

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 22 October 1980

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

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

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

PETITIONS: MEAT TRADING

Petitions signed by 2 057 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. O. Tonkin, Jennifer Adamson, and D. J. Hopgood and Messrs. Glazbrook, Langley, Evans, Keneally, McRae, Slater, Trainer, Peterson, Hemmings, and Lynn Arnold.
Petitions received.

PETITION: FIRE BRIGADES ACT

A petition signed by 243 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw its Bill to amend the Fire Brigades Act was presented by Mr. Millhouse.
Petition received.

PETITION: CONTRACTS

A petition signed by 3 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that it does not let contracts to private enterprise to the detriment of Government employees was presented by Mr. Schmidt.
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*.

PRIVATE CONTRACTS

In reply to **Mr. O'NEILL** (9 October).

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: The contract for 6 000 plastic strainers was let at a time when the department's dies were under modification. The contract cost to the private manufacturer no doubt included the cost of preparing his own dies. Twenty millimetre pistons for water meters are available from the commercial manufacturer as a spare part. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has, in fact, made its own dies for piston manufacture but for a period of time had to purchase these pistons whilst awaiting delivery of raw materials to commence production. The Government has maintained its stated objective of value for the taxpayer's dollar in view of the fact that circumstances did not permit the procuring of the items at any lower cost.

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (9 October).

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: The reasons for the decision to have the items mentioned manufactured by private contract are outlined in my reply to the question from the member for Florey. Ottoway Foundry costing is carried out on a regular basis with monthly and quarterly reviews of expenses, and the total cost for the period is applied to the total production to derive a standard cost per kilogram of cast product. The total cost is derived from direct wages, direct materials and indirect expenses. The foundry is currently working economically at break even point.

EARLY RETIREMENT

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

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: Since 1 July 1979 there has been a total of 44 staff members of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who have elected to retire between the ages of 55 and 65.

JERVOIS IRRIGATION SCHEME

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

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

- (a) One staff and ten weekly paid employees currently work on the Jervois Irrigation Scheme on a full-time basis. Two staff and two weekly paid employees spend approximately 15 per cent of their time working on the scheme. Their duties consist of general supervision and operation of the scheme, maintenance to channels and concrete structures, and maintenance and operation of the pumping stations associated with the scheme.
- (b) Cost of electricity 1979-80—\$26 223.
- (c) Cost of Capital Works at Establishment—\$1 205 000. Current book value—\$629 009.

DIRTY WATER

In reply to **Mr. HEMMINGS** (9 October).

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: During the 1979-80 financial year there were 37 claims made against the Engineering and Water Supply Department following incidents of dirty water. In 18 of these cases liability was admitted and damages paid totalled \$1 114-54. Because of the relatively small amount involved no special allocation is made, but is included in vote General Contingencies.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (9 October).

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: During July and August 1980, the Minister of Water Resources, the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Acting Manager, Riverland Region and the Director-General, Agriculture Department, undertook a study tour to the United States of America, Israel and South Africa.

Although no provision was made for this trip on the 1979-80 Estimates of Expenditure, it was necessary to expend \$23 859 during that financial year for fares and accommodation paid in advance. The total estimated cost of the study tour is \$32 000, of which \$8 000 will be reimbursed by the Department of Agriculture. The actual

payments of \$30 024 refers to overseas visits by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department engaged on Departmental business. The estimate for the 1980-81 financial year represents the remainder of the estimated cost of the study tour mentioned above and the estimated cost of overseas visits for research purposes proposed to be undertaken by Departmental officers.

LAND OWNERSHIP AND TENURE SYSTEM

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (9 October).

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: At the Estimates Committee hearing on Thursday 9 October 1980, the honourable member asked the following questions, and the following answers are provided:

1. Does the Department collect any fees from the users of LOTS?

Answer: One of the principal reasons for developing the Land Ownership and Tenure System was the pressing necessity for the Common Property File to be redesigned to cope with changes in valuation and rating procedures. The system provides benefits to Government departments who are the principal users, mainly the Engineering and Water Supply, State Taxes, and various Divisions of the Department of Lands. Further advantages will arise from the fact that the Land Ownership and Tenure System can be expanded into a fully integrated Land Information System.

In addition to being a recording system, it also provides an enquiry facility for which a charge is made. Details of these charges are attached. See Schedule A.

2. What are the estimated receipts this financial year?

Answer: \$105 000 as per attached Schedule B.

3. What will be the cost of operating the computer this financial year?

Answer: \$110 000 as per attached Schedule C.

4. How many staff does this System replace?

Answer: None.

5. What has happened to that staff?

Answer: Nine staff have been relocated as a result of the introduction of LOTS—vide attached Schedule D.

SCHEDULE A: LOTS FEES

1. Inquiry Fees

1.1 Public:

	\$
1.1.1 Category 1 (all details from system)	2.00
1.1.2 Category 2 (single file, special inquiries)	1.00
1.1.3 Category 3 (selected information, index only)	0.50

1.2 Government: (at Department of Lands)

As for 1.1 above, less 60 per cent

1.3 Government: (remote, on-site terminal)

20c an inquiry (all categories)

1.4 Public—including SAHT: (remote, on-site terminal)

As for 1.1, less 60 per cent

2. REPORTS TO DEPENDENT SYSTEMS

LGAs, E&WS—50c a transaction

SCHEDULE B: ESTIMATED INCOME THIS FINANCIAL YEAR

	\$
1. Public terminals (1.1, 1.2 above)	36 000
2. Government terminals (1.3 above)	26 000
3. Public remote—SAHT (1.4 above)	1 000
4. Reports (2. above)	42 000

Total: 105 000

Enhancements, such as unregistered documents and administrative interests, are expected to lift inquiry rate significantly.

SCHEDULE C: ESTIMATED OPERATING COSTS OF B6800

	\$
Charged against Consolidated Revenue	110 000
Represented by:	
LOTS, Operational	73 000
LOTS, Further Development	27 000
Debtors Ledger	10 000

SCHEDULE D: STAFF REPLACEMENT

The introduction of LOTS has resulted in the re-location of the following staff:

1. LANDS TITLES OFFICE:

- 4 taxing positions to LOTS Data Entry
- 1 taxing position to Council Clerk
- 1 taxing position to Endorsing (Bundling)
- 2 taxing positions to general clerical duties

2. VALUER-GENERAL'S OFFICE:

- 1 Kardveyor operator to LOTS Data Entry

REVENUE FROM CROWN LEASE RENTS

In reply to **Mr. LEWIS** (9 October).

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: At the Estimates Committee hearing on Thursday 9 October 1980, the honourable member asked the following questions, and the following answers are provided:

1. Would the Minister be prepared to supply the figures that relate to revenue obtained from lease payments made to the Government as against the total cost involved in administering that section of the Department responsible for the collection of lease payments, whether they be perpetual leases, pastoral leases such as miscellaneous leases, or whatever, on a lease by lease basis in terms of revenue?

Answer: Amounts Receivable from Rents and Licence Fees

Type of Lease	\$	Annual Rents \$
Acquired Lands Perpetual		11 159
Homestead, Closer Settlement Perpetual		15
Closer Settlement Perpetual		16 282
Developed Lands Perpetual		14 128
Agricultural Graduates Perpetual		695
Irrigation Licences		11 879
Irrigation Miscellaneous		11 076
Village Settlement Perpetual		489
Marginal Lands Perpetual		80 173
Education		871
Homestead, Ordinary Perpetual		1 574
Irrigation Town Perpetual		16 339
Ordinary Perpetual		414 333
Ordinary Licences		82 538
Ordinary Miscellaneous		161 786
Pastoral		419 286
Homestead, Repurchased Lands Perpetual		255
Irrigation Perpetual		57 529
Surplus Lands Miscellaneous		93
Surplus Lands Perpetual		26 446
Town Lands Perpetual		25
Town Lands (Whyalla) Perpetual		63
War Service Irrigation Perpetual		15 178
War Service Perpetual		359 019
Soldiers Irrigation Perpetual		14 072
Soldiers Ordinary Lands Perpetual		680
		<hr/>
		1 715 983

Deduct: Amounts payable to		
District Councils—share of shack site rents	37 200	
Marginal Land Improvement A/c	26 473	
Commonwealth under War Service		
Land Settlement	381 823	445 496
		<hr/>
		1 270 487
		<hr/>

2. What does it cost to collect those rents?

Answer: The cost of lease administration is not accounted for as a separate item. Accordingly, an apportionment of relevant salaries and contingencies costs has been based upon estimates of time devoted to lease administration by various officers of the Department.

The cost of lease administration for the year ending 30 June 1980 is estimated at \$705 000, made up of the following inputs:—

Land Resource Management Division		
	\$'000	\$'000
Head Office	274	
Regional Offices	23	
Land Office	261	
	<hr/>	
	558	
Less: Statutory fees charges	110	448
	<hr/>	
Administration and Finance Division		
Revenue raising and recovery		76
Survey Division		
Special Drafting Projects and General Information Service		181
		<hr/>
		705
		<hr/>

RESOURCE INVOLVEMENT

In reply to Mr. CRAFTER (8 October).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The following officers attended as advisers for Estimates Committee purposes:

Director-General, Dr. P. Ellyard; Acting Deputy Director-General, Mr. G. Inglis; Acting Director, Administration and Finance, Mr. N. Johnson; Acting Chief Administrative Officer, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Mr. R. Paech; Superintendent of Field Operations, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Mr. N. Newland; Acting Accountant, Mr. L. Djordjevic; Chairman, Amalgamation Steering Committee, Mr. K. Lewis.

Gallery Observers and Advisers if required (voluntary):

Acting Director, Coast Protection Division, Mr. D. Ellis; Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Mr. N. Gare; Assistant Director, Botanic Gardens, Dr. B. Morley; Director, Black Hill Native Flora Park, Mr. T. Crossen; Acting Director, Co-ordination and Policy Division, Ms. S. Briton-Jones; Senior Management Services Officer, Mr. K. Gursansky.

The SPEAKER: Before calling for Questions I indicate that the Minister of Education will take any questions relative to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and the Minister of Water Resources any questions in relation to the Minister of Agriculture.

QUESTION TIME**PROGRAMME BUDGETING**

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier explain why the Government has appointed P.A. Consulting Services

instead of the Public Service Board or Treasury officers to advise upon the further development of programme budgeting and related matters, including the operation of Budget Estimates Committees? Over the last two days members have been debating the Estimates Committees and, in response to requests from the Premier, opinions are being voiced as to the adequacy of the Estimates Committees procedure which was undertaken just recently over two weeks. In the course of further debate, suggestions have been made as to the way in which these opinions and comments can best be handled. Today I received from the Premier a letter which, dated 16 October, must have been prepared last week and predated the letter that I had in fact sent to the Premier on this subject. In explaining my question I would like to quote from that letter. The Premier stated:

You will recall from our private discussion on the subject and from assurances I have given to the House, that the Government is anxious to obtain members' opinions of the first stages of programme budgeting and the operation of Budget Estimates Committees.

You may also be aware that the Government has engaged P.A. Consulting Services Pty. Ltd. to advise upon the further development of programme budgeting and related matters, such as the revision of Treasury accounting systems.

I have suggested to Mr. Chris Geckeler, the senior consultant engaged on the project, that his independent assessment of the first completed stage would be incomplete without considering the views of the Opposition. I am writing, therefore, to invite you to discuss these matters with Mr. Geckeler, on the understanding that he will observe the confidentiality of your discussions in the preparation of his company's professionally independent analysis.

That letter clearly indicates that the Government has obtained the services of an outside consultant, thus passing over the various consultancy services within the Government at its disposal, including that of the Public Service Board and the Treasury, whose prime responsibility it has been traditionally in this area to advise departments and the Government on these matters and, further, suggests that indeed the operations of this House through its Budget Estimates Committees procedure and consideration of programme budgeting will also be the subject matter of investigation and report by this outside consulting service. In view of what I believe may well involve aspects of privilege as far as this House is concerned, I think the Premier should make it quite clear as to exactly what is going on and why he has engaged these consultants in this matter.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am certainly delighted to do that, and I am amazed that the Leader of the Opposition can whip himself up into such a frenzy about such a little matter.

An honourable member: He was restrained.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He would have been very foolish if he had been any less restrained. The development of the programme and performance budgeting has taken a good deal of time and study by various departments and it has been, I think, a matter of great congratulation to the public servants concerned that they have been able to work so well together. Officers from the Public Service Board and from the Treasury, with the advice of the Auditor-General's Department, have come together and formed a co-ordinating committee to oversee the implementation of the programme and performance budgeting format.

As part of this exercise, it was decided by both the Treasury and Public Service Board representatives (indeed, it was strongly advocated by the Under Treasurer) that it would be a wise procedure to adopt once

we had reached this stage of preparing our first programme performance report, the yellow book, if somebody skilled in programme and performance budgeting had a look at the whole project to make sure that the Government was on the right track.

Basically, in answer to the Leader, far from passing over the various consulting services that were available to the Government, the employment of Mr. Geckeler, who is a world recognised figure in this particular sphere, working for P.A. Consultants, was in fact made at the suggestion of the Under Treasurer, representatives of the Public Service Board, and indeed, the members of the co-ordinating committee who have been responsible not only for the programme performance budgeting system but for the changes in Government accounting, internal audit, and the other matters that we are taking to make certain that accountability is of paramount importance in the Government's accounts.

Regarding the question of privilege, I would like the Opposition to co-operate in providing information to Mr. Geckeler, and I sincerely hope that they will, in regard to their comments, particularly on the yellow book and on the presentation of programme performance budgets in that form. I made the point—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I hope that members opposite do not exhibit their ignorance to any great degree, but I would make the point that Mr. Geckeler would be grateful for the co-operation of the Opposition and indeed the co-operation of all members of this House in comments on the programme performance format. That is the thing that is under discussion at present. The review that Mr. Geckeler has made so far of the programme performance format budgeting has been most favourable, but obviously before he makes a final report he hopes to have input from every member of the House.

CRIME ALERT

Mr. MATHWIN: Would the Chief Secretary investigate the possibility of including in future crime alert programmes a system which has been used to great advantage in parts of Canada, namely, the marking, coding and indexing of valuables belonging to members of the public who indicate their desire to be included in the scheme. I was given a pamphlet recently when I attended a meeting on crime alert at Marion, together with the member for Ascot Park and the member for Brighton (which meeting, incidentally, was very well attended). In that pamphlet under the heading "Mark your Property" it states:

Often when police investigate reports of stealing, the owner is unable to give more than a vague description of the property. When it is located, difficulty can arise where the owner is unable to identify it, which may allow the thief to go free and prevent the lawful return of the property. Positive marking by inscription, or the noting of serial numbers will prevent this.

In British Columbia, in an effort to alert the public and to combat crime, the Government introduced a scheme of marking items which are more frequently stolen from private property, such as television sets, radio sets, cassettes and the like. Members of the Police Department stamp these items by engraving them with numbers or phonetics, and a record is then taken and kept. This has proved to act as a deterrent and, in cases of theft, it has made detection much easier. From my own observations and from reports of the scheme, as it operates in Canada, it appears that the scheme has been most successful.

Mr. Hemmings: Refer that question to the Police Commissioner.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The branding of one's articles is an old custom. We see it in the grazing industry with regard to livestock. Those who have served in the services would know the penalties for incorrect branding of one's issue—that carries quite big penalties, as some of us have found out. The honourable member raises an interesting suggestion.

This matter can be referred to the Police Commissioner, as some bright spark implied. If the suggestion was carried right through the community, the Police Force would have a lot of extra work. This Government has a policy of using volunteers, and this could be an area in which those volunteer groups that are interested in crime alert could help. We want to encourage people to assist the police to maintain law and order. Team work is needed, and the honourable member's suggestion bears considering. On a note a caution, I point out that, to involve the police in a large-scale routine of branding articles would give them an extra work load. The matter could be considered and perhaps volunteers could be used to the benefit of the community.

TAX SHARING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the Premier's publicly announced opposition to a State-imposed income tax surcharge mean that the South Australian Government categorically rejects stage 2 of the Prime Minister's new federalism; what was the result of the Premier's recent meeting with the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer; and is the Premier convinced that the Prime Minister will agree to the tax sharing proposals?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will answer the first of the Deputy Leader's three questions first. The answer is "Yes", and the Government has indicated this publicly many times. I can only say that, on each of the two occasions on which all the Premiers met and this matter was raised, the proposition was disposed of with a flat rejection of the principle in about 10 seconds, and I subscribed to that rejection. Regarding my consultations and my visit to the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, I point out that somewhere, someone in the Opposition got his wires crossed, because at the time I was told that the Leader, I think, was very interested in my visit to Victoria to see Mr. Hamer, I was at the opening ceremony of the entrance of the first passenger train into Alice Springs. At no time did I say I would visit Mr. Hamer: I said I would consult with him, and consult with him I did.

Mr. Hamer and I are both most concerned that the New South Wales Treasury appears to be holding up the joint submission that was intended to be made to the Prime Minister before the Federal election. Why the New South Wales Treasury wished to hold up the submission, I have no idea, but that Treasury has certainly endeavoured to make changes that were not within the parameters of the decisions made at the Premiers' Conference in Adelaide. I have since been in touch with all Premiers, suggesting that, since the urgency of getting the submission to the Prime Minister has disappeared (I may say, because the election has been held, and very soundly and very properly won by the Liberal Party), we may re-examine the situation so that Treasury officers can produce a slightly broader document.

As members will know, the Premiers are not seeking more money: they are seeking an assured share of money so that, as the member for Hartley would well appreciate, we can budget ahead with some degree of certainty that we

will receive enough money from the Federal Government to cover our basic needs. We are looking not for more money but for a formula that will give us, possibly, a share of income tax (and this was one of the alternatives discussed), a share of total tax revenue from the Commonwealth, but certainly with a base guarantee calculated on the amounts coming to the State in this financial year and indexed with a betterment factor. If we can get that, we can plan ahead and know exactly where we are going.

As Premiers, we see this as an essential ingredient of any agreement made between the States and the Commonwealth. As the Deputy Leader will know, as the Federal-State Financial Agreement comes up for renegotiation at the end of this financial year, it is essential that we have some undertaking before that time. Regarding whether the Prime Minister is likely to agree, that is something I can tell only when he has the document in his hand. I hope that it will not be long until that occurs; then, we will be able to discuss that matter with him. A Premiers' Conference is already tentatively scheduled early next February, when this whole matter of the revised agreement will be discussed with the Premiers and the Prime Minister, and I sincerely hope that we will come to an agreed solution to the problem of security (not of more money) of income for the States.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BLACKER: With regard to the Premier's statement yesterday advising the House of the interests of other companies in the Redcliff project, can he say whether these companies have been offered alternative sites for any proposed project and, if not, why not? Many of my constituents have expressed a vital interest in the dangers associated with a petro-chemical plant in the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf. All of this criticism and concern are about the site, and not the petro-chemical plant itself. My constituents are more than willing to support the project if it is relocated at a site farther south and in an area where there is proof of significant exchange of water. Many of my constituents believe that the petro-chemical project at Redcliff Point is so firmly entrenched in the Government departmental system that any talk of a realistic environmental impact statement is only window-dressing.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can reassure the member for Flinders that such is not the case. This matter was raised with me not long ago by the member for Rocky River, who is extremely concerned about the situation, as I know that the member for Stuart is also concerned. It is not proper at this stage to go into details of the names of other companies that might be interested. As the honourable member would know, the letters of intent for feasibility studies that the Government has now received have come from Mitsui Toatsu and Asahi, which are very big chemical companies in Japan, with world-wide reputations. They are the only companies, other than Dow, which are committed to conducting a feasibility study. There have been other indications of interest, one of which came only today, again from sizable interests, not from Japan, but from people who are also vitally interested, in seeing what the petro-chemical situation and feedstock potential have to offer.

There are undoubtedly quite marked advantages in the Redcliff site, and that was well recognised by the Hon. Hugh Hudson and, I think, also by the member for Baudin, when he was Minister; they were clearly

recognised as being advantages of major importance. One is that the pipeline carrying the feedstock down from the Cooper Basin can be constructed relatively efficiently, and without too many problems. Salt is so easily available from Lake Torrens in transportable form and in large quantities indeed. The Redcliff site also provides, although with some difficulty, a safe anchorage and harbor for the loading of the product.

