissues have been used as indices of exposure to lead in these cross sectional studies, some of which support the hypothesis; others do not. This is an area which warrants further properly designed research to elucidate the fundamental questions at issue. One such prospective study is currently being done in South Australia by the Health Commission with the support of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

4. (a) None.

(b) This matter is currently being considered by representatives of the relevant Government Departments who form an advisory committee on motor vehicle emissions.

(c) Motor vehicles are an important source of air pollutants and the Government recognises the importance of controlling their emissions. Transport, environment and health authorities in this State are all involved in strategies to control motor vehicle pollution.

5. No screening has been done and hence no results are available. See 3 above.

S.T.A. COTTAGES

510. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to S.T.A. cottages—

- (a) how many are there in metropolitan Adelaide and non-urban areas, respectively;
- (b) what are the locations and the respective numbers at each location;
- (c) how many are occupied by A.N.R. employees, vacant, pending occupation, and rented to non-railway employees, respectively, and what is the respective location of each cottage in the latter category;
- (d) what are the rental charges for railway/Government employees and non-railway occupants, respectively; and
- (e) how many have been offered for sale to the general public and railway employees, respectively, and what are the locations and how many have been sold in each category?

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

- (a) The State Transport Authority owns 77 houses in the metropolitan area and 267 in non-urban areas.
- (b) The non-metropolitan houses are located within 88 townships. Schedule 1 attached shows the locations and number of houses at each location.
- (c) Metropolitan Houses:
 - Occupied by A.N.R.C. employees, 45.
 - Vacant, two.
 - Both are pending occupancy.
 - Occupied by non-employees, 25.
 - The remaining five are occupied by employees of the authority.
 Non-Metropolitan Houses
 - Occupied by A.N.R.C. employees, 12.
 - Vacant, 76, of which 21 are pending occupation.
 - Occupied by non-railway employees, 179.
 - Schedule 2 attached shows the locations of the houses in the latter category.
- (d) Rentals for authority owned houses are established following reviews carried out by officers

of the South Australian Housing Trust each three years. In the period between reviews, adjustments are made to rental charges in line with movements in the consumer price index. The rental charged to non-employees is dependent upon the terms of tenancy and the condition of the house, but is approximately 25 per cent above that charged to employees.

(e) Since March 1978, 115 authority owned houses have been offered for sale to the general public, including four to retired S.A.R. employees. Sixty-two houses have been sold in this category.

A further ten houses have been offered to A.N.R.C. employees, but only six have been sold. Schedule 3 attached shows the numbers and locations.

SCHEDULE 1

Location and Number of Authority Owned Houses in Non-Urban Areas

Aldgate	4
Apamurra	4
Auburn	1
Blyth	2
Bowmans	9
Bumbunga	1
Bute	1
Clare	5
Dorrien	1
Eudunda	4
Farrell Flat	5
Finniss	1
Freeling	1
Gulnare	2
Halbury	1
Hallett	2
Hanson	1
Long Gully	2
Long Plains	6
Mallala	1
Manoora	2
Melton	3
Merriton	4
Monarto South	1
Moonta	3
Morgan	5
Mount Barker Junction	4
Mount Bryan	5
Mount Mary	2
Owen	1
Point Pass	1
Port Elliot	1
Port Wakefield	6
Redhill	1
Riverton	2
Saddleworth	1
Snowtown	4
Spalding	9
Strathalbyn	2
Tarlee	3
Terowie	3
Truro	3
Two Wells	1
Virginia	1
Wasleys	1
Cockburn	4
Crystal Brook	4
Laura	1
Mannahill	1
Olary	3

Peterborough	25
Port Pirie	1
Stone Hut	3
Wilmington	1
Wirrabara	3
Yunta	5
Alawoona	1
Berri	1
Bordertown	1
Borrika	1
Coomandook	1
Coonalpyn	3
Kalangadoo	1
Karoonda	2
Keith	4
Kingston S.E.	3
Lameroo	1
Lucindale	2
Mercunda	1
Paringa	1
Parrakie	1
Peake	1
Parilla	1
Pinnaroo	3
Renmark	1
Tailem Bend	24
Tintinara	2
Waikerie	1
Wanbi	1
Wolseley	3
Wilkawatt	1
Ceduna	1
Cummins	4
Kimba	1
Lock	2
Minnipa	4
Poochera	1
Port Lincoln	18

SCHEDULE 2

Houses Occupied by Non-Employees

Aldgate	Two Wells
Apamurra	Virginia
Auburn	Wasleys
Blyth	Cockburn
Bowmans	Laura
Bumbunga	Mannahill
Eudunda	Peterborough
Farrell Flat	Stone Hut
Gulnare	Wirrabara
Hallett	Yunta
Hanson	Alawoona
Long Gully	Berri
Long Plains	Borrika
Mallala	Bordertown
Manoora	Coomandook
Melton	Coonalpyn
Merriton	Karoonda
Monarto South	Keith
Moonta	Kingston S.E.
Morgan	Lameroo
Mount Barker Junction	Lucindale
Mount Bryan	Mercunda
Mount Mary	Paringa
Nantawarra	Parrakie
Owen	Peake
Point Pass	Parilla
Port Elliot	Pinnaroo

Port Wakefield	Renmark
Redhill	Tailem Bend
Riverton	Waikerie
Saddleworth	Wanbi
Snowtown	Wolseley
Spalding	Cummins
Strathalbyn	Lock
Tarlee	Minnipa
Terowie	Port Lincoln
Truro	

SCHEDULE 3

Houses Offered for Sale and Sold

General Public		
Auburn		1
Avenue		2 (Sold)
Blyth		2
Booleroo Centre		4 (Sold)
Borrika		1
Bower		1
Bruce		3 (Sold)
Bugle Ranges		1
Callington		5 (Sold)
Cambrai		1 (Sold)
Cummins		3 (1 Sold)
Eudunda		2
Freeling		1
Gulnare		1
Georgetown		1 (Sold)
Goolwa		1 (Sold)
Hansborough		1 (Sold)
Karoonda		1
Kromelite		3
Lyndoch		1 (Sold)
Melton		3
Moonta		3
McLaren Vale		1
Mount Gambier		1 (Sold)
Murrava		1 (Sold)
Murray Bridge		2 (Sold)
Noarlunga		1 (Sold)
Nantawarra		3 (Sold)
Naracoorte		3 (Sold)
Oakbank		1 (Sold)
Olary		2 (Sold)
Peterborough		12 (7 Sold)
Port Pirie		5 (4 Sold)
Peake		1
Port Lincoln		2
Paringa		1 (Sold)
Quorn		1 (Sold)
Riverton		1 (Sold)
Rudall		2 (Sold)
Spalding		9
Strathalbyn		1
Truro		2 (1 Sold)
Tailem Bend		3 (1 Sold)
Tantanoola		1 (Sold)
Tintinara		1 (Sold)
Wasleys		1
Waikerie		2 (1 Sold)
Wudinna		2 (Sold)
A.N.R. Employees		
Belair		1
Blackwood		3 (2 Sold)
Cookes Plain		1 (Sold)
Gawler		2
North Gawler		1
Quorn		1 (Sold)
Woodside		2 (Sold)

ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCES

511. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What amount of entertainment allowance is paid to—

- (a) Judges of the Supreme Court; and
- (b) Magistrates,

and what other allowances, if any, can be claimed or paid in each category?

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

(a) The Judges of the Supreme Court receive—

(1) an entertainment allowance of up to \$150 when undertaking circuit sessions at Mount Gambier and Port Augusta.

(2) an intrastate travelling allowance of \$50 per day and an interstate travelling allowance of \$65 per day.

(b) Magistrates do not receive entertainment allowances. Travelling allowances are claimed at the normal Public Service rates.

MARKET GARDEN PRODUCE

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

1. What was the commercial value of market garden produce exported from South Australia (including overseas exports) in the 1978-79 financial year?

2. What was the commercial value of imports of market garden produce from interstate for each of the years from 1975-76?

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

1. Available records do not permit a definitive calculation of the commercial value of market garden produce exported from South Australia in any year. Studies previously made on the marketing of major vegetable crops grown in South Australia indicate that the value of exports out of the State would be of the order of \$10 000 000 per year.

2. The commercial value of the market garden produce imported from interstate for the years 1975-76 to 1978-79, as derived from inspection records, is estimated to be 1975-76, \$2 076 500; 1976-77, \$3 590 000; 1977-78, \$3 620 400; 1978-79, \$3 871 000.

SALISBURY NORTH PLANNING

513. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What changes in valuation have been made to land in the Salisbury North/Direk areas as a result of the Supplementary Development Plan for Salisbury North?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Supplementary Development Plan for Salisbury North was gazetted in August 1979. All properties, whose values may have been adversely affected by changes in zoning, were examined. Where it was considered necessary, decreased values were placed on 21 properties formerly in an R2 zone. Prior to the release of the plan, a certain degree of allowance for exposure to aircraft noise, on those properties affected, was made. No alteration in value has been made to industrial and rural zone properties.

LOTTERIES AGENCY

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

1. Why was the application for a Lotteries Commission Ticket Selling Agency at the Hollywood Plaza shopping centre rejected in July this year?

2. What distance from the Hollywood Plaza shopping centre are the four closest existing ticket selling agencies?

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

1. There have been three applications for a Lotteries Commission agency in the Hollywood Plaza Centre. Based upon the commission's past experience, none of the applicants were considered to have a sufficient customer turnover to conduct an agency on a profitable basis.

2. (a) Approximately 1.6 kilometres (Salisbury North).

(b) Approximately 1.6 kilometres (Salisbury North).

(c) Approximately 3.0 kilometres (Salisbury).

(d) Approximately 4.5 kilometres (Parafield Gardens).

SEMAPHORE TRANSPORT

517. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister have a study undertaken by the S.T.A. of bus schedules and routes in the electorate of Semaphore with a view to—

(a) reducing the excessive walking distance necessary in some areas to reach bus stops; and

(b) reducing the time gap in bus schedules?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The public transport service coverage and frequency in all parts of metropolitan Adelaide is under constant review by the State Transport Authority. In comparison with most other metropolitan electorates, the Semaphore electorate is very well served by public transport. The greater part of the electorate is, in fact, served by both rail and bus, giving a large number of residents a choice of both modes for many of their journeys.

The authority endeavours to provide a public transport service to within 400 metres of most homes. This standard is met in the electorate of Semaphore, with the exception of one or two small areas which will be provided with public transport when resources permit. The majority of bus and rail services in the area are provided with a 30 or 40-minute frequency week day off-peak bus service, which is consistent with that provided in other suburbs. At night and weekends most routes receive a 45 to 60-minute service, and plans are in hand to improve services in the Semaphore Park area in this regard later this year.

RENAL SERVICES

518. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the review by the Health Commission of renal services throughout South Australia with a view to rationalising them, announced by the Minister in answer to a question without notice from the member for Mitcham on 28 August, yet been carried out and, if so—

(a) what were its precise terms of reference;

(b) who made it;

(c) what are the results; and

(d) what action, if any, is proposed as a result and when will it be taken and, if not—

(a) when will it be undertaken;

(b) what will be its terms of reference;

(c) by whom will it be undertaken; and

(d) will the results be made public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

A review of hospital-based renal services in metropolitan Adelaide—

(a) commenced during October 1980;

(b) Its terms of reference are—

1. to inquire into, and report to the S.A. Health Commission on the provision of hospital-based acute and chronic renal services in South Australia.
 2. to make recommendations on policies which are considered appropriate for the S.A. Health Commission to adopt for the rational and co-ordinated delivery of hospital-based acute and chronic renal services in South Australia.
 3. to examine and make recommendations on the appropriate range and level of renal services which should be provided by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; Royal Adelaide Hospital; Flinders Medical Centre; and Adelaide Children's Hospital.
 4. the committee is requested to have regard, *inter alia*, to:
 - (a) the provision of an appropriate level and quality of hospital-based renal services, including the needs of teaching;
 - (b) avoiding unnecessary duplication and fragmentation of renal services throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area;
 - (c) the present Government investment in facilities and personnel;
 - (d) the report of the S.A. Health Commission on community dialysis services. (This report is the result of discussions between hospitals and the Health Commission in an effort to improve training and support facilities for home dialysis);
 - (e) any further matters directed to the inquiry by the Chairman;
- (c) Dr. Ron Wells (physician, now in part-time practice), formerly Deputy Director-General, Commonwealth Department of Health and Chairman of the Federal Hospitals and Health Services Commission, will undertake this review;
- (d) The results will be made public.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

519. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many appointments to the position of justice of the peace have been made during the past 12 months?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: 319 appointments (September 1979 to September 1980).

WATER MAINS

520. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What delays have occurred on the laying of 600 metres of 4" water pipe by private contractors at Dernancourt?

2. What assistance and/or advice have the contractors received from the E. & W.S. Department and have the contractors been required to pay for any such assistance and/or advice?

3. Did the contractors fit the wrong connections to the pipes and, if so, did they rectify the mistakes at their own cost or did the Government pay them for rectifying their mistakes?

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

1. As no time limit for completion was specified in the contract, no delays have been incurred.

2. None. The E. & W.S. Department conducts periodic inspections of the work to ensure that satisfactory standards are maintained. A fee for these inspections is paid prior to the commencement of work by the contractor.