As I understand it, the investigations being carried on even now by Mitsui and Asahi delegates are not strictly limited to the Redcliff area. The Government will certainly not insist on that site, if, indeed, any of the companies interested in feasibility studies can put up alternative sites. The Government will wait and see what is in mind after that.

As to the environmental dangers, I am not unaware of the problems and the concern expressed by many people, concern which I think comes as much from a lack of full understanding of the factors involved as anything else. I think there are many people in the community who, because they are not in full possession of the facts, quite understandably show concern. There are many petro-chemical plants of this kind elsewhere in the world, and the ecological disasters that we have heard so much about in recent months do not seem to have happened in relation to those plants. However, that does not mean that we should in any way relax our vigilance in our requirements. So, wherever the petro-chemical plant is sited—and I hope that it will go ahead one way or another—we will continue to insist on the most stringent environmental safeguards being observed. Other than that, I cannot help the honourable member, but I undertake to report to the House at any time any further positive and definite indications of interest which may be forthcoming, and to keep the House fully informed as to developments.

ALICE SPRINGS RAIL LINK

Mr. HAMILTON: Is the Premier satisfied with the level of funding allocated for the first phase of the Darwin to Alice Springs rail link, and, if not, will he request the Prime Minister to review the \$10 000 000 allocated so that construction work will not be delayed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am more than satisfied with the amount allocated for the first stage of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway link; indeed, I would have been satisfied with any amount in this first year, because it indicates a positive commitment to go ahead with the project. This is the first opportunity I have had to say in this House that this is a project with which the Government is totally and absolutely identified. I say, without fear of contradiction from either side of the House, that the Alice Springs to Darwin link, thus bringing the long-promised and long overdue Adelaide to Darwin link, will receive general support from everyone in South Australia.

The Federal Government, in my view, is to be congratulated on what was a very far-sighted and responsible (if overdue) decision, and certainly I hope that the level of funding can be upgraded to the extent that we will have that link completed in the bicentennial year in 1988. That certainly is the aim of Mr. Everingham, the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory. It is this Government's aim, too, and we will be continuing to cajole and to pressure (and any term that the honourable member likes to use) the Federal Government to make sure that our bicentennial is marked by what I believe would be the very best means, the completion of the Adelaide to Darwin link.

I think the present plan is for the completion of the link in 10 years, and we want to keep that up, but it is not just a question of putting in additional money. There are logistics, and there are difficulties associated with the building of such a line. We have a fine team, and I pay a tribute to the construction team that has been so successful in completing the Alice Springs link. It has been a fine piece of engineering, a fine piece of workmanship, and we can all be proud that we have in that railway something of world class. It really is an enormous development and a great credit to everyone associated with it. There are difficulties, as the honourable member would well know. It is not just a question of putting in more money and providing more and more work force and more and more appliances. It does not work that way. I am informed that completion by 1988 is logistically feasible, and we will continue to press for that completion date.

TOURISM

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Tourism say whether the campaign to welcome a visitor to South Australia being conducted by the South Australian Tourist Bureau and through the Minister's office has been successful in creating increased interest on the part of people from other States who plan holiday visits to South Australia?

When the VISA campaign was launched, some people had doubts about its success, even though it received acknowledgement in the press as being a good plan and one which should work. As some doubts were expressed, I seek information from the Minister so that Parliament can know whether or not the money has been spent wisely and whether there has been increased interest by people in wishing to come to South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to be able to advise the House that, since the campaign opened in September, 4 000 inquiries have been received by the South Australian Department of Tourism bureaux in Melbourne and Sydney.

Mr. Millhouse: How does that compare with last year?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It completely swamps the number of inquiries—it is hundreds of times the normal number of inquiries to the bureaux—

Mr. Millhouse: There couldn't have been many before then.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That would be just about right. When one bears in mind that the majority of these inquiries have come in the form of a coupon response to the advertisements (in other words, the coupon at the bottom of the advertisement had to be filled out by the interested potential tourist who had then to post it off or drop it in to the bureaux in the other States and in return obtain the VISA kit), then I think that is a remarkable measure of the success of the campaign.

It is too early at this stage to translate those inquiries into bookings and of course it is difficult, if not impossible, to accurately assess the bookings, because many of them will not be done through the bureaux; people will simply embark on visits to South Australia in their own private cars and no formal bookings will be made other than when they arrive and book into motels. I would expect that in the figures for the overnight visitors in South Australia for the first quarter of next year we will see a reflection of the success of this campaign.

I was also very pleased indeed to note in conversation with interstate travel agents on an informal basis that they spontaneously mentioned the impact of the VISA

campaign, and at least two of these travel agents did so without being aware of the fact that I was Minister of Tourism (they were interstate guests themselves in South Australia). That in itself signifies that the department is servicing very well travel agents interstate, and that the agents, by virtue of the media campaign, have a good awareness of what South Australia is doing.

I have also been very pleased to note the amount of press the campaign has generated in the form of editorial comment in the other States, and that in itself is a good sign. I certainly recognise and am very grateful for the tremendous media support that has come from within South Australia. I think the principle newspapers, radio and television have backed the campaign with great enthusiasm. They have played the campaign jingle in an effort to make it a popular tune on everyone's lips, and the co-operation is all that could have been wished for. I extend that commendation to members of the Opposition whose support has been welcomed throughout the tourist industry. It is an excellent example of a bipartisan approach that is very much appreciated by me, the department and by the tourist industry.

NOISE LEVELS

Mr. CRAFTY: Can the Chief Secretary say anything more about the action reportedly taken by his Government to crack down on excessive noise and social disturbance caused by some suburban discos? It was reported yesterday that an inter-departmental working party had been set up by the Minister involving his own department, the Department for the Environment and the Department for Community Welfare. I note that the Department of Local Government was not mentioned in this regard. This interests me because a problem of this nature has existed in my district for some time, and I have spoken about this in the House. I think that the part of the Minister of Environment in this three-way consultation might well be the easiest because he, through his Noise Control Unit, can measure actual physical decibels and decide readily enough if noise limits have been exceeded.

The measuring of social disturbance is not quite so easy and, in the instance to which I have referred and with which I have been involved, people who live near the licensed premises concerned, at which a disco is conducted, were worried not so much about the volume of late night noise as about the behaviour of disco patrons once they had left the licensed premises. The Minister would know that the law does not pass any responsibility to the licensee for the behaviour of patrons once they have left the premises. In this case, the patrons have been in a mood to celebrate further and have done so outside private homes, and causing considerable disturbance in the neighbourhood in the early hours of the morning. It is of course difficult for the police—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member is now starting to debate the question.

Mr. CRAFTY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have raised this matter with the Commissioner of Police about difficulties the police have with respect to this problem, and with the local government authorities in relation to planning problems in this area, and I would be interested if the Minister can give an assurance that this aspect will be considered by his working party, and can give an undertaking that the next review of the Licensing Act and the review that is going on of the Local Government Act will include some provision to deal with this type of nuisance.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There is a working party set up which, of course, is principally in the area of the Minister of Environment. The police have an input in this area, and if there is any excessive noise it is always the police that the public contact. Indeed, even in the country in my own electorate we have recently had a lot of complaints about excessive noise, some from discos and some from industry servicing the transport industry and working at nights, causing havoc in the area. The working party, which is a conglomerate of the Police Department, and the consumer affairs and environment areas, is looking at the broad aspect of noise pollution. The Minister of Environment is more of a full bottle on the overall question that the honourable member raises. I will take on board the impact of his question and discuss this with my colleague and the Minister of Community Welfare, and we will put this matter to the working party.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Minister of Planning say what is the current situation and expected completion date of the hills face zone boundary inquiry? The hills face zone boundary inquiry was established nearly two years ago under Judge Roder to investigate and recommend on alternations to the hills face zone boundary to remove anomalous situations. It caused considerable concern in the Tea Tree Gully area in 1979, when it became known that many of the submissions sought excision of quite substantial areas from the zone for subdivision and development. Indeed, one application, which was subsequently withdrawn, was for withdrawal of a large area behind Fairview Park and was made on the part of the South Australian Land Commission. The concern in the area at that time was sufficient to lead to the collection of over 2 000 signatures within one week from the Fairview Park region of Tea Tree Gully. Because of this concern, there is considerable and continuing interest in anything that may result from this inquiry.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that I have now received the report on the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone of the metropolitan planning area. I agree with the point that the honourable member has made; it has taken a long time in coming. The inquiry was set up some two years ago and has been the responsibility of Judge Roder.

It was a very extensive inquiry, and 112 submissions, as well as an additional 1 720 statements resulting from the publication of those submissions, were received. Of the 112 submissions received, seven were subsequently withdrawn and three were considered to be outside the terms of reference. Of the 102 remaining submissions, the inquiry has made recommendations in respect of 35. What that means is that it is an extensive report; it is of very many pages, and I have asked the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs to provide an assessment of the recommendations that have been made to me in this report.

I know of the honourable member's concern; in fact, he has raised this matter in the House before, and he has raised the matter with me privately. I am not in a position to go into a great deal of detail regarding the report, but I shall be making it available as soon as I can. However, the inquiry proposes to vary the hills face zone boundary and it recommends in some cases that land be included in the hills face zone, as well as that some lands be excluded from the zone. As soon as I am able to make that report available I shall do so, and I recognise the interest that the member for Newland has shown in this inquiry.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Fisheries reconsider his stand in relation to his not accepting what I thought was a friendly invitation to him to accompany me on an A class professional net fisherman's boat to explore the real situation that exists in the areas that the Minister proposes to close to net fishing in Spencer Gulf?

I think the Minister would remember my invitation, and I might add that I did not extend it to him lightly. However, he saw fit to decline, giving as the reason that the representative on the fishing council, who was supposedly looking after the professional net fishermen's interests, was negotiating with the Minister and his department. I question this assumption and suggest to the Minister that the real problems of net fishing in Spencer Gulf are not being submitted to either him or his department, and I contend that they will not be submitted under the make-up of the current fishing council.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Contrary to what the honourable member says, I understand that the Scale Fisheries Consultative Committee met with the Director and officers of the department twice recently and that they are in the process of submitting to the Government a plan which will come through me. I cannot see what one trip on a fishing vessel in Spencer Gulf with me on it will contribute to the overall look at this fishery. The department is geared up to look at catches and at the data that has been coming from there. The consultative committee, which was set up by the former Government, is a very good committee and has produced worthwhile reports. The committee was chaired by Dr. Keith Jones, who is an acknowledged expert in the scale fishery field, and it is on the basis of the scale fisheries report of that committee that the closures and other things have been recommended. It is something that the Government does not take lightly, as I indicated in a letter to the member for Stuart yesterday.

The Government has not yet received that report, but I understand that we will receive it shortly, and on that basis we will make a final decision. I thank the honourable member for his very kind offer to traverse the blue waters of the Spencer Gulf, which are not unfamiliar to me, but I am sure that his and my sailing for such purposes would not contribute one iota to the data that has been collected by this expert committee.

HERCULES AIRCRAFT

Mr. LEWIS: Will the Premier, by making inquiries of the Commonwealth Government, investigate the possibility of obtaining the C130 model A Hercules aircraft, which are now superseded and obsolete, for conversion for service as water bombers in bush and forest fires? Aircraft of this type have been of use in this regard in the United States and Canada. One such aircraft located in, say, the South-East of South Australia may assist in regard to threats from fires. These aircraft could be of use for this purpose as far away as Gippsland to the east and the Gulf region of South Australia to the north.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I know that recent experiments have been conducted with firefighting aircraft that carry water, which is dumped on the heart of bush fires, and I believe that all honourable members would consider that any measure that could be taken to control bush fires effectively and stop the tragedies that so often occur would be well worth taking. I do not know whether any investigations have been done into the use of the Hercules aircraft, but I would be prepared to take up that

matter with the Commonwealth Government. The honourable member is to be congratulated for his suggestion.

I must say that it sounds as though it may be extraordinarily expensive to purchase a Hercules aircraft specifically for this purpose, but if it were to come to pass, it would have to be very much a joint effort between the Federal Government and perhaps the Victorian and South Australian Governments. There is also the question of servicing; the matter would have to be investigated on a cost benefit basis and a programme performance basis in regard to the exact cost to the taxpayers. I thank the honourable member for his suggestion, and I will certainly look into it.

RAILWAYS

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Minister of Transport use whatever influence he may have to obtain an answer from the Australian National Railways in regard to the route of the standard gauge railway line on LeFevre Peninsula? In June this year, the A.N.R. undertook to consider three alternative routes for this railway on the peninsula. Many people who live on that route are waiting for an answer, because two houses under one route will have to be torn down and, obviously, these people will experience great personal disruption and their lifestyle will be changed if that route is chosen.

Mr. Hamilton: One woman just bought one, didn't she?

Mr. PETERSON: Yes, in February this year. The values of properties along the line are dropping, and these people are worried about their future. I have tried continually to get an answer from the A.N.R. but it will not commit itself. It is up to the State to do what it can to get an answer for these people.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I assure the member for Semaphore that the State is doing what it can. The three alternative routes were discussed in June this year because of the representations that I made as Minister to the A.N.R. because of the complaints that I have had from citizens who live on LeFevre Peninsula, and from members of Parliament (the member for Semaphore, and, indeed, Senator Messner and one or two other Federal members of Parliament), who approached me on the question of the standard gauge link to Outer Harbor and the route that it should take.

Naturally, I took up the matter with the Australian National Railways Commission, and a committee was set up that consisted of officers from my department, the Highways Department, the Department of Marine and Harbors, and officials from the Australian National Railways Commission. This committee was to evaluate various alternatives in connecting Outer Harbor to the standard gauge link.

According to a report I received yesterday from one of my officers, those negotiations are drawing to a close. I believe that a satisfactory solution will be found to the problem, but it will be left to the A.N.R. Commission to announce when it has finally made a decision. I know that I cannot canvass too much of the matter now, but we will be discussing this matter in legislation before the House next week, and I hope that I shall be able to enlighten the honourable member at that stage.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Transport consider the arguments put forward by some councils and

the subsequent submissions made to the Chairman of the Inter-departmental Committee on Funding for Local Roads on developing an alternative formula for the distribution of urban local road funds? Along with other members, I have received some representations from councils that believe that the size of the population in a local government area, particularly in urban areas, affects the expenditure needs of the area. In some submissions, it has been suggested that the distribution of funds be to a somewhat similar formula as that currently observed in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, that is, based on a component related to population, the other component being based on either the length of urban roads and/or the area of the different urban councils rather than the continuation of the existing system.

It has also been expressed that such a formula for the distribution of urban local road funds, after the deduction of a specific percentage of the funds allocated to this State for assistance in special and unusual needs, such as for the construction of a bridge or some similar significant needs, would be not only simple and clear cut but, more importantly, would result in a fairer distribution of funds to councils with urban local roads. I therefore seek the Minister's comments on these suggestions.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: For every urban council that believes that local road grants should be distributed on a population basis, the honourable member will certainly find the rural local government body which will suggest rather that the allocation be made on the basis of length of roads in its area.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: All that does is point out the great difficulty I have, as Minister (and indeed, the great difficulty the Government has), in allocating funds for local roads. That has not been helped this year by the decision of the Commonwealth to amalgamate rural and urban local roads into one category, which has meant that I was therefore faced not only with having to make an allocation for urban and rural local roads individually, but also to split the cake between the country and the city, and that is not a job that one relishes. I also point out that one of the problems we have in South Australia in the allocation of local road funds is that we have such a large unincorporated area in the State. Members will realise the huge areas of South Australia that are unincorporated.

Mr. Russack: It's 85 per cent.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Goyder reminds me that it is 85 per cent. Those areas are not subject to Grants Commission funding, which therefore means that, as the Minister responsible for the Highways Department, I have to allocate funds out of the local roads programme for those areas as well.

However, I appreciate the representations made to me by the metropolitan councils, and in particular by the honourable member on behalf of his own council. He is quite right in saying that a report has been prepared by an inter-departmental committee. Soon after I became Minister, I realised that we must have a close look at this, and so, in conjunction with the Minister of Local Government, an inter-departmental committee was set up, and it has produced a report. At present we are asking for submissions from metropolitan and rural councils. I believe that we must get down to a formula basis. However, I would be equally adamant that we must consider the needs factor. That is most important.

I must take into account, and I believe the Government should take into account, not only the needs factor but also provision for such things as tourism, which is a most important growth industry for the State. I am sure the member for Brighton, with his interest in tourism, will

agree. We have to make provision for infra-structure for the State's development, and I am sure the honourable member will realise the problems that we have. Certainly, I believe that we should move to a formula basis, and I expect we will be able to do that before we allocate funds for 1981.

STATE TAXES

Mr. ABBOTT: Has the Premier now rejected some form of State sales or consumer tax as a replacement for pay-roll tax? If not, what form would such a tax take, and what support has the Premier received from other State Premiers on his proposal?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not sure that the honourable member is correct in saying that it is my proposal. The subject of an alternative to pay-roll tax has been investigated, by large numbers of people, by other Premiers, and other Leaders of the Opposition, for quite a considerable time. I think we would all like to see some alternative to pay-roll tax. I have not rejected or accepted any suggestion of a State sales or consumer tax. I think the honourable member refers to the widely based consumer tax so often referred to to encompass all of the possibilities. A study is being conducted at present by Treasury officers of all States. The further they go along that path, the more difficult it appears to be to find a satisfactory substitute for pay-roll tax. Nevertheless, they are persevering, but until we examine their considered report I am not prepared to commit the Government one way or the other. Obviously, whatever is done to replace pay-roll tax will require Federal Government approval. To that extent, we are very much in the hands of the Federal Government. When that approval is given, obviously it will be something which will be adopted by all States, and not just by South Australia in isolation. It is most important that we wait for the study to be completed and examine it very carefully.

OUTBACK NURSING

Mr. RANDALL: Has the Minister of Health seen a report in today's *News* headed "Outback nursing crisis threat", and what action does she intend to take to remedy the deficiencies referred to in the report? In today's *News*, a report by Julie Batchelor states:

Teachers in South Australia's far north-west have threatened to withdraw services if Aboriginal reserves are left without nursing staff. The teachers in Aboriginal schools fear a death may occur because of inadequate Health Commission nurse staffing. The Tribal Aboriginal Schools Association has called for the appointment of two permanent sisters for each of seven communities in the area.

Another point the writer makes, and one in which I concur, is that the extreme isolation leaves the sisters alone to deal with complex situations, and more support is needed from the South Australian Health Commission. Those points have been clearly made in the article and, having seen the area and knowing its remoteness, I seek the Minister's answer to the question.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The report was drawn to my notice at lunchtime. I read it with great concern and asked for information from the Health Commission in response to it, and I have received the following information. The fact that the council calls for the appointment of two permanent sisters at each of the settlements is well taken, but I should point out that at Amata, Ernabella, Indulkana and Fregon the establishment (the approved positions in each case) is for two

sisters. At the moment there is one vacancy at Fregon. It has been advertised, but it is hard to fill, and herein perhaps lies the difficulty: it is difficult to recruit people who are willing to go into remote areas to provide health services to Aboriginal people or, indeed, to anyone in the remote areas.

The great problem results from the extreme stress on the sisters which is partly caused by their lack of privacy and the fact that they are on continuous call outside clinic hours, very often for minor complaints. Members may recall that during the debate on the Estimates I acknowledged that I regarded the Aboriginal Health Services in South Australia to be deficient and that I had taken action to correct that. It is action that will take some time to come to fruition. Relieving staff has been sought from the Commonwealth Employment Services and private agencies—

Mr. Hemmings: Even from Canada?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I think any source of adequate staffing for the Aboriginal Health Service in the remote areas would be seriously considered. I should say that the article referred to the need to make salaries and conditions attractive for staff in these areas. The fact is that nursing salaries and allowances are determined in such a way that takes account of the difficult conditions. Nurses are provided with rent-free fully furnished self-contained accommodation as well as heating and lighting. I recognise, however, the criticism that the staff needs additional support from the Health Commission, and I think that support comes in both moral and practical terms by more frequent visiting from support staff, particularly doctors. I think that the Northern Territory Aboriginal Health Services maintain a better support for their staff than we have done in the past in South Australia. In reference to the past, I point out that the previous Government underspent the Aboriginal Health budget by \$120 000 in the year to June 1979. Those funds were lost to South Australia, and the Health Commission is in the process of trying to renegotiate those funds with the Commonwealth.

BUS FACILITIES

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport consider a proposal to provide special or reserved seating marked accordingly for aged, invalid or disabled passengers on S.T.A. buses? This matter was brought to my attention by a constituent who had travelled overseas and was impressed at the provision of these signs on buses in the city of Los Angeles. He indicated to me in writing that he had been impressed with this arrangement by which notices on the buses indicated that the seats to the front of the bus, which are the most appropriate for aged or incapacitated persons, were available for them. I put the proposal to the Minister because I believe it would be—

Mr. Millhouse: They used to have buses in America marked "blacks only".

Mr. SLATER: This is a different proposition. I did not agree with that, and I do not think the member for Mitcham did either. I would appreciate his silence while I continue with the explanation of the question, because I believe the proposal has some merit. It is the Year of the Disabled, so I ask the Minister quite sincerely whether he will consider the proposal.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I certainly treat the question as a sincere one. I will be pleased to give it some consideration, and I will make sure it gets more than my consideration and that my officers investigate it thoroughly. The Government is concerned to provide

facilities on public transport for the elderly and the disabled (we must not forget the elderly). In fact, some members of the project team for the North-East busway will be paying a lot of attention to what new initiatives we can bring in to this important area. Some of the things that are mentioned frequently when we are talking to elderly groups are low floor heights on buses, wider doors and destination signs instead of numbers. The Government has also taken the initiative of appointing one of my officers to the Transport Committee of ACROD (the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled). I am looking forward very much to the close relationship that will exist between my department and ACROD in planning for such improvements to the public transport system as the honourable member has mentioned.

I have received an advertisement from the United States regarding a bus in the Southern California Rapid Transport District which has incorporated in it wheelchair lifts and other items of that nature, at a cost of \$US130 000. That is not an expensive bus when it is compared with the prices we are paying now for our buses. It just shows that these things are possible. I sincerely believe that all Governments have really only paid lip service to the provision of facilities for the elderly and disabled—I do not refer just to South Australia but also to Australia generally—over the past few years.

DEATH OF DENIS PARLETT

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): By leave of the House, I would like to make brief reference to a tragic event, of which I think most honourable members are now aware. Denis Parlett, who is well known to all of us, was taken ill suddenly last night and died. He commenced duties at Parliament House in March 1974. His cheerful readiness to help and to assist honourable members has been well known to everyone and, indeed, I think I have never seen anyone quite so unflappable as Denis was. I knew him many years ago, and it was the renewal of an old acquaintance.

I am sure honourable members will join with me in expressing our condolences to his wife and teenage sons. One thing I can say is that we will certainly miss Denis from this place.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to join the Premier in the sad duty of expressing condolences to the wife and children of Denis Parlett and putting on the record our appreciation for the services he rendered as a member of the staff of this place over the six years that he was a caretaker. That small band of caretakers who work on a 24-hour basis to keep this House available and open to us at odd hours is a group that we come to rely on very much for many small services at all times of the day and night.

As the Premier has said, Denis was a distinguished member of that group; always cheerful, and always willing and ready to help. His death comes as a considerable shock. He was on duty yesterday as usual. I agree with the Premier that "unflappable" is a good description of him in going about his duty. His death is most untimely at the age of 54 years and comes, I think, as a considerable shock to all of us who knew him, liked him and appreciated him. I would place on record as well our condolences and distress at his untimely death.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I certainly was considerably shocked when the Leader of the Opposition told me at lunch time the sad news of Denis's death. I am pretty certain that I saw him as usual yesterday and talked to him. Of course, being closeted as I am in the basement, I probably see members of the staff who work in that capacity more often than many other members see them. Also, despite what is often said about me and my lack of attendance in the House, I often come in here at the weekends and I used to see him—as I see the other members of that band of caretakers and cellarmen—at the weekends and have a word with him, and I will certainly very greatly miss him. He had got used to my idiosyncrasies and the fact that a few of us jogged around the corridors before the City-Bay Run, and so on; he was quite unflappable about all that. It is a very sad thing that twice within a little over 24 hours we have to make reference to the death of someone who is known to us in one capacity or another in this place. I support what has been said by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Mitcham for making reference to a member of the Joint House Committee. As Chairman of that committee, I can assure all members of the House that I will convey the condolences expressed by members to the late Denis Parlett's widow and children.

PROSTITUTION BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to give effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution; to make related amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978; and to the Police Offences Act, 1953-1979; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I do not propose to give a speech. I refer honourable members to the speech that I made in the last session of Parliament on 27 February this year, at pages 1277-81 of *Hansard*. I can tell the House that the Bill is in precisely the same form as it was when I introduced it during the last session, and I have done that deliberately in the hope that members will be prepared to take up the debate in this session at the point at which it was left off last time, and that members will not feel it necessary for any reason to speak, if they have already spoken in the debate in the last session, just so as to keep it going, because I am particularly anxious that the Bill should come to a second reading vote. If it is passed at the second reading, of course in Committee it will be open to any member to move amendments to the Bill, and there have been suggestions made to me by churchmen and others that we should consider amendments, and I certainly would be open to do that at the appropriate time.

My immediate aim is to get a vote on the Bill, and I therefore express the hope, putting it another way, that there will not be a filibuster by any members to avoid getting a second reading vote. The only thing that I do add is this: when I spoke last time I gave a number of figures showing the visits of police to various so-called massage parlours, to illustrate the point that these visits were absolutely haphazard. Reading *Hansard*, I can see that the way I put it does not make for very great clarity and I have, in the interval, prepared a statistical table, and it is purely statistical, setting out the information which I put in my speech last time. So that it will become more easily

understood (and I hope the point will be made more strongly), I seek leave to have this table inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's having assured me that it is purely statistical, leave is granted. Leave granted.

POLICE VISITS TO SIX MESSAGE PARLOURS IN AND ABOUT ADELAIDE IN 1978

Massage Parlour	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total 1978
A	10 (1 arrest)	2 (1 arrest)	12 (1 arrest)	6 (1 prose- cution)	10 (3 arrests, 1 prose- cution)	16 (4 arrests)	10	4	6	2	10 (5 arrests)	10 (2 arrests)	98
B			5	2 (1 prose- cution)	3	15 (2 arrests)	7	2	6	5	5 (1 arrest)	6	56
C	3 (1 arrest)			2	1 (1 arrest)	10 (2 arrests, 1 prose- cution)	7	3 (1 arrest)	9 (1 arrest)	9 (3 arrests)	12 (4 arrests)	11 (1 arrest)	67
D	2	1	4	4	2	2	1	2		4		1	23
E	2	2 (2 arrests)	5 (1 arrest)	4 (2 arrests)	3	15 (1 arrest)	8 (2 arrests)	13 (1 arrest)	11 (1 arrest)	10	5	6 (1 arrest)	85
F	1					1	2 (2 arrests)	3	1	1		2	11

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all that I need to say. I understand that the Minister of Transport is prepared to seek the adjournment of the debate, because he wishes to speak and has another appointment, so I will not delay him, or the House, any longer.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a system of proportional representation should be introduced for the election of its members, as contemplated in the Constitution.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is launching for a second time a motion which I introduced into the last session of Parliament. I do not propose to make a second speech about it. Having looked at *Hansard*, I see I did not make a terribly good speech last time. I think I said enough to launch the matter and I hope that this time, as opposed to the last session, there will be some debate on it. Last time I introduced it perhaps a bit later in the session, and there was no debate at all. The poor member for Ascot Park is looking hurt. Of course, he made a speech on it. I had forgotten that. I beg his pardon, and that of anybody else who spoke on it, too.

Mr. Becker: I can recall his speech better than yours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can recall his speech now. He impugned my motives, and so on. There are just one or two things I would like to say, particularly arising out of

the general election last Saturday and the system of proportional representation, which is used for the counting of Senate votes. Mr. Speaker, you probably will understand it if I say that I, and members of my Party (although it is not self-interest of course; that is not the reason why I have introduced the motion at all), are even more attracted to a system of proportional representation, following the result of the election last Saturday for the Senate, than was the case before. I was amused when my son, Christopher, said to me on Sunday morning, "Dad, do you know what Tonkin said last night?" He was referring to the Premier, who is not often so referred to in our household, and probably not in yours, Sir, either. He said, "Dad, do you know what Tonkin said last night? He said Janine Haines wasn't going to get into the Senate and the Australian Democrats were a spent force."

We had a good laugh about that. I point out to the Premier and to others that in fact the vote of the Australian Democrats in this State not only was our best vote of any State of the Commonwealth but rose in comparison to the last Senate election from 11.3 per cent to 13 per cent. In fact, Janine Haines will get into the Senate; I would wager almost my bottom dollar on that. So, the poor Premier, Tonkin, as he was called by my son, was wrong on both counts, as he so often is. Of course, if there had been on those figures a system of proportional representation for the Lower House, almost certainly the Australian Democrats would have won a seat in the Lower House, as there are 11 Commonwealth seats; the same can be translated into the State sphere.

I know that the Liberals are not at all pleased with the showing of the Democrats, and our successes will not endear the system of proportional representation to them. Indeed, it has been reported to me that this week the Hon.

Mr. McLeay, who is the Federal Leader of the Liberals in this State, said, in the presence of one of my strong supporters, to the Divisional Returning Officer for Boothby to get ready for a double dissolution. So, apparently, the Liberals in Canberra are not at all pleased with the fact that is likely (although by no means a foregone conclusion) that the Australian Democrats will exert a considerable moderating influence in the Senate in Canberra. They are already getting ready for a double dissolution, according to the only South Australian member of the Ministry.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You shouldn't take too much notice of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hartley says that one cannot take much notice of it, but Sir Charles Court was saying much the same sort of thing a week before the election, and I suppose these Liberals speak with the same voice; it is sometimes not easy to pin them down, as the member for Hartley would realise. Anyway, that is what John McLeay has been saying this week and what Charlie Court said before the election. I can assure all members that the Australian Democrats will act with their characteristic reasonableness and moderation and that there will be no need for a double dissolution. However, I am now straying from the point, which is to commend to the House this motion, which concerns the introduction, as provided for in the Constitution, of a system of proportional representation for it.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House strongly disapproves of the "Guidelines for Public Servants appearing before Parliamentary Committees" approved and tabled by the Premier on 6 August; and upon the principle of open government which he has claimed to espouse, calls upon him to withdraw the guidelines immediately; and affirms that in any case it is the members of Select and Special Committees of this Parliament who decide the questions to be answered by witnesses whether those witnesses be public servants or not.

After all that has happened during the last few weeks, most of us have probably forgotten the brouhaha about the guidelines. We have had the Federal election and we have had the Budget Committee meetings, during which it seemed to me the guidelines were forgotten altogether, because some Ministers used their public servants and some did not let them say a word, and so on. But it is not only those Committees we must concern ourselves with, but also the question of Select Committees, of which there are a few from time to time.

I say that this matter has been almost forgotten; I suspect that the Government would like to forget it altogether and just let the guidelines wither away. I put this motion on the Notice Paper originally hoping that the matter could be debated before the Budget Committees sat. I wrote to the Premier about that matter, asking him to be prepared to go on, but because Liberal members spoke, on the only other day on which we have had private members' business, at inordinate length on some other matter—I think it was the Darwin to Alice Springs railway—this matter did not come on.

The Premier wrote to me on 25 August, and the letter was as follows:

Dear Mr. Millhouse,

Thank you for your letter regarding the timing of your debate on the motion of the guidelines for public servants. I

am, of course, ready to speak on the subject whenever it comes before the House, but as you would know the timing is entirely dependent on the progress of the Address in Reply and how many more speakers there are. I understand that you have some strong views on the subject—

I do not know how he got that message, apart from the letters I wrote to him—

and I am rather surprised, therefore, that you have not taken up my invitation to make a submission on the matter.

A very lordly, condescending way of putting it to me. The letter continues:

As I said in the House, the Government will give every consideration to such submissions.

Let me now make a few submissions on the subject. The guidelines themselves were offensive. I refer to them, as tabled by the Premier. Members may recall that there was some confusion about what the guidelines said and about who had seen what version of them, but I have a photocopy of the document tabled in the House. This was the first set, the authentic set. The Government tried to run away from them afterwards, but I have a copy of the authentic set. The following is one of the most offensive of them:

Arrangements for an official to appear before a Parliamentary Committee should be made through the relevant departmental head and the Minister's concurrence obtained.

I wonder what would happen if a request were made for a public servant to come before a Committee and the Minister said "No". I suppose we would immediately have a collision between the two, and the object of this Government, which claims to believe in the democratic principle, would be to impose the will of the Executive upon Parliament. The document continues:

Agreement should be reached prior to the committee hearing on the nature and extent of matters to be raised and appropriate officers to discuss particular issues.

The next guideline, from which they have not been able to escape, is as follows:

An adviser arranged through the Public Service Board must accompany an official appearing before a Parliamentary Committee . . .

The guidelines also state:

Documents and correspondence relating to the matters on which the public servant is being questioned should not be disclosed by the public servant without the Minister's consent.

The guidelines then go on about postponements and all sorts of garbage. My immediate objection to this was that it was not only an insult to Parliament but a usurpation of the role and the right of Parliament to call before it those who could give information on matters which are to be considered. It was on that ground that I opposed it immediately.

Of course, the Public Service Association also opposed it, because it maintained that the Premier had been misleading, that the association had never been consulted on the matter, and so on. A letter which the association wrote to me on 22 August states, in part:

For our part, the council of the association wishes it to be clearly understood that we regard the whole project as unnecessary. We sense that the guidelines tabled could unnecessarily restrict dialogue between public servants and Parliament and could bind the public servant more closely to the political interests of the Government of the day.

My council believes that they contain provisions which are vague and ambiguous, and control measures which may serve to intimidate public servants who are attempting honestly to carry out their legitimate duties to their department, their Minister, the Parliament and the public. We will be seeking

to express our more detailed views to the Premier shortly in what we hope can be meaningful consultations. Irrespective of the outcome of submissions we will make to the Government, we are concerned to ensure that, if there are to be any new arrangements, those arrangements should only be entered into after they have the approval of the House.

In my view, the only satisfactory arrangement would be the total withdrawal of the guidelines, and I hope that is what will happen.

I know that in some ways this appears to be a dead issue, but, as long as the guidelines are there, there is the risk that some fool will try to follow them, and there will be a collision between Government and Parliament. It is for that reason that I have gone on with this motion. I hope that it will be supported. At the very least, I want to hear what the Premier has to say in accordance with his undertaking of being ready to debate the matter whenever it came before the House.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the member for Hartley said, perhaps consultants could consider the matter. We will see what the Premier says if and when he speaks.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in order to protect the quality of the water in the River Murray vital to South Australia, this House urges the Government forthwith to take proceedings in the High Court of Australia against the States of New South Wales and Victoria—

(a) for a declaration that this State is entitled to water from the River Murray of sufficiently high quality for use for human consumption and by primary and secondary industry; and

(b) for an injunction against further diversions by either State of water from the River Murray system which may as a consequence further reduce the quality of water flowing down the River Murray into South Australia.

I hope that I need say very little about the acknowledged fact that water from the Murray River is absolutely vital not only to the prosperity but also to the life of South Australia and South Australians. The stark fact is that we South Australians live on the edge of a desert, which is slowly coming southwards. Without water from the Murray River, our community, if it did not die altogether, at the least could not exist as it does now. The question of water in this State is of supreme importance to us all, and I say no more about that. I assume that there is agreement on that matter at least.

Unfortunately, South Australia is the downstream State; New South Wales and Victoria get a go at the water from the Murray River before we do. The various rights, such as they are, of the parties are set out in the River Murray Waters Agreement, which is contained in an Act of this Parliament and in Acts of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales and Victoria. On a number of occasions since I have been a member of this House, that Act has been debated in this place, and it was the occasion for what I regard as the most politically dishonest action that has taken place in the South Australian Parliament since I became a member: that was the controversy in 1970 over the building of the Dartmouth dam, when the Labor Party, well knowing that Chowilla was not a goer, nevertheless opposed the amendments to the ratification of the amendments to the agreement so that the Dartmouth dam would be built,

preying on the fears of the then Speaker, the Honourable Tom Stott, and his obstinate espousal of the Chowilla proposal.

The Labor Party knew that inevitably the Dartmouth dam would have to be built, but it knew that, by opposing the Bill to ratify the agreement, it would have Stott on its side and it would be able to topple the Steele Hall Government. That was a politically dishonest action, because it was done not in the best interests of South Australia but for pure Party-political interests. It is one of the ironies of political life of the last 10 years in this State that the Labor Party went out of office just before the Dartmouth dam was completed, having in its first year brought in the same Bill as we had introduced and which the Labor Party had defeated with Tommy Stott's support in the previous Parliament, simply to win an election. At least that Government did not survive, much to its surprise and hurt, to be present at the opening of the Dartmouth dam. I need say no more about that.

The problem in regard to the River Murray Waters Agreement is that it is silent on what has become an increasingly vital matter—the question of quality of the water. We have been unable, as a State, to come to any agreement with our colleagues, the other States and the Commonwealth, on this question of quality of water. Salinity is, as we all know, a most appalling and growing problem in the Murray River. I guess most members are aware of the Senate Standing Committee on Science and the Environment and the reports which that committee has made in regard to this matter, the progress report of June 1979 and the second report (I suppose it is the second progress report) entitled *On the Continuing Scrutiny of Pollution in the River Murray*, which is dated September 1980. The committee is presided over by a South Australian senator, Senator Jessop (whom I was happy to see in the Mitcham TAB last Saturday morning, no doubt taking a bet on the outcome of the election).

Mr. Olsen: He would have won a lot of money, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He did not look too happy at the time. He cut me dead, and that was par for the course, but we will not worry about that. In its latest report, the committee indicated the following:

One of the major concerns of the committee during its examination was the delay in amending the River Murray Waters Agreement between the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, to expand the powers of the River Murray Commission in respect of water quality responsibilities as approved in principle by the four Governments late in 1976 and as recommended by the River Murray Working Party in October 1975.

Having said that the Federal Government's response does not go far enough, the report further stated:

As pointed out in the Maunsell Report, there have been a number of studies which have put forward technical solutions to the serious problems of the Murray Valley. What is still lacking is co-ordinated and effective implementation. The committee is concerned that, unless the four Governments can provide the River Murray Commission with appropriate powers to co-ordinate the necessary corrective action, the problems will remain and, with increasing pressures on the River Murray, will get steadily worse.

That is sufficient authority for the introduction of this motion. I believe that the only course left open to us now is to exert a little pressure on the other States. I do not suggest that the Commonwealth would not be co-operative if Victoria and New South Wales would be co-operative, but a little pressure on the other States by our going to the High Court of Australia and asking for the relief that I have suggested (a declaration of our entitlement to decent water and an injunction against any

further diversion of water, particularly in New South Wales) could be considered. I gave notice of this motion a few weeks ago and, because of the urgency of the matter, I thought that I would write to the Minister to encourage him not to wait until today but perhaps to take some action earlier. After all, he has only to discuss the matter with the Attorney-General and perhaps with the Crown Solicitor, if not the Solicitor-General, to see what they think about it, and then go ahead. It is easy enough to get a writ and get the thing started. I wrote to the Minister on 29 September, as follows:

My dear Minister,

You may remember that last week I gave the following notice of motion and put it down for the next private members' day:

I then set out the resolution, and I said (I thought that this was fairly moderate and proper):

I know that you and the Government are concerned about this matter, and it does seem to me that by taking action in the High Court we may bring it to a head. Although I have not looked closely at the law it does occur to me that we should be able to get both an injunction and a declaration as I have suggested in the motion.

I am writing to you because the matter is of some urgency, and I'd rather action were taken straight away than awaiting my moving the motion on 22 October and subsequent debate on it. If you would care to discuss the matter with me I should be only too happy to do so.

I believe that that letter was perfectly proper, but I am afraid that the answer was a bit of a brush-off.

The Minister wrote back to me. He signed the letter, but I wonder whether some clerk in his office did not prepare it, because not only was it a brush-off but it missed the point altogether. The following is what he said, on 14 October:

Thank you for your letter of 29 September 1980 expressing concern at the situation with respect to the quality of River Murray water being delivered to this State.

The question of the South Australian Government taking High Court action to protect the quality of water entering the State is already receiving active consideration as a result of my recent experience in relation to action which has been taken to protect the quality of water received by Mexico from the Colorado River by agreement between the United States of America and Mexico.

I shall write to you again when a decision on this matter has been reached.