3. Yes. The correct connections were installed at the contractor's cost.

HOPE VALLEY TANK

521. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What defects attributable to private contractors have been discovered in the Hope Valley Water Treatment tank and/or ancillary works?

2. What action was taken by the E. & W.S. Department Tank Reconstruction Gang to rectify any such defects?

3. What was the cost of rectification?

4. What action has been taken or will be taken by the Government to recover such cost from the contractors involved?

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

1. None.

2. Not Applicable.

3. Not Applicable.

4. Not Applicable.

FULHAM GARDENS DEPOT

522. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What defects were found to exist in the carport erected to cover the survey boat at the Fulham Gardens depot?

2. Were these faults the work of a private contractor?

3. What work has been done by Government employees to rectify any such faulty work?

4. Will the Government require the contractor to pay the cost of any rectification work?

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

1. The tender accepted for the erection of the carport was in line with the E. & W.S. Department's specifications. No defects have been found in the contractor's work, however, once erected it was considered by the E. & W.S. Department that the carport required bracing.

2. No.

3. Not Applicable.

4. Not Applicable.

E. & W.S. CONTRACTS

523. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. In the last 12 months how many jobs done by private contractors for the E. & W.S. Department have been faulty?

2. In the last 12 months how many faulty jobs done by private contractors have been rectified?

3. In the last 12 months how many faulty jobs done by private contractors have been rectified by E. & W.S. supervisory staff and workmen?

4. What has been the cost to the Government of such rectification?

5. What steps have been taken by the Government to recover such cost from the private contractors responsible for the faulty work?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: By "jobs" it is assumed that the honourable member is referring to contracts tendered for by private enterprise. On this basis the answers are:

1. None.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. Not applicable.

WATER FILTRATION

524. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What Government plant, equipment and/or expertise has been made available to the Dillingham Construction Company in relation to the water filtration plant being built for the department.

2. Is the department charging for any such plant, equipment and/or expertise and, if so, how much will the contractor be required to pay and, if not, why not?

3. What is the cost of such assistance?

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

1. The Government has made available a Favco Crane—Model STD 350 HT, together with a machine operator.

2. Yes—\$4 300 per month.

3. \$4 300 per month.

APPRENTICES

525. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many three-year apprenticeship courses in blacksmith work at Panorama Technical College have been commenced in each of the years 1976 to 1980?

2. What is the total number of students who have used the facilities of the blacksmith workshop in those years, what other educational function did the workshop provide and what use was made of its services by the public?

3. Can the Minister provide an assurance that the blacksmith workshop at Panorama will be maintained in operation at that site and that the level of staffing needed to fully utilise this service will be maintained?

4. What would be the replacement value of the workshop?

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

1. 1976, 3; 1977, 2; 1978, 2; 1979, 2; 1980, 2.

2. The total number of students who use the facilities of the blacksmith workshop in the years 1976-1980 were: 1976, 56; 1977, 141; 1978, 137; 1979, 143; 1980, 80.

The workshop was also used to conduct link courses and vocational oriented summer schools for both Government and non-government secondary school students, to conduct pre-vocational courses, to produce wrought iron and forged-art pieces by Adelaide College of Arts and Education students, and to provide both primary and secondary students with an appreciation of the blacksmithing vocation. Public use made of the blacksmith workshop included making non-standard technical aids for disabled persons, making of special tools which are not otherwise available for Government departments, etc., and providing access to workshop facilities to unemployed persons to improve skills, and allowing charitable organisations and service clubs to use the facilities to produce items at material cost.

3. The blacksmith workshop will be maintained at Panorama Community College of Further Education as long as there is sufficient current and foreseeable demand for its use in courses conducted by the Department of Further Education. The level of staffing will be

appropriate to the actual usage of the workshop and consistent with the overall programme demands of the college and the department.

4. The replacement value is about \$160 000.

URANIUM

526. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Will the Minister provide a complete list of Metropolitan Adelaide premises at which cores containing uranium ore are stored and/or processed?

2. Will the Minister provide in addition to the above, details of safeguards, if any, enforced at those locations by the Health Commission or its officers?

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

1. Department of Mines and Energy Core Library, Frewville. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, Frewville. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, Thebarton. Western Mining Corporation Ltd, Lonsdale. Ezzo Australia Ltd, Wingfield. A.C.S. Laboratories Pty Ltd, Unley. Comlabs Pty Ltd, Mile End. School of Metallurgy, Institute of Technology, The Levels, Pooraka.

2. The people responsible at these places for the handling of uranium cores are subject to the Radioactive Substances and Irradiating Apparatus Regulations, 1962-1979, under the Health Act. The premises are inspected by officers of the South Australian Health Commission to ensure that the standards required by the Commission are being met.

KANGAROO ISLAND WATER SUPPLY

529. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the Minister received any applications from Kangaroo Island councils for additional standpipes to provide primary producers with water during times of drought and, if so, how many applications have there been, what would be the cost to the Government of them and have these applications been approved?

The Hon P. B. ARNOLD: No.

NOORA BASIN

530. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government intend to proceed with the deviation line around the proposed Noora evaporation basin and, if so, what will be the cost of this new deviation line and, if not, what other arrangements will be made and will the present railway line be closed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If necessary, \$1 650 000, as provided in the Noora drainage disposal scheme. The railway line is the responsibility of the Australian National Railways Commission. Any move to close the line would be opposed by the South Australian Government.

IRAQI PROJECT

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

1. Have staff been selected for the Government project in Iraq and, if so, how many of the staff will be farmers, how many will be technical officers and what area of expertise will they represent?

2. Has equipment been selected for the project and, if so, what proportion has been purchased from South Australia, Australia, and overseas countries, respectively, and what is the total value of the equipment purchased?

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

1. Four team members have been selected for the Government project in Iraq. One team member has a farming background and will be the farm manager in Iraq; a second team member is the administrative officer for the project and is experienced in this area. The project agronomist has experience with the pasture species being evaluated for that region of Iraq and the background of the project director is in advisory agronomy. A further three farmers will be recruited in mid-1981.

2. A number of items of equipment have been selected for the project and some items have been purchased. The total value of equipment purchased to date is \$A170 926. Of this, 60 per cent has been purchased from South Australia, 64 per cent from Australia (or 4 per cent from Australia excluding South Australia) and 36 per cent from overseas countries.

NORTH-EAST TRANSPORT

532. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Government require the manufacturers of O'Bahn equipment to—

- (a) invest a substantial independent capital equity in the facility subject to ultimate acquisition without compensation; and
- (b) be liable to technical and operational costs over an agreed period of time?

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

(a) and (b) Normal commercial practice for warranties of the vehicle and track performance will be followed. The detail of these is a matter for negotiation.

533. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has horizontal guidewheel friction been assessed as a factor in fuel consumption by the manufacturers of the O'Bahn buses and, if so, what are the findings?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Further advice on this issue is required from the manufacturers. Current information is that the effect on fuel consumption is negligible.

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

1. Are Mercedes-Benz buses a necessary adjunct to operation on the O'Bahn guided busway on the basis of the following criteria—

- (a) patent rights;
- (b) engineering design; and
- (c) safety and legal liability?

2. When vehicles are being purchased for operation on the proposed north-eastern suburbs busway will it be possible to call for tenders in accordance with normal Government procedure and if so, will such calling be a mere formality and if not, what cost assessment will be made and by whom, to ensure that Mercedes-Benz do not take an unfair advantage of the State Transport Authority dependence on a monopoly manufacturer?

3. What investigations have been made into the likelihood that any such tendering could be in conflict with the observance of the restrictive trade practices legislation?

4. Are patent rights held by Daimler-Benz and Zublin on—

- (a) horizontal guidewheel steering assemblies; and
- (b) O'Bahn track components?

5. What is the legal relationship between these differing companies in any franchise for the marketing of O'Bahn equipments?

6. Can licences be made available to other organisations for the manufacture of O'Bahn equipment?

7. Have any prospective fees been discussed in relation to this matter, and if so, what is the general nature of them?

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

1, 2, and 3. It is the desire of the Government to call tenders for the supply of buses for the Northeast busway. This decision is subject to the points (a), (b) and (c) in the first question. It is hoped that other manufacturers will be able to tender. It is also the Government's intention that the bodies of the buses will be built in South Australia.

4. Yes.

5. The legal relationship remains to be established in detail.

6. This issue remains to be established.

7. No.

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

1. Will bus drivers be expected to assist in the removal of a vehicle affected by flat tyre or steering malfunction, to a servicing lay-by on the O'Bahn, considering that such defects are normally repaired prior to further movement?

2. Will bus drivers be expected on their own volition to attempt to maintain service schedules on the O'Bahn section of the busway by coupling up and pushing a defective vehicle clear of the facility?

3. Will the O'Bahn guided busway be planned to allow buses which have already entered the facility to exit and divert through side streets in the event of a bus ahead being rendered totally immobile?

4. How many exits are planned, where will they be located and will a signalling system be required to maximise their effectiveness?

5. What methods have been devised for dealing with the following bus breakdowns on the O'Bahn section of the proposed north-eastern suburbs busway—

- (a) flat tyre; and
- (b) steering malfunction?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: All of those matters will be resolved during the design phase of the project and in negotiation with the developers and the unions concerned.

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

1. Is there any intention to allow the proposed north-eastern suburbs busway to be used by emergency vehicles, such as ambulances and fire engines and if so, how will this system operate?

2. Will the carriageways and bridges of the component sections of the proposed north-east busway be designed for possible conversion to rail usage considering that is the policy being adopted by the authorities in Los Angeles for similar projects?

3. Which Government department will be responsible for "ways and works" maintenance on the proposed north-eastern suburbs busway?

4. Although an e.i.s. was prepared in respect of the l.r.t. line will one be carried out for the north-eastern suburbs busway and will the l.r.t.-e.i.s. be used for the purpose?

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

1. No.

2 and 3. Any consideration of those matters will be undertaken during the design phase.

4. An addendum to the l.r.t.-e.i.s. has been prepared.

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

1. Is consideration still being given to the suggestion of a "bus only" mall in Currie and Grenfell Streets and, if so, what effect will be there be on the functioning of abutting car parks, especially the limited access Harris Scarfe facility?

2. What is the route for the proposed north-eastern suburbs bus service across the east parklands between Hackney Road and Grenfell Street?

3. What methods of protection are intended on the proposed north-eastern busway to ensure that unauthorised vehicles cannot gain access?

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

1. The treatment of Grenfell and Currie Streets to emphasise bus and pedestrian movements will be developed during design of the system in consultation with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. The access to existing car parks will be an issue to be taken into account in the design.

2. The most probable options are North Terrace and Rundle Road or a combination of these roads. The final route will be determined during detailed design.

3. This is a matter for consideration during detailed design.

539. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it a fact that the Minister is on record as saying that the option of using Walkerville Terrace for the proposed north-eastern busway had been rejected because it lowered the standard of the service excessively and, if so, why has this judgment not been applied to the running of the buses on other public roads, between Park Terrace, Gilberton, and Light Square, Adelaide, where traffic congestion will be even more severe?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Walkerville Terrace option has been rejected because of the street's predominantly residential nature as well as the lowering of the busway standard. Other public roads affected by the proposal are recognised arterial roads of high capacity, and it is anticipated that bus priority measures will be developed which will limit the effect of traffic congestion.

540. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What will be the number of bus movements at the junction of Grenfell Street and East Terrace between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. Mondays to Fridays after the O'Bahn system has been introduced and what contingency plans have been considered to overcome traffic congestion at these intersections during these times?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In the three hour period between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. on weekdays the total number of bus movements in both directions is expected to be of the order of 180. Details of traffic management measures required have not been developed at this stage.

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

1. Will the Minister give an unequivocal assurance that the choice of a the busway option for the "Modbury Corridor" in lieu of the L.R.T. will not prejudice the long-term operation or the immediately required modernisation of the Glenelg tramway?

2. Is it intended to run every bus from each outer north-eastern suburban bus route to and from the city in view of the fact that it is large articulated units which are to be ordered for operation on the proposed busway?

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

1. Yes.

2. The precise composition of the bus fleet and the details of the operation will be determined during the design phase. It is currently envisaged that during peak hours and during the week day base period that the buses from each route will run to and from the city.

552. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the responses from those district councils that the Minister stated he had written to in answer to a question without notice on 5 August—

(a) how many councils objected to the A.N.R.'s proposals;

(b) how many councils agreed to the A.N.R.'s proposals;

(c) what alternatives did the councils put forward; and

(d) what alternatives did the State Government put to the councils?

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

(a) Thirteen councils indicated they would be prepared to make a submission generally objecting to the closure proposals if the matter is taken to arbitration.

(b) No councils indicated support for the reduction of rail passenger services.

(c) Some councils suggested a partial reduction in rail services; others requested more details on possible replacement bus services before making specific comments.

(d) Licensed motor coach service.

VICTOR HARBOR HAULAGE

542. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the Minister been approached by a deputation of road hauliers in his electorate requesting that he agree to exert pressure on the Australian National Railways to discontinue its road operations to Victor Harbor and has the Minister agreed to that request and to use his position in Cabinet to achieve this aim?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: No, I agreed to lodge inquiries at Australian National Railways management level about a number of matters raised by my road-haulier constituents. This has been done and the constituents were advised of the result by letter on 2 September 1980. There was no intention nor undertaking to raise the matter at Cabinet level and, accordingly, this has not been done.