Mr. Evans: How is that a brush-off?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There was not a mention of my motion today, of its being urgent, or that some action should be taken straight away, or to be ready to go on with the debate today. I might just as well not have introduced my motion, but simply written to him. It was a very discourteous letter, one which I did not expect from the Minister. Despite his shortcomings, I thought I would have got a courteous reply, because I tried to write a helpful letter. Let us not argue about that: the matter is far too important for it. I suppose that his reference to his own experience arises from the study tour he undertook in 1977—

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: And again two months ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—and on which he reported to us in a Parliamentary Paper and, I am happy to hear him say, a couple of months ago. Let us see some results. We have heard no decision whether the Government will do this or not do this. So far as I know, no writ has been issued. Now I would have thought would be a good time to put pressure on Victoria and New South Wales. Anyway, that is by the by. It is a matter for the Minister. I can only make a suggestion in the form of my motion, which I hope will be

supported by the House. As I said in my letter, I have not made a close study of the legal situation, because I wrote my letter as a member of Parliament, and not as a member of the legal profession, although it is not always possible to keep the two capacities separate.

Since putting my motion on the Notice Paper, I have inquired about it, and have spoken to Professor Sandford Clark, of the University of Melbourne, who is perhaps the expert in Australia on the law in this field. I spoke to him yesterday. I have had a look at the four volumes of the 1973 work entitled *Australian Waters Research Council Research Project (69/16)*, which is published by him and by Mr. Ian Renard, particularly volume 4 and, while the matter is by no means clear, certainly the opinions of these two gentlemen on the possibilities of going to the court and getting some relief are sufficiently encouraging for us, in my view, to go ahead with it. The following is what they say, and I propose to quote just a few passages in the hope that the Government's legal advisers at least look at *Hansard* and maybe get a few references, even if they have not looked at this document. Page 331 of volume 4, under the heading "Additional powers to control salinity", states:

The question remains whether some strengthening of the River Murray Commission is necessary to meet the problem of salinity. It is interesting that, before the turn of the century, soil samples were despatched to Professor Hilgard at the University of California.

So, the Minister is not the first South Australian to look to California for a little help in this matter. It continues:

He foresaw the problems that salinity would cause in the River, and strongly recommended the construction of drainage basins or a parallel channel, similar in principle to that suggested more recently by Pels.

At page 332 appears the following:

The Commission, however, has no power to control saline water flowing in from tributaries or adjacent land, although it does have power to measure "all diversions whether natural or artificial or partly natural and partly artificial from the main stream of the River Murray and its tributaries.

That is merely confirmation of what I have said: the agreement does not cover the question of quality. We now come to the views of the authors on the question of the ability of the State to take proceedings. The work is not written with our particular problem in mind. It is a more general one, and one must apply the principles set out in it to our situation. They say, at page 22:

The difficulties in administering interstate rivers are indeed great and have been the cause of dispute and litigation in many federations overseas. In some countries, notably the United States of America the considerable litigation has produced fairly clear judicial rules to govern the relationships between Governments. In Australia, however, there has not been a history of litigation. The result—perhaps fortunate, perhaps unfortunate—is that Australian courts have been denied the opportunity of hammering out firm legal rules.

This is a good opportunity to give them the chance. Page 22 continues:

As the examples above demonstrate, both Government authorities and individuals are consequently uncertain of their legal rights.

I come to chapter III, on page 98, headed, "*Locus standi of the States*", which states:

Consequently, if there exist no legal rights between States, or between individual residents of different States, to water in interstate rivers, then each State would have complete power to control at will the waters of any interstate rivers as they flow through the territory. This position of territorial supremacy is commonly termed the Harmon Doctrine, and at the turn of the century, it was popularly thought to be the

applicable rule of international law covering international rivers.

They go on to say, at page 101:

There is very strong authority for the view that, if rights to interstate rivers exist across State boundaries, the States, either under their own names or through their Attorneys-General, may sue to enforce and protect those rights.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will never know until we try it out. Page 104 states:

The theory that a State may sue to protect public rights of its citizens which do not depend on the Constitution or some other paramount legislation is known in the United States of America as the *parens patriae* doctrine. The term *parens patriae* is susceptible to some confusion, as it is used in two quite distinct areas of law. First, it denotes part of the Royal prerogative . . . A second meaning of this term as it is used in the United States relates to the sovereign or quasi-sovereign rights of the States to bring suits in the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to protect the general health and welfare of the State's citizens . . . the doctrine has entitled some States to seek relief against such activities as discriminatory quarantine of another State, pollution of an interstate river, diversions from an interstate river . . .

In the U.S.A., there would be no doubt that we could do this, but they say that the position under the Australian Constitution is different from that under the U.S. Constitution. At page 107:

Nevertheless, while the *parens patriae* doctrine is obviously distinguishable from the Australian Constitutional system, it can be argued that the doctrine is in fact a necessary corollary of federation, regardless of whether the federating States were previously independent or not.

At page 111:

A further argument in favour of the competence of the States to sue to enforce rights to interstate rivers is drawn from the common law rules applicable to watercourses. The rights of an individual at common law to the use and continued flow of a stream depend on his ownership of the bed or one of the banks of that stream: hence "riparian rights". It may be argued that, if an interstate river flows through or past a State, then by analogy that State must have "riparian rights".

At page 132:

Jurisdiction thus depends upon the existence of rules of law, either statutory or common law, governing inter-governmental relations with respect to interstate rivers. To determine the questions of both jurisdiction and the content of substantive rights held by the States, it is therefore necessary to examine the sources of law upon which the High Court may draw to determine an interstate "matter".

I will not quote any more of that. It is sufficient, I think, to show that there is a very strong argument that we are entitled to go to the court and that we are entitled to expect some relief. I know that the Minister's intervention last year in the New South Wales matter, soon after he came to office, in relation to the issuing of further water licences, was not well received in that State; in fact, it was regarded as offensive, and it may, unfortunately, have put back considerably negotiations to reach agreement between the States and the Commonwealth.

I am afraid it has. No doubt, the Minister wanted to take some initiative, and I do not blame him for that. It may be that it was hamfistedly done; I do not know. Certainly, in my view, we are entitled to take proceedings in the court, and we should try it. It is of such supreme importance to us, and negotiations are dragging on and on, with no prospect of finality. In my view, we should bite the bullet and do it. I am sorry that the Minister has not already done it. It is not difficult to draw the endorsement on the writ

and to have the writ issued.

I hope that what I have said will be encouraging to him. I apologise if I have said anything offensive, because I did not mean to do that. I have moved this motion because it is a matter on which we should all be agreed. We are all South Australians, with an interest in this, and we are entitled to a decent supply of water from the Murray River. This may be one way to ensure that we can get it.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I appreciate the honourable member's efforts in this direction. He referred briefly to the fact that, soon after coming to office, I decided that, in the interests of South Australia, we would oppose all further irrigation diversions in the Eastern States. The honourable member said that this may have had an influence on New South Wales not proceeding with the proposed amendments to the River Murray Waters Act that will give the River Murray Commission some control over water quality in the Murray River and its tributaries. It is my opinion that, with New South Wales intending to divert an additional 60 000 to 100 000 hectares of irrigation water, if the amendments are to give the River Murray Commission an opportunity to call a halt to that 60 000 to 100 000 hectares of additional irrigation, obviously the New South Wales Government will not proceed with the amendments at this stage: that situation is generally accepted throughout the community, especially in the River areas of South Australia. New South Wales would have too much to lose by proceeding at this stage.

As recently as 10 October, the New South Wales *Government Gazette* gave another full page of applications for irrigation diversions on the tributaries of the Murray River system in New South Wales. One application from O'Brien and O'Brien was for a further 7 000 hectares of irrigation diversion; that is about double the area of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the largest individual irrigation diversion in South Australia. We have a total irrigation diversion in South Australia of some 42 000 hectares. The additional diversions being sought in New South Wales over and above the present massive irrigation areas cover between 60 000 and 100 000 hectares. I simply do not believe that the New South Wales Government will pass at this stage legislation that will restrict it from proceeding with that additional allocation. That is common logic.

Since taking office, the Government has opposed all further irrigation diversion applications in New South Wales. Of course, New South Wales is not happy with my action, but the effect on South Australia is far more critical than are the benefits of the additional irrigation diversions in New South Wales. It might be interesting for the honourable member to know that in only one month in the past 10-month period has South Australia not been on its statutory allocation of water. During the months of February and March this year, during the major period of irrigation demand on the Murray River system, a loss situation prevailed in the river. During the past 10 months, only during a four-week period has any water passed through the barrages at the mouth of the river. During February and March, the volume of water going over Lock 1 on an average is 4 000 megalitres a day. The average evaporation rate and diversion rate below Lock 1 is about 6 000 megalitres a day.

When South Australia is on its statutory allocation of water, there is in some months insufficient water to meet the demands of irrigation and domestic use in metropolitan Adelaide, agricultural uses for stock water, domestic use, and for the major provincial towns throughout the State. We are very dependent in this State on the additional flows over and above our statutory

allocation in order to transport in the main the Victorian and New South Wales pollution or salinity load of about 1 000 000 tonnes annually which we in South Australia inherit and which must be transported through South Australia to the sea. While we are on our statutory allocation, and while there is no flow to the sea, that 1 000 000 tonnes of salt annually is locked up in the Murray River system in South Australia. The member for Mitcham, along with other people in South Australia, is consuming part of that 1 000 000 tonnes of salt that we inherit in our daily water requirements.

That is precisely why the Government took action as soon as it came to office to try to create a moratorium on further irrigation diversions, particularly in New South Wales. The Premier wrote to the Premier of New South Wales, seeking a moratorium on further irrigation diversions until the amendments to the River Murray Waters Act Agreement have been passed or ratified by the four Parliaments, giving the River Murray Commission an opportunity to fully assess the effects on South Australia of additional irrigation diversions in the Eastern States.

Reference was made to the objection lodged by South Australia at the Western Land Board hearing at Wentworth, when South Australia objected to the applications for further irrigation diversions. On that occasion, the Land Board upheld South Australia's objection, and the New South Wales Government has now appealed to the Supreme Court to have the decision reversed. The hearing commenced on Monday of last week in the Supreme Court in Sydney and at this stage it is proceeding well. I am informed that our representation in New South Wales is proceeding well, and that the hearing has been adjourned until 24 November. I believe that South Australia is in a good position at this stage.

I believe that South Australia is in a good position at this stage. However, whatever the outcome of that hearing might be, it does give the legal fraternity, and particularly the Crown Law Office in South Australia, the opportunity to study this complex situation of water apportionment, the quality of the water and the legal problems associated with it. This is the first time one State has challenged another in relation to the actual quality of the water. I was hoping that the member for Mitcham would have been able to give us a more positive answer to the question whether or not we can effectively institute proceedings for an injunction through the High Court. As I indicated to him in my letter, this matter is being studied in depth at the moment by the Attorney-General and officers of the Crown Law Office. At this stage they are not able to advise whether such an action would be effective. However, in the meantime, I believe the proceedings in the Supreme Court are paving the way for further action that may be necessary. As I said earlier, it is unfortunate that the member for Mitcham has not been able to furnish the House with a more positive statement in relation to the likely success or otherwise. As such, that is exactly why at this moment—

Mr. Millhouse: You've got to be prepared to give it a go, that is what I say.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: At this stage, the Government is giving it a go and it has been giving it a go right from the time it came into office. The honourable member has suggested that we might be frightening New South Wales off and that we may have upset them. I am prepared to run that risk, even if the member for Mitcham is not prepared to do so, and I believe I have the support of the majority of the people in South Australia for the action the Government has taken. We are awaiting a definite opinion from the Crown Law Office as to the

effectiveness or otherwise of seeking an injunction through the High Court.

The honourable member referred to the agreement between the United States and Mexico. In 1977, I spent about four weeks in the United States in the Colorado River area discussing with officers the history of the salinity problem that arose between the United States and Mexico and what action was taken to solve the problem. It is interesting to note that the problems of the Colorado River are similar to those of the Murray River system, and that is why I went specifically to that area. Mexico receives 1 850 000 megalitres annual entitlement under the 1944 treaty with the United States of America, and it is only in more recent years that that agreement has been reached on water quality. That was arrived at following continual representation by the President of Mexico to the President of the United States, following the incredible damage that had occurred to the irrigation areas of Mexico, particularly along the Mexicali Valley which was nearly all wiped out as a result of salt coming from the United States. Mexico threatened to take this issue to the International Court. It did not reach that stage but the United States made an acknowledgment of responsibility, and I think Victoria and New South Wales must acknowledge that they do have a moral obligation to supply South Australia's allocation of water in a fit and proper state for it to be utilised effectively. This is the basis of the agreement with Mexico.

The Mexican agreement states that water leaving Imperial Dam, which is the last major storage on the Colorado system before the Mexican border, must not be in excess of 115 parts per million, plus or minus 30 parts per million, over and above the salinity level of the water contained in Imperial Dam. The River Murray Waters Act must include a similar provision ensuring that water entering South Australia will be on a similar basis, plus or minus a given agreed amount. Until we can reach agreement on that, South Australia's situation will continue to deteriorate. As I wish to make further points after I have received advice from the Crown Law Office, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BURNSIDE ROAD CLOSURES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979, relating to Traffic Prohibition—Burnside, made on 29 May 1980 and laid on the table of this House on 3 June 1980, be disallowed.

These regulations concern the very fierce controversy which has raged in a part of the City of Burnside—Toorak Gardens, Rose Park and that area—over road closures. Originally, because their local member, the Premier, was not prepared to soil his hands with the matter, I was approached for help about it, as happens so often. That was about 12 months ago and notices on motion for disallowance were put on, I think, by the member for Unley and by me on the same day. However, as happens in this place, they were stillborn because the Government brought private members' business to an end and that was that, despite all the talk about there being a possibility of getting these things dealt with. Since then, happily, I believe most of the problems are being ironed out, but those who have been in touch with me were anxious that the notice be put on the paper again just in case something goes wrong. I put it down for today and I think, as a matter of prudence, it is better for me to move as I have done, so that we have started on the process should we need to go

further, rather than have it as a Notice of Motion for another day.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Ashenden:

That this House commends the Government on its decision to immediately proceed with the provision of a modern rapid public transport system utilising all the advantages of conventional and guided bus-ways, to serve the people of the North-Eastern suburbs of Adelaide, and its associated decision to restore and develop the River Torrens in line with the River Torrens Study Report prepared by Hassell and Partners Pty. Ltd.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 894.)

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): It is with pleasure that I continue the motion I put on 17 September commending the Government on its decision to implement the busway proposal for the north-eastern suburbs. I have earlier shown that there are many points in favour of such a busway proposal, the three major ones being cost, convenience and comfort. I also pointed out that the action the Government has taken is the only action that could have been taken by any responsible Government. The action of the Government has been subjected to a large number of emotional and incorrect statements and I started to correct some of those on the last occasion. A large number of factors influenced the Government in its decision and it is not, as has been implied, a political decision in any shape or form.

What the Government's decision does is to provide residents of the north-eastern suburbs with the most modern transport system in the world at a fraction of the cost of any other alternative. I pointed out, however, that the final cost in inflated terms for the busway proposal is estimated to be \$60 000 000 where, at the same time, for the I.r.t. the cost would have been \$178 000 000.

We also have heard that these costs are of a short-term advantage only, but I pointed out very clearly earlier that this just is not the case, for the busway is much cheaper in the long term as well as in the short term. I pointed, however, out that in the year 2005, at which time the busway proposal will be at its greatest disadvantage, since the buses will at that time have been replaced, even so the cost then of the busway proposal is still half of the then cost of the I.r.t. proposal.

I have also pointed out that the Government's proposal will service all residents of all suburbs in the north-eastern area, in that the buses will be utilised for all suburbs in that area and will not just be a tramway between Tea Tree Plaza and the city of Adelaide. I also pointed out that the Government's busway proposal removes any necessity for interchange. On the inward journey, I granted that there could be a quick changeover for a person, say, travelling from Banksia Park to the city, since when he arrived at the plaza it would not be very long before a tram would be going, so he would spend only, say, three or four minutes before he was on his way again. I pointed out that the interchange is a major disadvantage on the homeward journey for there, although trams would be travelling frequently between the city and the plaza, there certainly would not be feeder buses leaving the plaza for the outer suburbs with anything like such a frequency.

I used the example of the resident of Banksia Park. If he arrived at the plaza just after a bus had left for Banksia Park, he could be standing there for 30 minutes or more. I

acknowledge that one of the advantages of the light rail is that it would have been faster between the city and the plaza by a few minutes. However, what must be acknowledged is that by utilising buses, where there is no changeover, any residents living away from the plaza will get a quicker journey to the city because of lack of interchange. Previously the member for Salisbury said that he had interchanged frequently from his present home in coming to the city and he and other residents have come to accept that. Certainly, I acknowledge that that is the case but surely, if the Government can provide a system where no such interchange is necessary, it must be an advantage.

Another point that has been made frequently is that the roadway systems in the suburbs of Tea Tree Gully will not be able to handle the buses. I will certainly enlarge on this later in my speech, but I do want to point out, as I have done earlier, that in fact the actual weight through the axles on the buses of the Government's proposal will be less than that of the buses that we presently have in service, and therefore the damage to the roads must be less. We must also not overlook the fact that, even under the I.r.t. proposal, there would have been feeder buses operating along exactly the same roads to bring people to Tea Tree Plaza, and I therefore feel any such argument along those lines is fallacious.

When we look at comfort we find that, with the tramway, there would have been probably in the region of 170 persons on board a tram at peak period, with more than half standing at the rate of four per square metre, a situation which I am sure all passengers would have found most uncomfortable. As has been stated by the Government, in the case of the articulated buses, all passengers will be seated, so I am sure we do not have to look very far to see which system is more comfortable. The present buses cannot be compared with the type of bus the Government is planning to use, since there will be a much lower floor, access will be easier, and the ride will be much smoother. There will not be frequent stops, and the system will provide a very comfortable, quick ride for passengers from the north-east suburbs to the city. I think the fact that, with the tramway, so many would have been standing shows that the previous Government knew it could not afford to buy enough trams to make the system work at its best.

Then we have heard that the O'Bahn system is unproven. I would like to quote Mr. Peter Burden, who is the expert used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as well as the Australian Electric Traction Association, in arguments against the O'Bahn. I find that remarkable. These are some of the points made by Mr. Burden about O'Bahn. He has said:

Its promise is for low cost, high convenience of service and established standards of comfort. It is the result of almost a decade of planning and hard work.

He then says:

The advantage of the system is that it is low cost and the cost of setting up a length of guided track is far below that of new road making, and [I emphasise] far less again than that of a new rail system.

He continues by again stating:

The O'Bahn system has been around for some time and it quite obviously works and works very well.

Remember, I am quoting Mr. Burden, the expert used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when arguing against O'Bahn. Mr. Burden says:

Its promise to mass transit is enormous, and the things it can do are astounding. The O'Bahn system has already proved itself as a transit system.

He continues:

One was installed late last year as a feeder for the northern

German city of Hamburg. More than 300 000 passengers were successfully carried, and the Kassel test facility has also been important in demonstrating it.

He says that in Essen a light rail system will be replaced by O'Bahn. An underground O'Bahn system will be put in the city of Regensburg and both Bangkok and Heidelberg will have O'Bahn systems implemented. He says that:

A difficult section of an O'Bahn network can be constructed at minimum cost, using materials which are made in basic modules. This means further savings on the cost of construction (and I stress this), and better still, less encroachment of the existing environment.

That is just so important when we come to consider the area along the Torrens River.

Members opposite have attempted to build up fear about what happens should a bus break down on the guideway, or if a tyre should deflate. To rebut this, I would again like to come back to the points made by Mr. Burden as follows:

Tyre slash tests on guided sections, emergency braking, and braking with the wheels only on one side produced no ill effects,

He goes on to say:

The O'Bahn system really works.

This is the opinion of an expert that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition uses in his argument against O'Bahn, and is also used by the Australian Electric Traction Association as one of its sources of reference.

The member for Salisbury also acknowledges that what was first thought to be a problem should a bus break down is, in fact, not a problem at all, for, should a bus break down, it can be pushed along by a following bus to a point where it can be taken from the guideway, and thus normal use of the full system is allowed. However, in spite of the member for Salisbury's admission on this point (and, after all, he has been to Germany and studied this system, and therefore the point that he has made must carry some considerable weight with the members opposite), those members opposite are still trying to instil fear into residents of the north-eastern suburbs through the local paper that, should a bus break down, the whole system will come to a halt. This obvious scare tactic is totally untrue but still does not seem to stop the previous member for Newland (Mr. Klunder) and other members opposite from putting this fallacious argument forward. Mr. Burden states:

The advantages of such a network (that is the Mercedes-Benz guided busway network) appear enormously attractive. A mass transit system which can utilise an existing mode—buses—which is less expensive to construct than other systems, which conserves space, and which appears to trouble the existing environment less than any other is worth a considered thought. We have the first truly new and practicable transit system in years.