RAIL CARS

544. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister advise whether the problems as detailed in answer to question No. 982 of last session have been rectified on new generation rail cars and, if not, what is the fault of this equipment, what action has been taken to rectify these faults, how many delays have been occasioned to commuters since 14 July 1980 as a result of the malfunction of equipment on these new rail cars, and what complaints have been received by the A.F.U.L.E. members operating these new rail cars?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The problems referred to in the answer to question No. 982 of last session have not yet been rectified. Commonwealth Engineering has been asked to provide all cars with a feed valve of a different design to overcome the problems. These feed valves have been on order from England for some time. In the meantime, regular checking of the existing feed valves is carried out to prevent malfunction. The following delays to commuters have occurred since 14 June, from various faults:

14-30 June	4 trains delayed
1-31 July	28 trains delayed
1-31 August	14 trains delayed
1-29 September	36 trains delayed

As far as can be ascertained, no complaints from commuters have been received by the A.F.U.L.E. members operating these new railcars.

E. & W.S. DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

545. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What evidence is held by the E. & W.S. Department that supports the answers given by the Minister to question No. 320 that—

- (a) \$487 203 tender price for two 10.2 ml resurface tanks is a "1973 price";
- (b) \$171 443 tender price for an unspecified length of 600 mm gravity mains is a "1973 price"; and
- (c) \$164 748 tender price for "Loveday Surge Tank" is a "1973 price"?

2. Will the Minister supply a copy of the above evidence to the member for Mitchell?

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

1. The Engineering and Water Supply Department maintains records of the trends in construction costs for civil engineering construction works, together with records of tender prices and departmental contracts estimates.

2. No. The trends in construction costs can be derived from publications of the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

IRRIGATION COMMITTEE

546. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Why was the formation of the independent Irrigation Technique and Management Improvement Committee not announced by the Minister, who are the 10 persons comprising this committee, what was the method of appointment used to set up the committee, and what is the period of appointment of the members?

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

- (i) Not yet formalised
- (ii) See (i) above
- (iii) To be announced
- (iv) Not specified.

MURRAY RIVER

547. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What were the variations in the June-July 1980 monthly quantities of Murray flow approved by the River Murray Commission as advised in the answer to question No. 245?

2. What other approvals have been sought for the remaining months of 1980?

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

- 1. 7 000ml of the June entitlement flow was held over in Lake Victoria, from which higher quantities of good quality water were released during July to dilute highly saline water as it entered South Australia at that time.
- 2. None.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

548. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What were the total number of enrolments for both primary and secondary students attending the Education Department schools in South Australia in 1978, 1979 and 1980 and what are the projected figures for 1981 and 1982?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The reply is as follows:

Total enrolments Primary (Education Department Schools)	
1978.....	149 964
1979.....	146 793
1980.....	143 200 (projected)
1981.....	138 600 (projected)
1982.....	135 400 (projected)

Total enrolments Secondary (Education Department Schools)	
1978.....	80 491
1979.....	77 732
1980.....	75 900 (projected)
1981.....	73 800 (projected)
1982.....	73 700 (projected)

ANIMAL CONTROLS

549. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What controls has local government over dogs and cats?

2. Is the Government aware of the decision of Mitchell, J. in the case *Cooper v. Bormann* No. 2489 of 1979 and if so, what steps does the Government intend to take to restore the position of local government in this matter?

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

1. The Dog Control Act 1979-1980 provides for the legislative framework for dog control. In the case of cats, a council has no general power to make by-laws fixing the maximum number which may be kept on a property, its power being limited to making by-laws to prevent the keeping of animals so as to be injurious to health.

2. Yes. The case was taken under the Local Government Act but this is no longer the relevant Act as such matters are now adequately dealt with under the Dog Control Act. In the case of cats, it is not proposed, at this stage, to legislate to control the maximum number of cats which may be kept on a particular property.

HELICOPTER SERVICE

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

1. What is the exact location of that portion of Adelaide railway land to be leased to Lloyd Helicopters Pty. Ltd. for a helipad site?

2. When is it likely that this service will come into operation?

3. What types of services are proposed for —

- (a) private flights; and
- (b) public flights?

4. To where will these flights operate?

5. During what hours will this service operate?

6. What is the financial benefit to the State in terms of leasing arrangements?

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

1. An area 50 metres square, immediately to the east of the Safety School on Port Road.

2. A service has been operating from the site since January 1980.

3. (a) The site is not used for joy flights by the general public.

(b) As operators of the State Helicopter Rescue Service, Lloyd Helicopters Pty. Ltd. in using the site in connection with emergency surveillance by the Police Department and Hospital Retrieval to the Children's Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is also being used by TV camera crews.

4. Anywhere in the State depending on the requirements of the hirer.

5. The service is permitted to operate between sunrise and sunset.

6. The authority receives \$1 500 per annum for the lease of the site.

LEGIONNAIRES DISEASE

554. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister seen the article in *The News* on Thursday 18 September with respect to Legionnaires disease and if so, does the Minister intend to make a public statement advising the residents of South Australia the symptoms of this disease and if so, when, and if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. No public statement regarding the symptoms of this disease is proposed. In recent years Legionnaires Disease has received a good deal of publicity in both the lay and medical press. Consequently, doctors and health authorities in South Australia are well aware of its signs and symptoms and of the appropriate treatment for the disease.

TRADING HOURS

555. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: In relation to assaults occasioned to Department of Trade and Industry Inspectors policing trading hours in the motor car industry—

- (a) how many have occurred;
- (b) when did they occur;
- (c) how many inspectors were involved;
- (d) what prosecutions against the assailants have been successful;
- (e) what prosecutions have been unsuccessful;
- (f) how many cases have not been proceeded with; and
- (g) how many prosecutions are pending?

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

- (a) one;
- (b) 31 March 1978;
- (c) one;
- (d) one;
- (e) none;
- (f) none;
- (g) none.

VOLVO BUSES

556. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many Volvo B59 buses are currently in service with the S.T.A., how are they distributed amongst depots, what proportion of buses at each depot are Volvo B59s and what moves are anticipated to equalise these proportions?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There are currently 307 Volvo B59 buses in service with the authority. Prior to recent moves of buses between depots aimed at equalisation of proportion of Volvos and Swifts, the number of Volvos and Swifts in each depot was as follows (August 1980):

	Volvos (B59)	New Swifts	Old Swifts
City/Hackney	122	66	110
Port Adelaide	47	—	57
Morphettville	71	—	64
St. Agnes	56	—	—
Elizabeth	—	—	61
Lonsdale	11	—	—

The authority intends to implement the following proportions of buses in each depot. The main depots affected will be St. Agnes (replacement of some Volvos by Swifts) and Elizabeth (replacement of some Swifts by Volvos):

	Volvos (B59) per cent	New Swifts per cent	Old Swifts per cent
City/Hackney	50	10.4	39.6
Port Adelaide	49	11.8	39.2
Morphettville (Plains)	50	10.7	39.3
St. Agnes	55.2	6.9	37.9
Elizabeth	51.6	9.4	39.0
Lonsdale	(Operates mainly "express" type buses)		

BUSES

558. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What types of bus are presently permitted to service S.T.A. bus routes that traverse 80 km/h speed zone areas and for what reasons are other buses excluded from travelling such routes?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The authority has no restrictions on the types of buses that are permitted to traverse 80 km/h speed zone areas. Some 80 km/h speed zone areas occur on the Main South Road, O'Halloran Hill, and standard A.E.C. Swift and Volvo B59 buses (silver two door) buses are not used on this road as they are not fitted with auxiliary braking necessary for Tapleys Hill. A similar situation applies on the Mount Barker Road. On the Main North Road through the Salisbury East area, buses fitted with high speed tyres are used. Volvo V59 Number 1245 is fitted with auxiliary braking and is used on the Main South Road service.

BUS DEMISTERS

559. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister ensure that no S.T.A. driver will be expected to take a bus from the depot that does not have a functioning demister at such times as a demister could be considered an important safety feature?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No bus operator is required to drive a bus with ineffective equipment if this will affect the safe or efficient operation of that bus.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

560. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government, either in one of its departments or one of its authorities, own a Holden Commodore with licence plate XJS-744 and if so—

- (a) when was the vehicle purchased and what was its price;
- (b) for what purpose was it purchased and who is authorised to use it; and
- (c) is it painted in "two-tone" and if so, why was not a "one-tone" vehicle purchased instead?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The vehicle is owned by the E. & W.S. Department.

- (a) Purchased 21 July 1980, Price \$5 774.
- (b) The vehicle provides transport for a Safety Officer of the Safety Services Branch, E. & W.S. Department in the performance of his official duties.
- (c) No.

SCHOOL ANCILLARY STAFF

561. Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it Education Department policy to provide temporary replacement for ancillary staff who are absent on extended leave and if not, is it proposed that such a policy will be introduced and if so, when and if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is current Education Department policy to provide temporary replacements of ancillary staff during periods of extended leave without pay, subject to justification by school principals. The situation regarding replacement of ancillary staff on extended paid leave is that the Education Department's budget does not provide funds for this purpose. The matter is receiving the Minister's consideration.

LANGUAGE STUDIES

562. Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Which primary schools presently offer a second language for study by students, what language does each offer, to which year levels is it offered in each case and how many places are available for the study of a second language at each school at each year level?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: During April, 1980, the Education Department conducted a survey into the teaching of languages other than English in South Australian primary schools. The survey report (which is far too detailed for publication here) details the names of the schools, the languages taught, the year levels, and is accompanied by a summary of the survey by languages. (See table.)

TABLE VA LANGUAGES PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

School Name	Language	Type of Course	Year Levels	Start Year	Continuous Yes/No
Allenby Gardens Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-7	1978	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-7	1978	Yes
	Yugoslav	MTM and second language	R-7	1978	Yes
Amata Aboriginal	Pitjantjatjara	Bilingual	R-12	1969	Yes
Anna Creek Rural	Pitjantjatjara	second language	3-7	1980	Yes
Ascot Park Primary	French	second language	3-7	1965	Yes
	German	second language	3-7	1965	Yes
Basket Range Primary	French	second language	4-7	1977	Yes
Blair Athol Primary	Italian	second language	4-7	1978	Yes
Braeview Primary	Italian	second language	4-6	1979	Yes
Brighton Primary	German	second language	3-7	1972	Yes
Broadmeadows Primary	Dutch	second language	6-7	1976-79	No
	French	second language	3-4	1979	No
	German	second language	4-7	1976	Yes
Brompton Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	1-7	1976	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	1-7	1979	Yes
	Yugoslav	MTM and second language	1-7	1979	Yes
Burnside Primary	French	second language	4-7	1962	Yes
	Italian	second language	4-6	1978	Yes
Cambrai Area	German	second language	4-7	1975	Yes
Challa Gardens Primary	Greek	MTM	2-7	1977	Yes
		second language	3-7		
	Italian	MTM	2-7	1977	Yes
		second language	3-7		
Clare Primary	German	second language	6-7	1978	Yes
	German	second language	6-7	1980	Yes
Colonel Light Gardens Primary	Greek	second language	1-4	1979	Yes
		second language			
	French	MTM and second language	4-7		
	German	MTM and second language	4-7		
Coober Pedy Area	Greek	MTM	R-7		
	Yugoslav	MTM	R-7		
	German	second language	R-7		
Coromandel Valley Primary	German	second language	R-7		
Cowandilla Primary	German	MTM and second language	3-7	Before 1974	Yes
		second language			
	Greek	MTM and second language	3-7	1976	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	3-7	1976	Yes
Crafers Primary	Indonesian	second language	3-5	1975	Yes
Craigmore Senior Primary	Indonesian	second language	3	1979	Yes
		second language	4	1980	Yes
		second language			
Croydon Junior Primary and Primary	Greek	MTM	3-7	1975	Yes
		MTM	2	1979	Yes
		second language	2-6	1980	Yes
	Italian	MTM	3	1974	Yes
		MTM	3-7	1975	Yes
		MTM	2	1979	Yes
second language	2-6	1980	Yes		

TABLE VA LANGUAGES PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS—*continued*