And this point of Mr. Burden's I would like to take up. The system is tried, it is proven, and the Government proposes to install a combination of Mercedes-Benz guided busway and conventional busway. As Mr. Burden has shown only too clearly, the guided busway system works, and we know from experience overseas that conventional busway systems work, and this is illustrated in a number of North American cities. Those who have been fortunate enough to travel overseas and to have visited, for example, as I have, the national capital of the United States, would have seen a conventional busway operating extremely successfully in that city, just as others operate in Pittsburgh and Los Angeles, and also in other cities. This Government has chosen a combination which will allow all the benefits of each system to be used, as each system is to be used where it is best suited.

Members opposite really do not give up on their mis-statements, for we also find their stating that the buses will cause trouble once they arrive in the city area. Again, this is sheer scare tactics. When the buses reach Park Terrace, they will travel on their own bus lane through to the city and Grenfell Street. The buses will have a traffic light system which they can operate to give them priority over all other traffic, and there will therefore be no delays, once the buses leave the guideway.

I would now like to discuss the Government's plans in relation to the Torrens River valley. The Government will be providing an additional \$4 000 000 to enable beautification of that section of the Torrens to be utilised for the guided busway, and beautification will precede the development of the busway system. A cycle track will be constructed, and the area will be opened up, beautified, and provide for the travellers along the busway one of the most beautiful trips to a capital city anywhere in the world. At the same time, residents will be able to utilise an area which is presently little more than an area for rubbish collection. This development will be in line with that proposed in the report prepared for the Government by Hassell and Partners, and indicates this Government's desire to do all possible for the environment.

The next point that I would like to take up in relation to the advantages of a busway when compared to a tramway is motive power. Had a tramway been installed, the only possible system of power that could have been used is through electricity provided via overhead wires. At the moment this is not the most cost efficient method of motive power. The cheapest form of power is presently diesel, and it is considered that this will continue to be the case for a considerable number of years. This means that the Government's decision to utilise diesel buses will result in considerable savings in energy costs, and statements by members opposite that electric power has the least effect on the environment and is the only thing to use in view of the difficulty of supply of fossil fuels, must be made with their tongues in their cheeks. I ask the members opposite: just where do they think electric power comes from? Of course, it is generated by the burning of fossil fuels.

There will certainly be sufficient diesel fuel for more than the next few years and, even if costs continue to escalate as they presently are, this will still be the cheapest form of power for a considerable time. But then again, we find another big advantage of the bus proposal in that the buses will, after approximately 15 years, require replacement. This will mean that, at that time, the Government will be able to utilise even more up-to-date technology than is presently available, and we must all admit that technology is at the moment advancing far more rapidly than ever before. In 15 years, who knows what sort of systems will be available for use in motive power?

Even at this stage though, we do know that the busway system can utilise other forms of motive power. There could be trolley electric, there could be battery electric, there could be l.p.g., or l.n.g., or methanol.

Even more interesting is the fact that the buses can be hybrid, that is, they can each utilise two systems of motive power, and Mercedes-Benz already have some of these in operation. Thus, for example, they could be trolley electric between Adelaide and Tea Tree Plaza and then revert to diesel, or they could be trolley electric, and then battery electric for the run from the plaza out to the suburbs, or any other of many various combinations of types of motive power. Therefore, unlike the trams, which could only be electric, the buses can utilise, at any given time, the most efficient and the most cost effective form of power.

Another aspect that must be considered in relation to the Government's decision is the tremendous flexibility of the busway proposal. The development of the City of Tea Tree Gully is far from complete, and there are rapidly changing patterns of land use. Therefore, as time goes on, there will be a shifting emphasis in transport needs. With a busway system, it will mean that buses, because of their flexibility, will be much more able to meet the growing and changing requirements of the north-eastern suburbs. Again, because of the very much lower capital cost, it will mean that increased usage of the Modbury transport corridor will be much more easily catered for. A bus can be purchased for approximately one-sixth the cost of a tram, and so it will be much easier for the Government to increase its fleet of buses than it would be to increase a fleet of trams.

A further point in favour of the busway is that residents living in suburbs such as Highbury, Dernancourt, and Holden Hill, for example, will not have to catch a feeder-bus to take them in the reverse direction from the city, to the plaza, and then catch a tram to the city, as would have been the case under the previous Government's proposal. Now, buses will be able to pick up passengers in those suburbs and join the busway at Darley Road, for example, and continue with the direct journey to the city. There will be no doubling back, and therefore, for those residents, there will be very, very considerable time savings. They will not double back to the plaza; they will not have to interchange; they will be able to board a bus, and very quickly move directly to the city.

It is perfectly clear that the Government is instituting a rapid transport system for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs which is second to none. We have heard statements from independent experts and the only criticism of the Government's decision I have heard have come either from members opposite or from specific interest groups such as the Light Rail Action Group and the Electric Traction Society who, of course, have their own specific interests at heart.

Mr. Slater: What about the Tea Tree Gully council?

Mr. ASHENDEN: I am sure that the honourable member has his tongue in cheek, as he knows full well how many members of the Labor Party are on that council. Those people have not concerned themselves with costs and with what is best both for the State as a whole and for the north-eastern suburbs in particular.

The Light Rail Action Group and the President of the Australian Electric Traction Association have also attempted to argue their case by putting forward misrepresentations. Mr. Wheaton, of the Australian Electric Traction Association, states that the Government's decision to implement a busway proposal was clearly political. Nothing could be further from the truth. Had the previous Government installed its monument to Mr. Virgo, that would have been a political decision. This Government considered cost, convenience, and comfort, all three areas, as I have shown, which indicated a busway as the clear winner. The decision was a good one, based on sound economics and sound policies. It is the Labor Party and specific interest groups that are making this issue political.

The residents of the north-eastern suburbs must be extremely alarmed at the behaviour of members opposite and the previous member for Newland, Mr. Klunder, who have made clear that they will do all they can to stop the busway from proceeding. This is grossly irresponsible and typical of the Party opposite, which has not yet realised that it is no longer in power and that we now have a Government whose prime consideration is to ensure that the interests of the people are put first.

As I have said, this Government does not wish to erect a monument to its Minister of Transport. It wishes to provide the people of the north-eastern suburbs with the most modern and efficient public transport system possible, and this it is doing, at a fraction of the cost of the previous Government's proposal. This will mean more money for the improvement of transport to other suburbs and other additional essential Government works.

If members opposite continue in their efforts to stop the busway, they will be seen for what they are—negative and against the interests of the north-eastern suburbs. Statements have been made in the local press in the north-east that, should the Labor Party regain power (and let us hope for the sake of this State that this never occurs) it would stop the busway proposal. This would be at a time when the project would be nearing half completion. Can you imagine the huge waste of public funds that would occur if members opposite were to do this? I am certain that residents throughout South Australia, and particularly those in the north-eastern suburbs, would have no bar of such a proposal by any group representing itself as an alternative Government.

Members opposite, and their supporters in the north-east, have continually employed the familiar scare tactics used so often by them. We see these tactics being used in relation to the north-eastern suburbs transport system. Even the member for Salisbury, for whom, as I have said before, I have the greatest respect, has attempted to confuse the issue. Certain matters were raised by him in his personal explanation yesterday, and I will soon refer to these briefly. He previously stated that buses would be travelling at 80 km/h along suburban roads in competition with pedestrians. This is, of course, ludicrous.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker. I withdrew this particular reference in a later speech; the honourable member should refer to more current speeches.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I accept the point made by the member for Salisbury, but he made that statement without adequately checking and verifying the true situation. If one is to put arguments to the public, one should ensure that those arguments are accurate. The guideway will be similar to a light rail system and the high speed track for the buses, or the trams, will be quite separate from pedestrian traffic. I acknowledge that the honourable member has retracted his statement and I will say no more about it. I also believe that the same honourable member must have spoken with tongue in cheek yesterday in his personal explanation, when he said that he had mentioned bus capacities of 150 because he had read articles that emanated from Germany. Had he read the S.T.A. report (and he acknowledged that he was aware of current S.T.A. and union policies in relation to articulated buses), why did he say that the buses would have 150 people on them? He knew full well that this would not be the case in South Australia, and I wonder what motive he had in citing that figure. I read into his statement that he was trying to confuse the public of South Australia. He should have used not the West German figures but the figures that he knew and admitted that he knew were right in relation to South Australia.

I have already said that, in his personal explanation, the honourable member talked about damage to roads. If he were fully aware of the important aspect of weight, he would know that the greatest factor is axle weight and, as he has now acknowledged, the axle weight of the buses that would be implemented by the Government will be less than the axle weight of the buses that are presently used and, therefore, there will certainly be no increase in road

damage. I have already made the point that, even if I.r.t. was used, feeder buses would operate on the same roads.

The member for Salisbury cited figures in regard to Essen, but, as he stated, he was the one who calculated those figures. He also talked about the expense of the implementation of the system in that city. Again, I wonder why he would talk about the cost in Essen and not the cost in South Australia. Is it because he acknowledges that he knows only too well that the Government's arguments and costs are only too true and that there will be huge savings to the South Australian public because of the implementation of the busway system?

The honourable member withdrew the statement that he made about the guideways going along ordinary roads in Adelaide. He indicated that that is the case overseas, and he assumed that this situation would occur in Adelaide. If members opposite want to argue the O'Bahn case, surely it behoves them to determine what is proposed before they issue statements that turn out to be quite untrue. Why did the honourable member make that statement if it was not meant to alarm the residents of the north-east suburbs?

The member for Salisbury referred to the statements made by Mr. Klunder in the north-east area, to which I also referred, and, as the honourable member acknowledged, Mr. Klunder based his arguments on statements that are open to interpretation. Again, I ask why Mr. Klunder and the member for Salisbury made their interpretation if it was not to mislead the public.

The Leader of the Opposition has also attempted to use a number of scare tactics in his responses to the Government's announcement. First, he has said that an extra 90 buses in the city would increase congestion, especially in Grenfell Street, neatly implying that all these buses are going to be there at pretty well one time. This is, of course, ridiculous.

Dr. Billard interjecting:

Mr. ASHENDEN: I will be making that point shortly—that there will be fewer buses in the city. I thank the honourable member for reminding me of that point, which is a good point. The point made by the Leader of the Opposition was ridiculous, and he has completely overlooked the fact that, although there will certainly be buses coming from the busway into the city, the number of buses coming in along the Lower North-East Road and the North-East Road will be reduced. Not only will there not be, at any time, 90 extra buses in the city but there will not be as big an increase in the number of buses in the city as the Leader implied, and, in fact, 11 fewer buses will operate after the busway commences than operated before that time.

Also, the city of Adelaide should, like overseas cities, encourage public transport in the inner city area and discourage private cars in that area. I see no reason whatsoever why Grenfell Street and Currie Street should not become streets for the standing of buses only, and that no kerbside parking be allowed for cars. In this way, the Currie-Grenfell Street area could become a major interchange for passengers travelling on alternative routes and no inconvenience could be caused whatsoever.

In the *North-East Leader* of 10 September, the Leader continued his gross misrepresentations of the truth. He stated that, when a busway is built along the Modbury transport corridor, it will be widened in the future to create a freeway. It really would be most interesting to see private cars attempting to use the guided busway section if such a project as the Leader's were to be taken seriously. When members opposite make this kind of statement, it is obvious that they cannot compete with the Government on facts, and they therefore have to resort to these

emotional scare tactics.

Also, let us face facts: if a light rail system had been implemented along the Modbury transport corridor, there would have been just as much room left for a freeway as there is with a conventional busway. So, the Leader was, as usual, speaking arrant nonsense.

Then he continued, in his press statement, by stating that the busway is untested and technologically suspect. I have already dealt with this aspect, and repeat, for the Leader's benefit, because it is obvious that things have to be repeated many times before they can sink in, that conventional busways have been used for many years in many overseas cities most successfully, and the Mercedes-Benz guided busway has been proved under normal, commercial, public operation in Hamburg, as well as at the Mercedes-Benz test facilities.

Again, for the Leader's benefit, I repeat that many cities throughout the world will be implementing a busway because it offers all that light rail offers at a fraction of the cost, and busways are already replacing light rail in Essen.

Again, the Leader repeats his statement that the busway option of the Government is not cheaper than light rail. He obviously cannot understand figures, so again I will repeat that in the initial stages the busway will cost one-third of the cost of a light rail system, leaving almost \$120 000 000 for this Government to spend in other areas, and, in the long term, as I have said before, the closest that the busway proposal will get to light rail in cost is one-half, and this occurs immediately after the full replacement of buses after 15-20 years.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. ASHENDEN: I suggest that the honourable member go to the library and read the article in the *North-East Leader* and see whether I am making any misrepresentations.

When those buses are replaced, just think of the advanced technology that the Government will then be able to incorporate.

Mr. Keneally: You only replace them once, I take it?

Mr. ASHENDEN: I will take up that point, too. The second time they will be replaced is when the trams would have to be replaced, and buses cost one-sixth of the cost of a tram. So, I would not push that too far, if I were the honourable member.

I come back to my original point: the Leader of the Opposition cannot refute the positive advantages of a busway and has therefore resorted to emotionalism and statements that do not bear looking at as far as truth is concerned. I am certain the people of the north-eastern suburbs will see through the smokescreen which he and his colleagues are attempting to put up.

The Leader also states that trams will be pollution free and energy conserving because they are electric. Again I ask the Leader: will the area which is producing the electric power be pollution free? I also ask again. Where does he believe that electric power comes from? It is not found under cabbage bushes, and causing no trouble. It is the result of the burning of fossil fuels, and, at this stage, diesel in buses is cheaper and more efficient than fossil fuels being used for providing electricity for buses or for trams. Therefore, it points out the wisdom of the Government's decision.

He also restates, in his article of 10 September, that the O'Bahn buses are untested. This again is patently false, and I refer him to the reports of the Government officers and Mr. Burden which show that the buses and the Mercedes-Benz guideway system work extremely well.

Let us hope that when the Leader enters this debate he will do so with some factual information, because most of what I have seen of his outbursts so far is certainly far from

factual. Earlier in this session the member for Price also made some statements. All I can advise him is that he should do a lot more homework. He attempted earlier this session to criticise the north-east transport proposal, and said (among the arguments he put forward) that Daimler-Benz has got only a 1.3 kilometre test track in Essen and that is all that it has. This, of course, is totally untrue, and the test track is not even in Essen! Essen is the city in which last month the O'Bahn replaced a previous light rail system and commenced operation. He totally ignored the other areas where O'Bahn has successfully operated, such as in Hamburg.

Another point I take up is in relation to the member for Playford. I notice that he is not in the House at present, and has not been in the House during the debate, yet he stated in the *North-East Leader* that the Government was not going to allow debate on the north-east transport system. He made a big thing of this in the *Leader*.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ASHENDEN: Before I was rudely interrupted, I was saying that—

Mr. O'NEILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the honourable member implying that you rudely interrupted him when you responded to my call?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. However, I suggest to honourable members on both sides that, after a ruling has been called for and given from the Chair, there should be no reference to it on any occasion. I do not take offence at the comment made by the honourable member for Todd.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I made my remark in a humorous manner, with a smile on my face, and certainly it was not referring to your ruling, Sir.

The member for Playford has made a big issue in the *North-East Leader* of the fact that the Government would not allow debate on the north-east transport proposal. (Again, he is still not in the House). He knew, when he made that statement, that it was patently false because, when he put that in the *North-East Leader*, this debate had already commenced in the House. To make that sort of statement again only supports the feeling I have that the Opposition is not interested in putting facts before the residents of the north-east suburbs, but is trying to confuse the issue with untrue emotional statements not based on fact. This sort of thing is doing the Opposition no good whatsoever. If only Opposition members could put forward the truth of the matter in their articles in the *North-East Leader*, I am sure that all residents would be much the happier.

Other Opposition members have continued their scare tactics by saying that the replacement costs with O'Bahn buses would be tremendous. As I have already pointed out, although the buses must be replaced twice as often as the trams, you are still looking at a considerably lower cost for a bus as against a tram. The potential saving of purchasing the buses against trams would result in a saving of \$500 000 per vehicle in the long term.

Members opposite have attempted to confuse the public on costs. I have already covered that point, and there is no doubt whatsoever that both in the short term and in the long term the Government's busway proposal is far, far cheaper than the light rail proposal put forward at the last election by the previous Government.

Members opposite state that the light rail transport system would be the fastest system. Except for the section between the Plaza and the city, that statement is untrue. Very few residents live at Tea Tree Plaza. For those living away from the Plaza the busway will be quicker. Members

opposite have attempted to say that the buses would be noisy and polluting, and they criticise the use of diesel fuel. They will not be noisy; they will not be polluting, and they will use diesel fuel initially because of its economy.

Members opposite have said that a busway will be slow. The busway, again I point out, except in the area between the Plaza and the city, will be faster overall. There will be no interchange, and passengers will not have that inconvenience. On this point, when we look at the report prepared by officers of the S.T.A., we find that they state that there are many advantages of the bus system. Buses are highly dependable; they will provide a quicker trip to the city; they will result in lower increases in the deficit of the S.T.A.; they have a much better benefit-cost ratio; they offer greater flexibility of use; they will enable earlier use of advanced vehicle technology; and various power sources can be utilised. How could the Government have come up with any other alternative?

In conclusion, I put my motion to the House for its endorsement, as this Government has made a decision to develop a combined conventional and guided busway system as it is by far the cheapest option in both the short and long term. It is far and away the most convenient option for the residents it is designed to serve. It offers far and away the greatest degree of passenger comfort, and is based on good decision analysis and good decision making processes. A busway is to be proceeded with, providing the north-eastern suburbs with a transport system as modern and convenient as any in the world, and for this the Government must be commended.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): It is with pleasure that I rise again on the subject of the O'Bahn system. I seem to be taking part in a kind of Parliamentary volleyball with the member for Todd, and I have a feeling that it will not end until the next election, Sir, when you announce that the House is prorogued. It cannot continue after the next election, because only I will be in this House at that time.

The points raised by the member for Todd are most interesting. He has given a great deal of information, much of which is certainly very accurate in content, but much of which is not entirely accurate to the situation in hand, and perhaps it attempts to create a situation that is not entirely correct. I give the member for Todd credit for the fact that he chose to acknowledge all the points I made in my personal explanation, with the exception of one, where he did some circumlocution. He has obviously accepted the others as being valid and correct, and I accept that. Unfortunately, he undid some of the good work by making other references to things I have said which I have already refuted in this House. That was not really necessary, because it merely indicated that he is not reading in *Hansard* what is going on.

The member for Todd said that I had said, with regard to the problems of bus breakdowns and guideways, that there is no problem at all. I refer the member for Todd to page 1017 of *Hansard* of 23 September, in which I was commenting on a similar assertion by the Minister of Transport. On that occasion, I acknowledged that there was no technical problem with the breakdown. I acknowledged that and I say it again. I said on that occasion:

I went on to say that this can be done only with time table disruption.

I said, further down:

Indeed, I would have to concur in the comment made in a report to the Minister of Transport in November 1979 by Messrs. Waite and Miller, who said:

There could also be industrial and mechanical

problems in pushing buses in service which would need to be resolved.

While I said there are not the problems perhaps that we had initially anticipated, I did not say that there was no problem at all. I am concerned that neither the member for Todd nor the Minister has touched on the possibility of industrial problems with buses breaking down in the guideway. This is an important area. We on this side have been accused of speaking before the facts are known and before the situation is fully resolved, but if this situation has been resolved I would appreciate information from the Minister. What is the position of a driver, pushing in front of him a bus that has broken down, with his vision clearly obstructed? That must be responded to by the union with a great deal of concern and caution. The driver has to push the bus, not knowing what is in front of the disabled bus in front of him. It may be that the Minister or the member for Todd has thought out some solution to this—a giant periscope or something. These are issues that need to be touched on. I have raised them to get some response, and I hope that I will. I take it that the member for Newland is speaking next, and that he will give the Minister's response. That is good.