School Name	Language	Type of Course	Year Levels	Start Year	Continuous Yes/No
Darlington Primary	German	second language	7	1977	Yes at the moment
	Japanese	second language	6	1979	No
Dernancourt Primary	French	second language	7		
	Italian	second language	4, 5, 7		
Direk Junior Primary	Indonesian	second language	2	1979	Yes
Direk Primary	Indonesian	second language	7	1980	Yes
Elizabeth Field Junior Primary	Special form of languages teaching through drama teacher (i.e. languages courses computer data)				
Enfield Primary	Greek	MTM and second language			
Ernabella Aboriginal	Pitjantjatjara	Bilingual	R-9		
Eudunda Area	German	second language	6-7	1978	Yes
	German	second language	1-5	1979	Yes
Evanston Primary	French	second language	7	1980	Elective
Evanston Gardens Primary	Greek	second language	1-7	1980	Yes
Forbes Primary	German	second language	4-7	1973	Yes
Glenelg Primary	Indonesian	second language	4-5	1973	Yes
Goodwood Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-7	1976	Yes
Grange Primary	French	second language	6, 7	1974	Yes
	Indonesian	second language	4, 5	1978	Yes
Happy Valley Primary	German	second language	3, 5, 7	1974	Yes to end of 1979 1980 3, 5, 7 only
Hectorville Primary	Italian	second language	4-7	1978	Yes
Hendon Primary	Yugoslav	MTM	R-3	1980	Yes
		second language	4-7	1980	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-3	1980	Yes
	Ukrainian	MTM and second language	R-3	1980	Yes
Hindmarsh Primary	Greek	MTM	1-7	1976	Yes
	Yugoslav	MTM	1-7	1976	Yes
Hope Valley Primary	Malay	second language	*	1974	
Indulkana Aboriginal	Pitjantjatjara	Bilingual	R-9		
Ingle Farm Primary	German	second language	3-7	1976	Yes
Kadina Primary	German	second language	7	1972	No, discontinued
		second language	4-5	1979	Yes
Karrendi Primary	Indonesian	second language	1-7	1979	Yes
Keller Road Primary	Indonesian	second language	1-7	1978	Yes
	German	second language	6-7	1980	Yes
Kilkenny Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-7	1971	No
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-7	1970	Yes
	Yugoslav (S/C)	MTM and second language	R-7	1975	Yes
Klemzig Junior Primary	Italian	second language	2	1979	Yes
Klemzig Primary	Italian	second language	3, 4, 5	1979	Yes
Linden Park Primary	French	second language	5, 6, 7	1975	Yes
Loxton Primary	Greek	second language	R-2	1979	Yes
	Italian	second language	3-5		Yes
Magill Junior Primary and Magill Primary	German	second language	3-7	1968	Yes
Mallala Primary	Malay	second language	6	1979	No
Mansfield Park Junior Primary and Mansfield Park Primary	Greek	MTM	1-7	1978	Yes
Mimili Aboriginal	Pitjantjatjara	Bilingual	R-7		
Mitcham Primary	French	second language	5-7		
Mylor Primary	German	second language	6-7	1976	Yes
Nailsworth Primary	Greek	second language	3-7	1977	Yes
Napperby Primary	Greek	second language	3-7	1977	Yes
Newton Primary	Italian	Bilingual	R-2	1976	Yes
		Maintenance	3-7	1976	Yes
		Bilingual	R-2	1979	Yes
		Maintenance	R-7	1979	Yes
Norwood Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	1-7	1964	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	1-7	1978	Yes
Parafield Gardens Primary	German	second language	5-7	1976	Yes
Paringa Park Primary	French	second language	3-7	1968	Yes

TABLE VA LANGUAGES PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS—*continued*

School Name	Language	Type of Course	Year Levels	Start Year	Continuous Yes/No
Para Vista Primary	French	second language	5	1980	Yes
Parkside Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-7	1980	
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-7	1980	
Payneham Primary	Italian	second language	3-7	1974	Yes
Pooraka Primary	Indonesian	second language	6	1979	Yes
Port Augusta Primary	Pitjantjatjara	MTM and second language	R-7	1978	Yes
	Adnamatona	second language	R-7	1978	Yes
Port Lincoln Primary	Greek	MTM	3-12	1979	Yes
		second language	3-7	1978	Yes
	Indonesian	second language	7	1980	Yes
Prospect Junior Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-2	1977	Yes
Prospect Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	3-7	1976	Yes
Ramco Primary	German	second language	4-7	1976	Yes
			3-7	1980	Yes
Renmark Junior Primary	Greek	MTM	R-2	1980	Yes
Renmark Primary	Greek	MTM	R-7	1980	Yes
Renmark North Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	3-7	1979	Yes
Reynella Primary	German	second language	3		
Reynella South Primary	French	second language	3-7	1978	Yes
			1-2	1980	Yes
Richmond Primary	Greek	MTM	3-7	1978	Yes
Ridgehaven Primary	Indonesian	second language	6-7	1976	Yes
Rose Park Primary	Italian	second language	5-7	1979	Yes
Saddleworth Primary	German	second language	3-7	1976-78	Yes
			4-7	1979	
			6-7	1980	
St. Agnes Primary	German	second language	3, 4, 7	1977	Yes in 3, 4
St. Leonards Primary	Indonesian	second language	7	1978	Yes
			5, 6, 7	1979	Yes
			3-7	1980	Yes
St. Morris Primary	Italian	second language	R-3	1976	Yes
				Term 3	
Salisbury Primary	German	second language	4-7	1977	Yes
	Indonesian	second language	4-7	1977	Yes
	French	second language	5-7	1979	Yes
	Italian	second language	5-7	1979	Yes
Salisbury North (R-12)	Indonesian	second language	6-7	1980	Yes
Salisbury North-West Primary	Italian	MTM and second language	1-7	1977	Yes
	Indonesian				
Seacliff Primary	Indonesian	second language	3-6	1972	Yes
Seaview Downs Primary	French	second language	4-6	1980	No
South Road Primary	German	second language	3-5	1979	Yes
Stirling East Primary	Indonesian	second language	5-7	1980	Yes
Sturt Primary	Indonesian	second language	4-5	1973	Yes
Sturt Street Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	4-7	1976	Yes
Tarpeena Primary	French	second language	3-7	1979	Yes
		informal introduction	1-2	1979	Yes
Thebarton Primary	Greek	MTM and second language	R-7	1976	Yes
				(¾ only)	
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-7	1977	Yes
	Yugoslav	MTM and second language	R-7	1978	Yes
Thorndon Park Primary	German	second language	3-7	1980	Yes
	Italian	second language	R-7	1976	Yes
Tonsley Park Primary	French	second language		1966-67	
		second language	3-7	1968	Yes
Torrensville R-6 (formerly Thebarton Junior Primary)	Greek	MTM and second language	R-3	1976	Yes
		MTM and second language	R-6	1979	Yes
	Italian	MTM and second language	R-6	1976	Yes
Trinity Gardens Primary	Italian	Bilingual	R-2	1976	Yes
		MTM	2-7	1976	Yes
		second language	1-7	1977	Yes
	Greek	second language	5	1977	Yes
		second language	R-3	1979	Yes

TABLE VA LANGUAGES PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS—*continued*

School Name	Language	Type of Course	Year Levels	Start Year	Continuous Yes/No
Truro Primary	Indonesian	second language	6-7	1979	No
Two Wells Primary	Greek	second language	1-5	1979	Yes
	(?Italian)				
	Greek	MTM	1-2	1980	Yes
		second language	2-4	1979	Yes
Unley Primary	Greek	second language	R-4	January 1979	Yes
	Italian	second language	R-4	September 1979	Yes
Yorke town Area	German	second language	7	1980	Yes

LATE RETURNS

Dover Gardens Primary	German	second language	3-4	1978	Yes
Elizabeth Field Primary	German	second language	6		
	Greek	second language	7		
North Adelaide Primary	Italian	second language	3	1978	No
			5-6	1980	Yes (so far)
Loxton North Primary	Greek	second language	R-7	1979	Yes
Port Adelaide Primary	Indonesian	second language	3-7	1970	No
				off and on	
Salisbury North Primary	Indonesian	second language	3-7	1978	Yes
Keith Area	French	second language	7-8	1979	
Modbury South Primary	German	second language	6	1979	Yes
	French	second language	6	1979	Yes
	Italian	second language	3	1979	Yes
Para Hills West Junior Primary	Malay	second language	2	1980	Yes
Sedan Primary	German	second language	4-7		

FINAL SUMMARY

Language	Number of Classes	Total Number of Children	Number of Children at non-Government Schools	Number of Children of Same Background as Language	Class Hours Per Week
French	145	3620	897	13	135.7
German	196	4465	289	171	197.7
Modern Greek	213	2932		1444	282.5
Indonesian	82	2066	21	1	78.5
Italian	422	7830	3592	2773	453.4*
Pitjantjatjara	20	213		196	2.7*
Yugoslav languages	32	449		170	44.7
Adnamatana	2	24		11	2.0
Dutch	1	30		0	2.0
Japanese	4	92	12	0	2.4
Malay	2	44		0	2.3
Ukrainian	1	15		14	1.5
Total	1 120	21 780	4 811	4 793	1 205.4

* Excluding bilingual classes

ENERGY

563. Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Is the Minister aware of a report in the July 1980 edition of *Civil Engineering-ASCE* on the conference held in Montreal in 1979 on the long-range future in energy and associated matters?

2. Is it a fact that the report stated that the technology for many renewable energy sources (including solar heating, wind, conversion of biomass into gases and liquid fuels) is available now and if so, is that finding inconsistent with the Minister's statement on 20 February 1980 (*Hansard*, page 1126) and if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. The report reinforces my statement of 20 February 1980 in that energy price increases have encouraged the technological development of alternative energy sources including renewable forms and have broadened the energy base. Whilst the technology of some of these alternatives is now reasonably developed, they are generally not cost competitive with conventional energy forms. Further technological developments and higher conventional energy prices would be required before these alternative renewable sources could be considered.

FOOTBALL PARK

565. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of the inadequacy of the exists from the Football Park stadium car park, the lack of positive direction given to existing vehicles within the car park and the prolonged traffic congestion after football games, particularly during the finals series and, if so, is he aware of any proposals (including the provision of officers to direct traffic within the car park, or the provision of additional exits) to alleviate this problem?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is considered that it would be unwise to increase the number of exists from the car park. At present the rate of vehicle flow is compatible with the capacity of the arterial road network in the vicinity. Any increase in traffic flow would result in severe congestion at local intersections and increased inconvenience to other traffic not associated with Football Park. The provision of sufficient road capacity to enable immediate clearance of dispersing traffic from Football Park is not justified as the problem occurs for only a short period on relatively few days during the year.

INFORMAL CABINET

566. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the "informal" Cabinet, when and where does it meet, who are its members, and what are its powers?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is an informal meeting of the members of Cabinet.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

567. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Why has the Attorney-General cut back on the series of lectures for Justices of the Peace?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Over the past few years practical courses for justices have been conducted in Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Elizabeth, the South-East area, the Riverland area, and the Iron Triangle area. It was considered that an adequate number of justices had completed the course for the present. However, it is intended to conduct further courses in the future.

ROYAL VISIT

568. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the visit of the Ogilvys to South Australia this year an official visit and, if so, what will it cost the State?

2. How much is it estimated that the reception for these people at Edmund Wright House will cost, how many guests have been invited to the function, and what are their names?

3. What are the titles and names of all persons on the current Government protocol list?

4. Is there a vice-regal list which differs from the Government protocol list and, if so, what are the names and titles of persons on that list?

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

1. The visit of H.R.H. Princess Alexandra and the Hon. Angus Ogilvy to South Australia is an official visit. The visit will cost the State approximately \$5 000.

2. The reception at Edmund Wright House will cost approximately \$2 000. The 200 guests invited to the reception comprised members of the House of Assembly, members of the Legislative Council, the Chief Justice, Supreme Court judges, heads of services, the Commissioner of Police, the Right Hon. Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, President of the Industrial Court, a number of South Australian Royal visit officials, the Royal party and spouses/partners.

3. There is no Government protocol list. There is a table of precedence.

4. There is no Government House protocol list.

SALISBURY HOUSING

569. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is the Minister aware that his answer to question No. 515 was incorrect by including Pooraka?

2. Has Pooraka or any other area not in the electorate of Salisbury also been included in the answer given to question No. 390 of the last session and, if so, will the Minister now give a correct answer?

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

1. The information supplied to the honourable member inadvertently included a development in Pooraka, which as the honourable member correctly points out, is not in the electorate of Salisbury, and excluded a development in Parafield Gardens which is in that electorate. The correct answer to the second part of the question should have been:

2. 315 single unit housing completions are anticipated for the 1980-81 financial year.

(a) Parafield Gardens . . .	145 houses
(b) Salisbury Downs . . .	47 houses
(c) Salisbury North	123 houses

315

187 housing completions are anticipated for the 1981-82 financial year.

(a) Parafield Gardens . . .	75 houses
(b) Salisbury Downs . . .	91 houses
(c) Salisbury North	15 houses (cottage flats)
(d) Parafield Gardens . . .	6 houses (cottage flats)

187

2. No.

MINISTERIAL REPLY

570. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Premier aware of the answers to questions Nos. 336 and 480 and which, if either, of the answers is correct and if both answers are correct, how is that so?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The South Australian Housing Trust, in maintaining good relationships with the Highways Department on future road proposals, attempts

to take into account any factors which may have some bearing upon future residents living in trust-built houses. This close co-operation with the Highways Department also ensures that, by its actions, the trust does not unwittingly preclude road planning operations. Furthermore, the trust, in common with other developers, is subject to the provisions of the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act.

The information supplied previously by the Minister of Environment related to the location of houses on Martins Road, which took into account the land "possibly required for road widening" as shown on the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan. This land includes provision for a future service road, and the "proposed alignment" referred to in Question on Notice No. 336 was taken to be the approximate line of division between this service road and the land which may be required for the future through carriageways of Martins Road.

However, as implied in the answer to Question on Notice No. 480, the Martins Road proposal, in so far as

the actual width and location of these carriageways within the land is concerned, has not been determined.

RURAL ROADS

571. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How much money was provided for rural arterial roads by the Commonwealth in each of the years 1972-73 to 1980-81?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reply is as follows:

Year	Allocation \$
1972-73	3.21m
1973-74	3.85m
1974-75	1.20m
1975-76	1.77m
1976-77	3.30m
1977-78	7.00m
1978-79	8.09m
1979-80	8.05m
1980-81	8.94m