I also mentioned the matter of running along roadways at 80 km/h, and we had a little interchange on that matter. I think the member for Todd accepts the point now. I acknowledge that the Government in this State does not want to apply the system in the same way that it has applied in Essen, where buses will be going at 80 km/h next to roadways and in one instance down the middle of a roadway. The Government does not want to apply that aspect of the design, but the other aspects it is applying worry me.

The member for Todd said that I was constantly referring to the West German documents regarding bus capacity, not mentioning that one of the documents I quoted from was issued under the auspices of the Department of Transport in Adelaide, using the reference of 150. When the member for Todd first attempted to rebut my comments, he said that the seating capacity of the bus was 70, and that I had not been far out, that the figure was only half what I had said before. He was juxtaposing seating capacities and fully loaded capacities, but we will ignore that.

The State Transport Authority figures suggest that, due to axle loading regulations, the maximum number an articulated bus can carry is 123, not 70. If the member for Todd was trying to imply that the figure I initially quoted was double the figure that would be the situation, I think he should acknowledge that he was wrong; 123 is the permissible maximum for articulated buses on S.T.A. figures. The member for Todd may have read one reference where it talks about average loads for articulated buses and the figure of 70 is given there. I think he read that too quickly and ignored the word "average". The S.T.A. information gives the figure of more than 100, and I wish that had been mentioned by the honourable member.

With regard to axle weights, he seems to indicate that I had now come to the realisation that they are lighter. I did not say that. I had done the figures with my calculator, using information available from the German document, and I gave the percentages yesterday. The member for Todd must know that, within the area of traffic engineering studies people contend that there is a wear factor determined by the repetitions of wheel passes, and if you have a large number of wheel passes on a slightly lighter axle loading ratio that may well cause as much damage as a substantially fewer number of wheel passes with heavier axle weights. There may be wear and tear,

and I will come back to that in a minute on another aspect of the O'Bahn system that has been praised.

There is a debate among traffic engineers about the relative wear and tear factors of these two things, and given that articulated buses are not significantly lighter in axle loading (14 to 15 per cent), it is highly possible that the repetition of wheel passes should be taken into account.

I follow that from another reference made by the member for Todd. He referred to hybrid buses. He said that even more interesting in terms of the advantages of the O'Bahn system would be the possible introduction of hybrid buses. I agree with him. It is a most interesting area of technology. They look most efficient in the way they use potential energy sources. Perhaps it is being considered that they should be used in the years ahead on the O'Bahn system when the present buses are phased out and the new buses come in.

I would just caution members with the comment that is made on page 13 of the Wage and Miller Report to which I previously referred. The report states:

All of these hybrid buses suffer some penalties as a result of their additional complications. Perhaps the most notable one is their additional weight—rear axle loads—this is something the member for Todd is interested in—of over 12 tonnes are produced, well in excess of the current eight tonne legal limit. This would not be especially significant on a purpose built busway or guideway, but the buses will need to operate on normal streets and some severe problems could arise in road damage.

It goes on a bit further and I think in fairness I should read the next sentence, which is:

Daimler-Benz argue that the high axle weight is compensated by the softer suspension of modern buses and that there may be no additional road damage, but the argument has not yet been accepted by German road authorities.

In other words, the independent traffic engineering specialists did not accept that argument. The commercial traffic engineering authorities, who have a vested interest in selling their buses, are trying to say that the argument is not significant. I think we know the way in which we need to interpret those sorts of facts. While the hybrid bus situation may be interesting, we have to acknowledge it will on its own bring problems that I think need to be considered.

The other matter which ought to have been mentioned by the member for Todd is the difference in axle loadings between the different axles on an articulated bus; they are not identical. One of the axles is 50 per cent greater than the other two axles. I think that should have been touched upon as well.

I want to touch briefly on one or two other issues the member for Todd mentioned in his dissertation just now. First, he seems to have regressed somewhat because, on an earlier occasion, he said that the event that took place in Hamburg was indeed a short-term event, and he went on to say that it was very successful. We will see how successful it is when all the international traffic engineering authorities who went to the exposition—it was a traffic engineering exposition—rush back home and install the O'Bahn. When they have all installed it, we will know that the Hamburg display was a success. Be that as it may, he had said that on an earlier occasion, but today he did not refer to that. Today, it is back to being a feeder system. I take it that a feeder system is somewhat more permanent. Just for the record again, let us accept the fact that it was just a project. It did carry 300 000 people, it did operate for some weeks, and it did seem to operate without too many flaws. A feeder system of a permanent

kind it is not. Indeed, the city of Hamburg, the very place where it was displayed, has not installed it on a permanent basis.

The honourable member then went on to mention Bangkok. He quoted Mr. Peter Burden, but that is all he quoted, in relation to Bangkok. I have come across no evidence anywhere that the city of Bangkok has decided to install the O'Bahn system. If I can be enlightened and I am wrong, and there is information on this matter, then I will take the point, but to this time the only information I have is what is available in reports to the Government which suggest that the city of Bangkok has made no definite decision. I might say that the authorities have been stalling on this matter for some considerable time. I think they have been very wise because they want to see that the system really has all the advantages that the Daimler-Benz people are suggesting it has.

One other point I ought to mention is that the member for Todd talked about Essen replacing a light rail system with the guideway. Just to make the picture absolutely correct (technically and semantically, the honourable member was quite correct), it is not replacing the entire light rail transit system in the city of Essen. I know the honourable member did not say that, but I want to make sure that the readers of *Hansard* in their thousands will see the situation for what it is. In fact, the second stage of the Essen development project will involve an integration of light rail transit and guided busways, so that both systems will use the one track. That city still has a commitment to light rail transport. It is not throwing it out by the adoption of the small guided track.

Also, of course, the member for Todd mentioned (I think he was quoting Mr. Peter Burden again) that the cost for a guided track was far less than the cost of a track for l.r.t. systems. That is not what I was told in Rastatt by the people who manufacture the system. They said the costs metre for metre were equivalent, and indeed that same assertion is made in the reports available to the Minister of Transport.

I think that is something he has to acknowledge. Perhaps the most interesting comment of the member for Todd is that many cities will be implementing guided busways. I was quite surprised at that because I have come across Essen—the Essen scheme is mentioned in today's *News*, but the editor is downgrading it, because the City-State edition had it on page 2 but in the edition we receive here it has been dropped back to page 28. That shows a lack of confidence. I do not know, apart from the Regensburg situation, of the "many cities" being referred to. I do know many cities are installing light rail systems, and I have referred to them on earlier occasions: San Diego, Denver, Newcastle and many other cities. I know of them, but personally I have not yet heard of these many cities installing the guided busway system. I hope that the member for Todd names these cities in due course. I do know that there is one city in the southern hemisphere to use the system, and that is Adelaide.

Mr. Ashenden: You'll find out if you read my speech of this afternoon. The cities are named.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I suppose the honourable member's inclusion of the names of Essen, Regensburg, Heidelberg, Bangkok (which has not made a decision to install one) and Adelaide can be taken as being "many cities".

The other question on which I want to touch briefly relates to some of the problems of break-downs of the buses. I mention the industrial problems if a bus breaks down and needs to be pushed out. It has been asked what will happen if a bus has a flat tyre. The member for Todd has outlined what happens if a bus has brake failure—it

can cope with that. It can also cope with a break-down caused by a flat tyre because there is a little steel roller underneath. It has to be there; they had to install it because the steel roller stops the knuckle from falling right on to the road and being severely damaged. That is its purpose, but it has the added advantage of allowing the bus to roll along to the next break in the system.

Of course, again, there are problems. It is a small steel roller, and therefore the bus is not able to continue at the cruising speed it has been maintaining before. That would have to disrupt the time table of buses farther back along the line, not to mention the discomfort that might be caused to people travelling on the bus. Again, I would be interested to hear the comments of the Minister on how serious that problem is expected to be. I hope the people the Minister is sending to Germany, Dr. Scrafton and Mr. Wayte, will be looking at these particular problems in the Essen project. I was unfortunately not able to see the Essen project in operation. I was not able to ask about time table effects, only technical problems. I will be interested to hear just how the time table suffers through these sorts of problems.

One other point I have mentioned twice so far, and I mention it again for the third time in the hope of eliciting a response (and perhaps the member for Newland will choose to respond to it) is the option that could have been investigated by the Government for a cheaper installation of O'Bahn than the one it has actually chosen. I have mentioned that it is possible to install on ordinary buses the knuckle system, and I quoted the figure of \$4 000 a bus. If we were to convert 90 buses on our present system we could do this for a cost of \$360 000. There is no technical problem related to the different brand of bus. It can be done.

Instead the Minister is proposing that we will buy 90 new buses at a cost of \$18 500 000. I would like to know how the Minister can justify such a vast increase in the number of buses in the fleet—90—when he could purchase much fewer, if he feels some extra buses are needed to cope with extra traffic demands, and convert other buses already in the system with the installation of knuckles. On a cost scale, he would have a minimum cost for an O'Bahn system of \$360 000 spreading right through to his maximum cost of \$18 500 000, and he could have chosen a figure somewhere in between that was much less than \$18 500 000. We already have, as I mentioned on an earlier occasion, buses occasionally filtering up to the north-east. What is going to happen to those buses? They are not going to disappear; they are still going to be there; they will still be able to offer a service, albeit that some Volvos from there will be going to other depots.

I suggest that the Minister would have been far wiser to have had knuckles installed on some of those buses to give the system a bit of a trial. If it was found that the system did not live up to all the expectations the Minister has for it then what would be the loss? The loss would be substantially less, because we already know that the guideway of the O'Bahn system is convertible to the l.r.t. system. Specifications being used are convertible to l.r.t., so that particular part of the system is not a total loss. However, the cost of the equipment for this greatly increased number of buses would be a significant loss if the Government had to back down and go to the l.r.t. system.

I have asked this question for the third time. I hope that I will get some response as to how the Government can justify this greatly increased unnecessary cost. I hope this has nothing to do with the fact that it has been forced into the situation by Daimler Benz refusing to sell patent rights for the knuckles alone. It would be a terrible situation if Daimler Benz, on the one hand, has acknowledged that it

is a possibility and a saleable product, yet on the other hand refuses to sell us just the knuckles. I will keep on asking that question until I have a response from the Minister as to why that is not being done in the situation here in Adelaide. If that were done, the Minister could play around with his O'Bahn at much less expense and if, as I strongly believe, the system is not adequate for our needs and does not meet the needs of north-eastern suburbs residents, the changeover could be done at much less cost and, moreover, at much less political embarrassment to the present Minister of Transport.

One of the points I have also made (and I am pleased to see that now people are going over to Germany to investigate the O'Bahn system), is that I do not believe enough information has been made available by the Daimler Benz people to the authorities in South Australia as to what the whole system is about, partly, I acknowledge, because the company has not had the information itself on how the system operates in a continuous commercial situation. I think it would have been a much wiser decision for the Government to have delayed a final "Yes" or "No" on O'Bahn until after the Essen project had at least had some chance to prove itself.

To digress slightly (and I will return to the point), in the Netherlands I was told by Ministry of Transport officials there that they regard two years as essential proving time for a project. If they try a new bus method, a new timetable routine, a new fare structure, they regard a two-year testing period as essential to find out whether or not that can be regarded as being successful. That is a very wise move. I think the Dutch have shown clearly their expertise in public transport in so many areas, and that is the finding they have come up with. I think we can take a lesson from that. The lesson would be that for proper use of funds we have available in South Australia we should have waited until the Essen project had been under way for some time to see how it operated on a day-to-day basis and, also, to see how the Regensberg project got under way. Instead, we have decided that we will not do that; we will plough straight ahead and commit ourselves straight away to the O'Bahn technology.

I would like to repeat the point I also made about l.r.t. I think it has a lot going for it. I am not saying, however, that all particular models used in l.r.t. offer the same services. When we travelled in Europe, we travelled on a great many systems in various cities. I would have to say that some of them I would not want in this city because they were inconvenient in their route structure, and in vehicle design. In our situation, with a young child in a push-chair, some of them were very difficult to get into. Just because some of them are badly designed, it is a mistake to throw them all out, because indeed others are excellent in design. They have very good specifications to meet the needs of all sorts of passengers, including mothers with children in prams, and the needs of rush-hour traffic and the like. The net result of the observations that I made was that I believe l.r.t. indeed is the most appropriate means of moving large numbers of people.

The question of the impact on the Torrens Valley is an important one. We have heard mention of the fact that the system that is being installed for O'Bahn will be convertible to l.r.t. However, there are some points I think we should at least acknowledge and put on record. These points include the fact that, in terms of visual appearance, certain aspects of the O'Bahn technology are far more obvious than are aspects of l.r.t. technology. The Minister has issued to the press photographs of the scheme in Essen, and we have seen them in today's paper. The Minister was generous enough to show me a series of photographs as well. Indeed, they were very interesting

photographs. I was pleased to see this first photographic evidence of the scheme, but I believe that they just confirm the fact that the O'Bahn track system has much greater visual impact than the l.r.t. system. My recollection of light rail systems going through parkland areas in Europe, particularly in Vienna, is that the impact is not as significant as the concrete paths that the O'Bahn system has. Indeed, the very dimensions of the concrete guideways would also support that assertion.

I mentioned at an earlier time the question of flexibility and the wisdom of using large articulated buses through areas of our city, and I said that I felt that that was an inefficient use of passenger capacity, and I remain of that opinion. I do feel that that is an inefficient use of passenger capacity. I was interested to receive a letter from the Australian Electric Traction Association in which the following comment was made. It refers to the Minister's comment that the O'Bahn provides greater flexibility for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. The letter states:

The Minister should be aware that true flexibility in transport is the capability of a route to respond economically to variations in passenger loading. In this respect the proposed busway system is anything but flexible.

Later, it states:

... the notion of every bus on each outer north-eastern route proceeding an extra 20 kilometres to the city and return with its virtual handful of passengers is surely irresponsible in these energy-conscious days.

It is my assertion that there will be over-capacity at the north-eastern end, at the suburban end, of the O'Bahn system as it is proposed, and I do not think that that point has been adequately responded to. Again, I invite, ask or hope that the member for Newland will see fit on this occasion to respond to that aspect.

I want to correct one point mentioned by the member for Todd. He said that the light rail vehicles have twice the life span of O'Bahn buses. If we take the information in the Director-General's report on the matter last December, that implies that the light rail vehicles have a 30-year life span, an assertion not supported by the facts concerning trams which were the predecessors of light rail vehicles that have operated throughout the world. When I asked the Minister by way of a Question on Notice as to the life span of present buses within the S.T.A. system, I was given the figure of 10 years, which implies the fact that, if the O'Bahn buses are going to have the same lifespan, the trams are therefore expected to operate only for 20 years. Again, quite clearly this is different from overseas experience in this regard. Indeed, I am interested to know why the lifespan for O'Bahn buses is 50 per cent greater than the lifespan—

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

Dr. BILLARD (Newland): I can understand the frustration that the Opposition must be experiencing when it tries to work out what to do about the Government's decision to supply a rapid transit busway to the north-eastern suburbs. In fact, the history is that the Labor Party decided some years ago that it wanted an l.r.t. There is a well reported statement of the former Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo), which was made prior to the 1977 election at a stage when the NEAPTR study was supposedly open to the public and suggestions were welcome, and when, supposedly, no decision had been made. The Minister of Transport at that time made the statement that it was long-standing Government policy to supply a tram to Tea Tree Plaza. So in one fell statement in the heat of an election he undermined all the money

that had been spent on dressing up the Labor Party's decision.

The result of the Labor Party's going straight into a proposal to have a tramway to the north-eastern suburbs without looking fully into all the alternatives was that it found that this supposedly great election winner quickly became an albatross around its neck. What was at one stage a project mooted to cost \$50 000 000 soon became \$70 000 000 then \$75 000 000, then \$80 000 000, then \$115 000 000. Members know, from the studies that are currently being done that, if the l.r.t. had been pursued, by the time it had been constructed we would have had to shell out nearly \$180 000 000. So, the Government could well see that if it proceeded with this project it would have become a lead weight around the neck of taxpayers and around the necks of the travelling public of the north-eastern suburbs. In a sense, I think that Opposition members must be glad that the responsibility has been taken from them and that they are no longer obliged to pursue a project which was never on.

I want to discuss what I feel would be the correct factors to be taken into account in deciding between the options that were presented by the Government. In doing so, I recognise that there are many who have come to conclusions in choosing between these options that are based on incorrect data. That incorrect data in some cases may be deliberate, but I suspect that in most cases it was not deliberate, and that people were simply deciding on the basis of their experience of one system or another which operated in one city or another in one country or another. These people therefore based their decision on those subjective judgments of other situations, without looking closely at the details of what was proposed here. We find a clear example of this in the statement of the member for Salisbury when he was referring to seating capacity of 150 for buses, when in fact the study of the option which would be implemented in Adelaide was based on a capacity equal to the seating capacity of 70 per bus. If we make a subjective judgment on the comfort of a bus, it is quite wrong for us to base that on our own concept of what a crowded bus is.

Likewise, if we base our concept of what a tram is like on what is expected overseas and transfer it to the South Australian situation, we will not necessarily be forming a correct conclusion. My point is that a great many people (and I do not simply include among those people those who have a political axe to grind; there are many people who have no particular axe to grind) have made incorrect conclusions because they have failed to take sufficiently close account of the details of the options which were presented by the Government. I particularly want to take up one point that was made by the member for Salisbury. In a statement last month, he said:

We are to have these large articulated buses which must travel empty along large sections of their route in the City of Tea Tree Gully, or be only minimally loaded, achieving nowhere near a significant loading ratio of their 150-passenger capacity until half way down to the actual entrance to the guided busway.

That statement clearly implies that the buses in Adelaide will be loaded to 150.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: No, it doesn't.

Dr. BILLARD: Well, I beg to differ with the member for Salisbury, because I believe you would have to construe that in a most strange way to draw any other conclusion. The member for Salisbury then went on blindly to ignore the fact that the whole of the costing of the bus options was based on catering for all the passenger needs of the north-east suburbs using the figure of 70 passengers per bus. If the contention of the member for

Salisbury was that we in fact would have 150 per bus, then the whole of the costing of the bus system is thrown overboard. Thus, it can be seen that if we do not work on the facts as they are, but on the facts as they may be in some other application, in some other city, in some other country, we are led to incorrect conclusions. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TRANSPORT

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I refer to a comment made by the member for Salisbury in his recent speech, wherein he said that I stated that, in Hamburg, a feeder service will operate. For the honourable member's benefit, I indicate that, at that time, as I stated quite clearly, I was quoting what Mr. Peter Burden had said. When Mr. Burden said that the system involved a feeder service, he was referring to the fact that buses took members to a convention centre, and in that sense he used the word "feeder". I want to put on record that those words were not mine but the words of Mr. Peter Burden.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. McRae:

That, in the opinion of the House, victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and should be otherwise assisted and rehabilitated if necessary on the basis that public money expended be recovered where possible from those at fault; and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime.

(Continued from 24 September. Page 1082.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In speaking to this motion, I suppose I could be excused for being a little cynical, because the motion that the member for Playford has moved is as follows:

That, in the opinion of the House, victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and should be otherwise assisted and rehabilitated if necessary on the basis that public money expended be recovered where possible from those at fault; and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime.

That motion was moved by the member for Playford on 24 September 1980. On 13 September 1972, exactly eight years and one month earlier, I moved the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, where damage is done or theft committed by inmates of Government institutions who have escaped custody, the Government should meet all direct and indirect costs and damages incurred by the property owner in having his property restored where he is not covered by insurance.

That motion also covered females in society. My motion was put to a vote on 27 September 1972; there were 17 Ayes and 22 Noes and, in fact, the division was conducted

on Party lines, with the Labor Government of the day rejecting my proposal. It is rather ironic, when one looks at the numbers now, to find that 12 of those who supported my motion in 1972 are still members of Parliament on the Government side, either in this House or in the other place; I also find that 10 members of the Opposition who are still in this House voted against my proposition in 1972.

I must be cynical in saying that it appears that loss of property meant nothing to that Labor Government. I doubt whether the member for Playford, in introducing his motion, remembered that I had moved my motion just over eight years ago; if he did remember, he failed to acknowledge that fact. I believe that, if the honourable member had remembered my motion, he would not only have acknowledged it but he would have pleaded for my support and the maintenance of the attitude that I held in 1972. Admittedly, the motion of the member for Playford is different from my motion: it tries to cover a broader area, and it attempts to set up a Select Committee, which will be a financial burden on the Government and the taxpayers.

When I moved my motion, the then Attorney-General (The Hon. Mr. King) stated that my suggestion was illogical and not necessary. The Hon. Mr. King used the argument that I was talking about compensating those people who suffered damage at the hands of wards of the State, whether adults in prison or juveniles on remand or in juvenile homes who had escaped and damaged property, and he stated that it was not logical to cover only that area of compensation in regard to loss of property. He cited an example of two neighbours, A and B, living in the same street: resident A had his motor vehicle stolen by an escapee from an institution; resident B had his car stolen by a citizen who was committing an offence against the law but was not an escapee from an institution; neither of the cars was insured; and, under the provisions of my motion, the Attorney said that resident A would be paid compensation, but resident B would not be paid compensation, so it was stated that my resolution was illogical and that there was no justice in it. The Attorney said that two injustices should be continued, so that neither would receive compensation.

I argued that a person who escaped from a Government institution was a ward of the State and, therefore, the State was responsible, because the State had apprehended that person and the State had declared that that person should be detained for the protection of society. Therefore, the State should be liable to pay compensation. I refute now, as I did in 1972, what the Attorney said. Before the vote was taken, I stated (page 1645 of *Hansard* of 27 September 1972):

I realise that if two people living in a house each lose a motor car and one is paid and the other is not paid, that constitutes an injustice, but if neither is paid there are two injustices. We can afford to pay compensation in such cases. I realise that the Government will work as a team and not support the motion. I will be disappointed, because I believe that this was the chance to show that we are concerned about people who are unjustly treated in the present circumstances. Although they may be a small minority they should be considered, and I hope that the Government will consider them by supporting the motion.

My motion attempted to take a step down the same path as the member for Playford now asks us to walk down, but the path is now longer. Yet, at that time, the member for Playford voted against my motion. When he introduced his motion on 24 September this year, the member for Playford stated:

I think that this area of the criminal justice scheme is a

sacred one and every attempt must be made by political Parties to get politics out of the arena.

Why, in 1972, was I not supported, if the lack of support was not bringing politics into the arena. The Government of the day did not want to meet its financial commitments in regard to that minority group about which I was talking, not in regard to the broad spectrum that the member for Playford would now like to include. From that point on, the member for Playford made comments of the following kind:

I was amazed last year when, on moving this motion, I was advised by the Chief Secretary, who is in the House now, that his Government would not agree to any part of it, not even that part dealing with the Select Committee, because I am the first to concede that this type of motion can never be perfect. However, the kind of philosophies that lie behind it seem to get at the root of a grave problem in the community.

This matter was always high among my order of priorities . . . From that point on in his speech, for the next half a page the member for Playford spoke about Adrian Brien Ford, or someone who was accused of spending money on advertising, about election campaigns, and slogans used in some of the fringe electorates in election campaigns, yet before that he was asking people to keep politics out of the matter. Was he genuine in trying to keep politics out of this matter? He was playing politics.

I come back to the proposition that the member for Playford has put to us. I support the concept that society should pay compensation for those who suffer because of criminal actions by others, whether personal or property.

Mr. O'Neill: Would you support a no-fault superannuation scheme?

Mr. EVANS: If the Treasury of the day could foot the bill for the total amount to which I have referred, I would support that concept. I am not talking about the no-fault matter that the member for Florey has raised; I am talking about the concept of paying compensation for people who suffer because of criminal actions or because of people escaping from institutions, doing damage, and committing criminal actions against other people's property. I ask the Australian Labor Party to remember that the Attorney-General and this Government have appointed a committee to inquire into the victims of crime, and an inquiry into that aspect is taking place at present. As a Parliament, we should wait until that report is available, before committing the Parliament to a Select Committee. That inquiry may bring down the material necessary for us at least to make the first move in the direction in which the member for Playford would like us to go.

He is talking about a publicly funded insurance scheme. He has not given any indication of how he believes it should be set up: he hopes that a Select Committee will do it. Perhaps there is another way of doing it, and perhaps the committee of inquiry will give us those indications, but it would be foolish to pass the motion at this stage, or have it defeated if there are enough against it, when there is possibly a more simple solution other than spending more money on a Select Committee.

At the time my motion was debated, the member for Mitcham supported it. I take it that he would still, in principle, support the concept that I was advocating at that time. I was pleased that the member for Glenelg also supported me, as did the now retired member for Heysen, in their speeches. All of the people to the right of politics who were in opposition at that time supported the motion. The Government opposed it, in the main, because of financial constraints; it did not want to commit itself to the expenditure in that field. I am asking the Parliament and the member for Playford not to force the motion through, but to wait until the report of the committee of inquiry is

available to the Government and, I hope, to the community so that we can assess what is in the report. I would be disappointed if that report does not at least recommend that the area of compensation be expanded by some method for those people who suffer because of crime.

I will refer to one or two of the types of damage which has occurred and which made me move my original motion; it was property damage, not personal, that I was dealing with. Personal injury is more important than property damage.

Mr. Keneally: There's a difference between the two Parties.

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Stuart wants to get on to the tack on which he is talking, good luck to him. At the time I introduced my motion as regards property, Parliament supported a motion through the Parliament to cover personal injury, at least to some degree. It was supported by both sides of politics. It called for a \$1 000 maximum, later increased to \$2 000, now to \$10 000, and it has not been opposed by this side of politics. For the member for Stuart to suggest that we do not believe that people who are personally injured should be compensated is being unfair and playing politics, and it does him no credit. The reason why I moved the motion in relation to property damage at that time was that the Government failed to recognise the loss or damage to property. The member for Stuart tends to think that, when you talk of property damage, anyone who has some property that is totally his is very rich.

I will give him two examples of why I raised it at that time. Three wards of the State were taken to a camp at Stirling, at the bottom end of Ethel Street, called Woorabinda. They were taken on a walking exercise through the bush to look at the beauty of the Hills. They were working their way back into society so as to take their place as responsible citizens. They chose to go astray and do considerable damage to a local community hall that the people had worked hard to build, develop, and make available for public purposes. They then went to a private home and stole from a young man, who was struggling to pay it off, a sports car on hire-purchase, and this was his only possession. He owned only part of it; the remainder belonged to a relative from whom he had borrowed. Because of that, he had not insured the motor vehicle comprehensively. The young people had an accident in the car, wiped it off, and fortunately were not injured, but it was a total loss to the young man. He was not rich, or the sort of person the member for Stuart is suggesting I might support by his implying that he is rich. I do not like that sort of cynical attack the honourable member uses.

Mr. Keneally: It is not cynicism; it's fact.

Mr. EVANS: It is not. The second example was that, on two occasions within four weeks, at a house at Felixstow, escapees broke in and did damage and stole goods. A month later, another similar offence occurred, whereby an escapee broke into the same home. The person was not satisfied with doing damage to a little furniture, but lifted the lid of the piano and tipped honey into it, and it cost a substantial sum to have the piano restored. It was not a rich family. They had not insured against that sort of damage, because they had not expected it. To say that we should not consider that sort of compensation, because it does not happen to be property, is a bad attitude, and we should not take that approach.

Mr. Keneally: Who said that, Stan?

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Stuart were to look back to 27 September 1972, he would find that he voted against the measure. Clearly, he was not really concerned. At that time, I quoted instances of people who had suffered losses

resulting from inmates escaping from institutions. In recent times we have tended to become more lenient to those who have broken the law, in the hope of rehabilitating the offenders. In some cases it works, but with it we increase the possibility of other law-abiding citizens suffering personal or property injury or loss. If, as a society, we think we should be more lenient, more amiable towards parole, towards letting people off with a reprimand or a suspended sentence, if we are to do that in the hope of rehabilitating the offender, and if we acknowledge automatically that there is a greater chance of offences being committed against persons or property, it must be our total responsibility, as taxpayers, to pick up the tab. That must be part of the price of rehabilitation. Members opposite will argue automatically that we should throw the matter before a Select Committee. While I do not say that I oppose a Select Committee, I do ask that we should wait until we know the result of the committee of inquiry into the actions we take in relation to victims of crime.

Apart from the part of his speech in which the member for Playford showed some bitterness about what he thinks happened at the last State election, he has shown in the main, I believe, a concern similar to mine. He has shown that he believes action should be taken. I am disappointed only that I did not get such a response back in 1972, because we would have had a basis to work on and we would know how the system was functioning in at least one area of compensation. Eight years of opportunity to recognise some of the injustices in our society has been lost.

I hope that the Government's report would be such that we could speed up the plan to cover at least some of the areas and, as soon as possible, all the areas in which we believe the taxpayer should carry the burden. I do not support the motion to the point of saying that the matter should go to a Select Committee, but I support the concept that the member for Playford is advocating, although I am not sure of the best method to achieve it. Therefore, I will wait for the report.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion moved for the second time in this House by the member for Playford. I seek the support of all members who have not as yet indicated their view on this matter. I was unable to hear the first part of the contribution of the member for Fisher, and I shall read in *Hansard* what he had to say before I am required to finish my remarks. I understand that he has asked the member for Playford to withhold any requirement for a final vote until a report is brought down by a committee instituted by the Government. That is a matter for the member for Playford to determine, but there may be some reluctance on his part, because it would seem to be another example of a worthy motion being delayed and delayed again. The member for Playford is a man with a great social conscience, as all members will agree. It is fitting that he, of all members, has been prompted to continue with his desire to ensure that people who have been injured through criminal activity should be suitably compensated.

I was interested to hear the reaction of the member for Fisher in response to an interjection which, quite out of order, I made when he pointed out that in 1972 he moved that similar compensation should be paid to people who suffered property damage arising out of criminal activity. When I interjected to the effect that this is the traditional difference between the Party he represents and the Party I represent, I had in mind that it has been historically accepted for some hundreds of years that the conservative interests within the community are more concerned about

the protection of property, whereas the philosophies represented by members of my Party have been more concerned with the protection of persons.

Mr. Mathwin: The Labor Party hasn't been going for hundreds of years. That's rubbish.

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Glenelg should look at the philosophical basis from which his Party derives and that from which the Labor Party derives. Of course, there was no such thing as a Labor Party or a Liberal Party as he knows them now. There were differences within the community who represented capital and labour. The interests that represented capital controlled the major economies of the world. One has only to look at the penalties imposed on criminal activity to realise where the power lay. The penalties for injury to property were much more severe than were the penalties for injury to persons. The member for Glenelg should look at the people who first came to Australia as convicts. They came much earlier than he did, and in a much less satisfactory way. Then he would realise that the penalties for injury to property were much more severe than were the penalties for injury to persons.

It did matter whether persons were of the ruling class or of the working class. When I see members of the Liberal Party in South Australia concerning themselves with compensation for injury to property, as compared with injury to persons, I understand it, because that is the traditional position that they take.

Ironically, only today representations have been made to me by constituents seeking compensation for damages to the family as a result of what would appear to be criminal activity. It is not a matter I wish to canvass here, but I mention it as an irony of the situation. We are debating this motion, and I had a matter brought to me involving people seeking compensation for the results of criminal activity. I shall expand on this matter further when I again have the call. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

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

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D. O. Tonkin:

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.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 1186.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I will not refer at length to the manner in which the Health Commission vote was dealt with in the Estimates Committee because my attitude to the manner in which the Opposition behaved is on record in the *Hansard* report of that Committee. However, I repeat my disappointment that for the second year in succession the Labor Party has deliberately chosen to fail to deal with the Health Commission budget. That is a sad reflection upon the Opposition, and the behaviour of the A.L.P. members at that Committee cannot fail to be noted by all those who work in the health services field.

I want to deal particularly with matters raised in the House last night by the member for Mitcham, who reached fresh heights of sanctimonious self aggrandisement in the way in which he attempted to deal with matters concerned with the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

I refer particularly to his allegations in respect of Mr.

Sheriff, and his claim that I took action in regard to providing redress for Mr. Sheriff's complaints only because he, the honourable member for Mitcham, pushed me into it. He alleges that, had it not been for him, I would have taken no action to correct the wrong that Mr. Sheriff alleged. He went on to say that because of what he said to me on that occasion (that is, during the Estimates Committee) and because of the questions he asked, we had yesterday a Ministerial statement "from the honourable lady". I propose to demonstrate that what the honourable member for Mitcham said was arrant nonsense and to prove it with facts that can be substantiated from the record.

The record is that on 13 August Mr. Duncan Sheriff sent me a letter, which I received some days later, advising me that he wished to have the right to defend himself against my publicly expressed charges of professional negligence and inhumanity, as he expressed it in his letter. He said in that letter that he would be absent on 19 August and during the week 25 August to 29 August, but otherwise he was at my service. As soon as I received that letter, some time after 13 August, I wrote on it a note to my secretary in which I stated, "Yes, contact Mr. Sheriff. I should see him."

The next event (and I do not have with me my diary to check), was the interview that I had with Mr. Sheriff as a result of his request. I have a record of that interview in the form of a minute to the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science dated 5 September. I imagine that it was written on the day, or the day after, I saw Mr. Sheriff. In that minute to the Director, I said:

If there is substance in Mr. Sheriff's claims and if, indeed, he has been maligned either expressly or by implication, then the matter should be set right by way of a Ministerial statement clarifying the situation.

I concluded my minute to the Director as follows:

If there is any doubt whatsoever of the truth of the statement to which Mr. Sheriff objects, will you please arrange for a brief Ministerial statement to be drafted clearing him of any suggestion of negligence or professional misconduct.

The minute is signed by myself as Minister of Health and dated 5 September 1980, which of course was a long time before the member for Mitcham reared his ugly head in the Estimates Committee alleging that, had he not done so, Mr. Sheriff would have had no opportunity for redress.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, that is true.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Napier is going to take part in this debate, even though interjections are out of order, he must do so from his own seat.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The next event in this course of events came in the form of a response dated 11 September from the Director to my minute, in which reply the Director set out a draft Ministerial statement. The substance of that statement is identical to that which I read to the House by way of clearing Mr. Sheriff's good name. That occurred on 11 September. Incidentally, I had not at that stage prepared that statement for the House. On 16 September, Mr. Sheriff wrote to me asking the reason for the delay. By that time I had the draft statement and it was read to him over the telephone.

Mr. Sheriff rejected the statement and said that it was not acceptable to him. Obviously, I was then not in a position to read it to the Parliament, and further action was needed to try to meet his objections. Mr. Sheriff sent me another letter on 22 September rejecting, in a formal sense, my statement. I then wrote to Mr. Sheriff on 26 September, acknowledging his letter, as follows:

As a result of your letter, I have asked the Chairman of the council of the institute to investigate your allegations and when I receive a report from him I will be in touch with you again.

The member for Mitcham alleges that I failed to make a decision that it was within the Minister's province to make. That may be so, but it is extremely difficult for a Minister to determine the rights and wrongs of matters when there is a dispute between two officers of a department or an organisation. The correct procedure, I believe, is for the person who has the management responsibility and the authority, which in this case was the Chairman of the council of the institute, to determine the matter and advise the Minister. That is precisely what I asked Mr. McGregor to do in a letter dated 29 September, which of course was well before 8 October, the date on which the Estimates Committee that considered the health portfolio met and the date on which the member for Mitcham raised the question of Mr. Sheriff. I wrote to Mr. McGregor, and the final paragraph of that letter was as follows:

I would, therefore, be grateful if you would be good enough to establish the truth of the matter by consultation with both Mr. Sheriff and Dr. Bonnin and provide me with a statement which is agreed upon by both Mr. Sheriff and Dr. Bonnin as being appropriate to clarify Mr. Sheriff's position and which can be read to the House of Assembly when Parliament resumes following consideration of the Budget by the Estimates Committee on October 21.

In other words, my intention to clear Mr. Sheriff's name has been clearly stated and is on the official departmental record in several instances. It is certainly evidence of my good faith. I reject categorically the allegation by the member for Mitcham that he and he alone was responsible for clearing Mr. Sheriff's good name; he had nothing whatever to do with it. The member for Mitcham's intervention was incidental, and the honourable member can claim no credit whatsoever for any move that may have led to the statement I made in the House on Tuesday, entirely as a result of my own initiative and in the belief that, when anyone has been falsely maligned under Parliamentary privilege, albeit unwittingly, by a Minister, the matter should be set right.

I gave Mr. Sheriff that assurance in the first instance and I have fulfilled it. The fact that it took some time to do demonstrates the complexity of the matter, and that I went to a great deal of trouble and took considerable care to ensure that the facts were thoroughly investigated and any wrongs set right.

Mr. Hemmings: Would you say that the member for Hanson was conned on the Estimates Committee?

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like your ruling on the situation in relation to the member for Napier. He is wandering about the Chamber like a first-rate hitch hiker. He interjects from his normal place on the cross-benches and then hitch hikes to the Leader's bench and interjects from there. I would like to know what is the situation regarding the member in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: In answer to the question raised by the honourable member for Glenelg, I have ruled on earlier occasions that, where an executive member of the Opposition is in charge of the business of the House for the Opposition (that is, no more senior executive member of the Opposition is present), the member who sits on the cross-bench may occupy one of the first three seats.

That is precisely the same arrangement as I have entered into with the three Ministers of the Crown who sit on the cross-bench. When conducting their business on behalf of the Government, they may occupy one of the first three seats on the Treasury benches. I called the

honourable member for Napier to order a few moments ago because he was interjecting from out of his place, not being the most senior member of the Opposition executive in the House. The honourable member for Napier, from my own knowledge and vision, has recently returned to one of the three front benches because he now is the most senior executive member of the Opposition in the House.

Interjections are out of order at any time but, in regard to the normal practice of this House, occasionally, when interjections are made, the member for Napier is in order in interjecting from the position he currently occupies but, if he persists and undertakes more than reasonable interjection in the circumstances, he will be called to order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Mitcham reiterated that, if he had not taken some action in this place, the matter would still have dragged on and, as he said, we probably would never have heard about it at all. I understand that the member for Mitcham is a reader of *Hansard*, and I hope that he reads this passage and lays to rest once for all any suggestion that he can take any credit for the statement I made in respect of Mr. Sheriff, because his involvement was purely coincidental and had no bearing whatsoever on the outcome or on my Ministerial statement.

The member then went on to deal in a very scathing fashion with the suggestion that an inquiry should be conducted into the use of laboratory and experimental animals at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, I announced that inquiry at the conclusion of my Ministerial statement dealing with Mr. Sheriff. The member for Mitcham said:

... whoever an independent consultant may be. What does this mean? Does she mean a business consultant or a professor at a university? What sort of a person is an independent consultant? No explanation of that is forthcoming.

For the record, I say that a few hours after that I released to the media the full details of the terms of reference and the name of the person who is to conduct this expert inquiry, and, although those matter have been reported in the press, they have not been reported fully and I should like to read into the record, for the benefit of the member for Mitcham and other interested members, the terms of reference for the inquiry at I.M.V.S. They are:

1. To inquire into the use of laboratory and experimental animals at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and to report and make recommendations to the Minister of Health regarding:

- (a) the adequacy of existing procedures to safeguard the health and well-being of laboratory and experimental animals and what changes, if any, are necessary;
- (b) the suitability of the present Animal Ethics Committee structure, operation, methods of monitoring and enforcement of decisions and any changes necessary;
- (c) the staffing and administrative arrangements necessary to ensure that proper procedures are followed in respect of laboratory and experimental animals.

2. To advise the Minister on the application of recommendations in respect of the foregoing to other institutions administered under the health portfolio.

It will become clear from what I am about to say that I.M.V.S. is by no means the only health organisation under my portfolio that deals with laboratory and experimental animals. The member for Mitcham, before he is finished, may wish it were, because he has leapt, without thought, into a very deep hole, as I am about to demonstrate, and I think he will find it very hard to climb out of it and retain any credibility. Later, the member for

Mitcham referred to the fact that more information had come to him which had confirmed his fears about the institute. He said he hoped that the honourable lady (I) was listening and would in due course intervene in the debate and give an explanation.

I certainly will, and I think the explanation will very much embarrass the member for Mitcham. He referred to the answer I had given to a Question on Notice in which I referred to the fact that an unknown but small number of greyhounds had been used for experimental purposes at the institute. The member for Mitcham had in his possession a letter from Mrs. Rosemary Bor, of the Anti-Vivisection Union, which, he claimed, pointed out that the number of greyhounds was neither unknown nor small because, as she claimed, the experiment was written up in *Lancet*. He gave the particulars of the *Lancet* as 1977, page 1279.

The article in the *Lancet* to which the member for Mitcham referred reported on operations that had taken place before December 1975 and were performed on mongrel, greyhound, and beagle dogs at the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

The introduction to the article and the conclusion attributed the work done on the dogs to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I should have thought that a Queen's Counsel might be a little more meticulous before he accepted, at face value, assertions which he had not checked and which, if he had checked, he could have seen to be completely unrelated to the matters that I dealt with in my reply to the Question on Notice.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: He was far too anxious to seize on something to prove his case.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed he was, and I have a very strong suspicion that, in being anxious, the member's motivation was based very solidly on spite and malice, not on a desire to get at the facts.

An honourable member: Spurious.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It was spurious indeed. As I recall, when he was speaking, the honourable member had in his hand a volume that was presumably a bound volume of the *Lancet*.

If he had used his eyes, the honourable member would have seen on page 1278 an article headed "Electrical bone growth stimulation in an experimental model of delayed union," the authors of which were D. C. Paterson, R. F. Carter, G. M. Maxwell, T. M. Hillier, J. Ludbrook, and J. P. Savage. He also would have seen that those experiments took place at Adelaide Children's Hospital, Adelaide, Australia. Had he read the article through and read its conclusion, he would have seen an acknowledgement at the end of the article, as follows:

We thank the staff of the departments of paediatrics, histopathology, and nuclear medicine at the Adelaide Children's Hospital for their help and advice.

The acknowledgement concludes with a reference to the fact that requests for reprints of the article should be addressed to D. P. (presumably Denis Paterson), Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Adelaide Children's Hospital Inc., 72 King William Road, North Adelaide, 5006, Aust.

There is not one single mention of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and yet the member for Mitcham was so anxious to link anything damaging with the institute that he fell straight into the trap and leapt in with false allegations about the institute, for which I think he should be required to provide an explanation and an apology to the House and to the Chairman of the institute. I think his conduct in this matter has been absolutely outrageous; it has been completely irresponsible and he has a great deal to answer for.

I want to provide a little more detail concerning this matter. As I said, the operations on the mongrel and greyhound dogs were not performed at the institute, as the member for Mitcham claimed. The reply given to the member for Mitcham that appeared on pages 183 and 184 of *Hansard* concerning the number of dogs used in the animal theatre at the institute is correct. The figure of approximately 50 beagles provided for the two-year period prior to 1978 was an estimate because new staff and a new system of record-keeping were instituted in January 1978, and previous records were not kept. In my answer it was stated that the approximate figure of 50 beagles was an estimate, and, in fact, that is what it was. The figures for 1978 onwards have been rechecked and confirmation has been given that approximately 180 beagles have been operated on which, again, is in accordance with my answer. The greyhound dogs which were referred to in the first part of Question on Notice No. 169 totalled either six or seven dogs; in other words, a small number in anyone's language. This figure cannot be verified absolutely, as more than one operation may be performed on a single dog and only the operation is recorded, not the identity of the dog.

The answer given regarding the greyhound dogs is accurate; it is unrelated to the *Lancet* article. The member for Mitcham's conduct and assertions in the House last night demonstrated the folly of accepting allegations at face value. The member for Mitcham went on to make allegations related to a Mr. Peter James McNamara. Mr. McNamara was employed to work in the Division of Tissue Pathology from May 1977 to December 1978, not from May 1976, as stated by the member for Mitcham. He worked as a scientific officer, occupying the role of graduate research assistant. In this capacity, he was involved in a variety of research programmes, some of which included experiments using rats. Professor Vernon Roberts, who was referred to in the member for Mitcham's vitriolic attack on the institute, is the head of the Division of Tissue Pathology, and, as far as he is aware, all the animal experimental work in which Mr. McNamara had been engaged had received approval under the procedures governing the use of animals effective at that time. This afternoon I saw the documentation concerning that, and there is no doubt whatsoever that Mr. McNamara had the authorisation to use animals. I think it is worth noting that neither Mr. McNamara nor any other member of the Division of Tissue Pathology was involved in experiments using dogs during the time when Mr. McNamara was at the institute. It is also worth noting that, as an employee who was an authorised user of animals, at no time did Mr. McNamara express his concern to Professor Vernon Roberts over experiments using any animals. So much for the member for Mitcham and his allegations about the institute.

I return now to the matter of the experiments and operations that were conducted at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I do so because it seems apparent that the member for Mitcham is quite determined to stir up trouble, regardless of the consequences, regardless of the reputations he damages in the process, and regardless of the facts. Lest he should turn his vitriolic tongue to an attack on the Adelaide Children's Hospital, I just want to inform the member for Mitcham that, when the article in the *Lancet* was published, there were some allegations that the work was cruel to the dogs. At that stage, Colonel Harries, of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, investigated the work, and at that time he went on television and confirmed that it was not cruel. I mention that to emphasise that the matter has already had a public hearing and airing and it is of little use to the

member for Mitcham to drag up the matter two years after the event in the hope that some mud will stick onto someone. The Adelaide Children's Hospital and Sir Dennis Patterson had the university's approval for those experiments, and surely the member for Mitcham should have known that, because he included in his reading into *Hansard* that very fact.

It seems to me that last night's shabby exercise by the member for Mitcham should go on the record as one of his all-time low efforts to try to damage people who are doing the best they can in the health services field. I believe that his conduct last night requires an explanation and apology. I challenge him and invite him to provide an apology to the Chairman of the institute and to the Director of the institute, who has suffered miserably as a result of the honourable member's allegations. Dr. Bonnin is an honourable man. Anyone who knows him knows that he is a man of honour, that he would be incapable of deceit of any kind, and the verification that I received in response to the member for Mitcham's allegations simply confirm that those answers were accurate. I hope that, as a result of tripping up and falling over his own tongue, the member for Mitcham will now let the inquiry which I have announced into the use of animals at the institute proceed; that he will accept any recommendations that are made as a result of it; and that in the meantime he will refrain from unfair and unjust attacks on the institute.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I refer to the local government vote and also the housing vote. In our society it is quite clear that a large number of people do not realise the tremendous range of community services on offer by both Government and voluntary organisations. That is why the former Labor Government thought that it was essential that the community and ethnic information services should be established, so that if a problem arose, people could have a means of finding out whether specialised services were available. As a result, the former State Government provided funding for existing community information services and was prepared to back new initiatives. The former Government also established ethnic information services to cater for the specialised needs of ethnic citizens whose language problem may have prevented their gaining full benefit from a range of services available.

However, the new Liberal Government has shown a cynical disregard for the provision of these services. One of the Minister's first acts was to cut off funding for several ethnic information offices and to prevent new initiatives from taking place. One of these ethnic information offices was situated in my electorate. The Thebarton Residents Association was closed in almost indecent haste, and that association is still receiving accounts for the telephone and electricity. I received a letter from one of my constituents, a Mr. P. Golding, who is the Chairperson for the Thebarton Residents Association. He has received an account of \$319 for the telephone, and also an account for \$48.17 for electricity.

I think all members on both sides are well aware of how the residents association office was closed within two weeks. The association was given no chance to take action. It took as much action as possible and received good television coverage, although very little press coverage. Unfortunately, the Minister of Local Government does not see fit to honour the accounts and see that the Government covers these amounts. He has sent a letter back to my constituent saying that the Government will not be responsible for the phone and electricity accounts. I think that it is a shocking state of affairs for the Government to expect people, who give a service and have

given a good service over a long period in an area where there is a large Greek and Italian community, to meet out of their own pocket the cost of these accounts.

These same people have helped tremendously in the ethnic community centre, and the Minister of Local Government should be severely condemned for refusing to meet the costs of these accounts.

The previous Government set up a top-level working party to look into the future provisions of information services. The working party, over a course of one year, obtained evidence and questioned community groups, organisations and individuals about the information needed in our community. The report of that working party, published after the change of Government, is of major significance, and its quality has been recognised throughout Australia. The Minister's response was to refer the subject to community groups for more discussion. Even though that was the purpose of the working party, basically the Minister's action can be described only as stalling operations designed to prevent further initiatives. It seems quite clear from the examination of the Estimates that the Government is not prepared to back any new information centres. Instead, it is willing to pay only lip service to information needs. I take this opportunity to call on the Minister to come clean with the public about the Government's intentions. He should stop dilly-dallying over the information service and implement immediately the recommendations of the working party into information services. If not, he should say why his Government has decided to ignore pressing social needs.

I would like further to refer to the vote on housing, particularly youth housing. Since the last State election, youth unemployment has risen dramatically to a shocking 27 per cent of the young people aged between 15 and 19 years. One of the results of the high youth unemployment, as the Minister should be aware, is the acute housing and accommodation problem. Unemployed young people under the age of 18 receive only \$36 a week. Malcolm Fraser has clearly shown his unconcern for this group of unemployed. He referred to them in a *Nationwide* programme before the election as being a family problem. He clearly does not see this group as being a Government responsibility.

Mr. Hamilton interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: My colleague has just reminded me also of what Mr. Anthony said.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. By way of inquiry to you, Mr. Speaker, are the opinions, alleged or otherwise, of the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister in any way relevant to the matter we are debating this evening?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. In relation to Budget debates where fiscal matters, which have a major component of Commonwealth involvement, are concerned it has always been the understanding of the Chair that members will range widely. I will, however, listen to the contribution by the member for Peake and, if it is necessary to bring him back to the line, I will do so. I make quite clear to all members that fiscal arrangements involving the Commonwealth and the State are a relevant part of the Budget debate.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I appreciate the efforts of the honourable member for the dingoes. He has objected every time that I have stood up and spoken.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I take exception to the use of the term "dingoes" as it relates to my constituents.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mallee has taken exception to the words used by the member for Peake. Will he withdraw the words used?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I most certainly will offer my apologies. The honourable member so often speaks about those animals that I made a slip. I will withdraw the term. According to the South Australian Council of Social Services, young people would need three times the amount to which I have referred in order to have access to private rental markets. Unemployed young people, 18 and over, receive \$51.45 a week. This group makes up the bulk of the unemployed. A recent survey by the South Australian Council of Social Services found that 9 000 young people in South Australia are either homeless or suffering from acute housing difficulties. The Minister would be well aware that the Emergency Housing Office of the South Australian Housing Trust provides assistance to people with housing difficulties.

However, these 9 000 young people in the State, who are trying to cope with enormous accommodation problems and who do not have the money or the jobs to break out of the vicious circle of poverty that they are in, are not eligible to seek the assistance of the Emergency Housing Office. It is a disgrace. It is no surprise that, with such limited support from the Commonwealth in unemployment benefits, the young unemployed are often seen as a financial liability as tenants. How can they pay average rents of \$45 to \$50 a week, when receiving benefits of \$36 or even \$51 a week? It is worth noting that the current poverty level for single persons is \$73.20 a week. It is quite clear that the issue of the homeless cannot be divorced from the broader issue of income security. In our society, accommodation is largely dependent upon having a reasonable, dependable and secure source of income. Those who receive various forms of Government financial assistance and support are therefore particularly vulnerable owing to their income being inadequate.

The Minister may be aware that homelessness is linked with other social ills. Drug dependence, low levels of mental and physical health, unemployment and crime are all associated with homelessness. Young people are not in a position to cope with personal and family problems, devote their time and energy in seeking a job, or pursue educational or other interests, if their primary need for shelter has not been satisfied. Like others, young people require secure, reliable foundations from which to operate when dealing with social, family, personal and economic difficulties. Security of accommodation may be preconditioned to finding better solutions to some of the more severe problems that are experienced by the young, yet, once again, the State Government, under the Liberals, is choosing to do very little.

Some weeks ago, the Committee of Inquiry into Youth Housing Needs reported to the Government, but the report has not been released, and I have been told that it was deliberately sat upon during the Federal election period because the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who is responsible for youth matters, no doubt in association with the Minister of Housing, believed that the report of that working party could prove embarrassing to the Federal Government. I call upon the Minister of Housing, who is ultimately responsible for the provision of housing in this State, to request the Minister of Industrial Affairs to release the report of the working party so that the press and the public can see what is going on in this State.

Mr. Mathwin: Who told you that?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I will completely ignore the member for Glenelg. On a previous occasion, I referred to private contracting, and I will continue in that direction in regard to the local government lines. Most honourable members would be aware of the Government's attitude of giving work to private contractors. In actual fact, private contractors have been involved in many jobs throughout

South Australia and Australia. Private contractors and Government workers or local government workers have worked shoulder to shoulder, and have done so successfully.

When this Government came to power, it decided to change the system completely. The Minister of Local Government gave certain advice to all Government departments. The member for Mallee need not move out of the House if I am embarrassing him; he can turn his ears off. The Minister said, in this House, that he sent a letter suggesting that Government departments, local government departments, and semi-government departments like the Housing Trust, should no longer employ day workers: they should use private contractors.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. PLUNKETT: As I have said, local government and Government departments have worked shoulder to shoulder with private contractors. Many members do not realise that, by the Minister's turning his attention to private contractors, he did away with people who had a guaranteed council or Government job for many years. Six of my constituents have approached me; these people worked for 15 years as private contractors (and I hope members opposite listen to this) and, because of this Liberal Government's attitude, they have been thrown out of work. This is the Government that said "Put us in power on 15 September 1979 and we will make sure that the private contractors are looked after". This occurred only in one area. However, the Minister was not talking about the small one-man, one-truck, one-machine contractor—that kind of contractor was sacrificed as soon as the election was over: the Minister was talking about the multi-nationals. I can prove that my constituent wrote to the Minister, who is not now in the House.

Mr. Mathwin: Who is he? Tell us his name.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The Hon. Dean Brown is the Minister to whom he wrote. Private contractors who had a one-man, one-truck operation and who had worked for 15 years are now unable to get employment. My constituent brought six other people with him. His truck has run out of registration because he cannot get work. What does he think of the Liberal Government's attitude towards private contractors? I know what he thinks. This contractor has done everything; he has advertised in the paper continually to try to get work. This private contractor was thrown out of work by the Liberal Government, which came into office on the promise of looking after private contractors. I hope that members opposite understand that, when I talk about private contractors, I am referring to a working private contractor, not the multi-national private contractors that this Government tends to consider.

If members opposite sat for two minutes and used their brains, they would realise that those private contractors are detrimental to the State. They never do a decent job, and I have seen this repeatedly. A certain person in the member for Glenelg's district has a gardening contracting business and exploits the young by paying under-award wages. His workers are paid a pittance; they would be better off on unemployment benefits. In another sector, a contractor employs age pensioners. He knows that these pensioners will lose their pension if they earn too much, and he exploits them. That is the type of private contractor to which some members opposite refer. Members opposite know that I have the facts and figures and I can produce names.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: I will not reply to interjections from

members opposite, because they do not know what a worker is. Once a worker is referred to, they come up with stupid interjections.

I now refer to road contracting. I have seen work done in this regard by private contractors. A good example occurred during the Administration of the State Labor Government. Foolishly, the Highways Department gave a contract to a private contractor for roadworks. Do you know what happened to that job? The job was not correctly prepared under the supervision of the Highways Department, and it cost the South Australian taxpayers a mint of money in regard to the digging up of that road, because it was not correctly prepared; it had to be resealed. I would not expect the member for Mallee to know anything about that: he walks around the parks looking for dingoes.

I also bring to the Government's attention the matter of a private contractor named Broons Hire. The manager goes around to councils, urging them to sack their permanent staff and replace them with contractors. He employs all scab labour: he will not employ any trade unionists on the place. He is going around to metropolitan councils whose officers will listen to him asking them to employ non-unionists and to pay them below the award. If any of the workers injure themselves, half the time they have to go to court to get any insurance or compensation. This is how he can employ people on scab rates and get away with it. If any Government members want to inquire, they will find that what I am saying is true. He brags to the extent of saying, "I'll get the job done cheaper than your council workers can do it." Do Government members give any thought to council workers? Would the member for Morphett like to see scabs from Broons Hire working for councils in his district?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not helping the cause of the member for Peake to be constantly interjected on. I ask honourable members on my right to cease.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you. I apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, for being the cause of any disruption, because I know that you are a fair Speaker. I am country bred, and have a loud voice. I try to speak over the ignorant interjections so that they will not be heard. Do any Government members know anything about the action taken by the Highways Department when it had a bitumen plant at Northfield? I know about this matter, because I was looking after the men who were working there. As soon as a Liberal Government came to office, it sold the operation to private enterprise. The department produced bitumen not only for itself but also for councils at a price lower than a private contractor could. The person who was in charge of the machine at the department is now working for a private contractor. He knows the special ingredients that go into making bitumen for the Highways Department so that it is a lasting job. The bitumen lasted for many years, because it was well laid. Government members can check with the department to see that what I am saying is correct, because this information is available to them.

The chemist on the back bench has never said anything intelligent since he has been here. It hurts Government members to know that I defend the weak, the young, the unemployed, the aged, and the workers. What promise that Government members made on 15 September was of any benefit to the workers? The member for Hanson could answer that, but I would not expect the member for Glenelg to know. He is forever looking for the red raggies.

An honourable member: I don't have far to look in here, do I?

Mr. PLUNKETT: If you have any proof, step up with it,

and say that I am anything but a Labor man. I have been a Labor man throughout my life. I would not expect three Government members ever to defend the worker. They would not have the brains. They have never looked into the hardships of unemployment; they would not have a clue on such matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order.

Mr. PLUNKETT: No doubt, all members have council workers among their constituents, and I have proof that private contracting will kill councils.

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support my Leader and Deputy Leader in that they have moved certain amendments to the lines, but I intend to devote my remarks to the lines relating to the Minister of Water Resources in Estimates Committee A. I believe it would be fair to say that some interesting answers were received in response to members' questions in both Committees whilst they were in session. One interesting answer I received from the Minister was such that I feel that I need to probe the matter a little further.

At the particular Committee, I had drawn the Minister's attention to page 76 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year 1979-80 which clearly shows that the reduction of the weekly-paid work force in the E. & W.S. Department was, for 1976, 74 persons, for 1977, 316 persons, and for 1978, 500 persons. I had suggested to the Minister that there was a progression in those figures which indicated that the previous Government had recognised the need to reduce the work force in that area, that a proper method had been used, and that the very nature of the increasing progression I had outlined indicated that the proper action had been taken.

The response from the Minister was most interesting. After some chit chat, he said:

In the House, I have stated quite clearly that the action taken by the previous Government to really come to grips with this problem should have been instigated in 1975 in accordance with the recommendations of the tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee. Action was three years too late . . .

The tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee is entitled, "Rationalisation of Engineering and Water Supply Department Metropolitan Workshops", and the figures that I referred to the Minister related to the overall weekly paid employee positions within that department. So, the Minister was wrong on that count. Nevertheless, in the tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee, we find the recommendations on page 21. The first recommendation is that the workshop activities at Thebarton, in addition to those at Kent Town, should be transferred to Ottoway. There is no comment about a reduction of the work force. The second recommendation was that the Thebarton site, until returned to park lands, should be used as a combined operations centre for both sewerage and water supply. There was no statement in relation to an alleged plan recommended in 1975 in the tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee, a report which the Minister suggested should be followed.

The third and final recommendation was that the department must allocate a much higher priority to improving management information systems, with the object of achieving more effective control over the cost of its activities (the annual expenditure at that time exceeded \$1 000 000), and that, to ensure that existing resources to achieve this were better co-ordinated, the Automatic Data

Processing Branch should be transferred to the Management Services Division. Although he had a reasonable battery of advisers with him, I suggest that the Minister took a punt and gave the wrong answer.

Taking the figures in the report of the numbers employed in those locations and putting them up against the reductions that occurred, let us see whether the Government was acting responsibly, despite what the Minister has said in the past and what he said in Estimates Committee A. Page 15 of the report states:

At present, the numbers employed on workshop activities at the three depots are: Kent Town, 347; Thebarton, 240; Ottoway, 335.

The report was issued in 1975 and ordered to be printed on 11 November 1975. Looking at the figures, the combined workshop staff for Kent Town and Thebarton totals 587. Looking at the figures I provided for the Minister, and allowing for his wrong assumption and wrong recommendation, it appears that, in the three-year period from 1976 to 1979, a reduction of 890 persons occurred in the work force. That is considerably more than the figure which the Minister apparently had in mind as the reduction that should have applied.

We also had occasion in Estimates Committee A, in connection with the vote for the Minister of Water Resources, to refer to an increase in water charges which was instituted by the present Government shortly after it took office. The water charge was increased by 3c, from 24c to 27c. I ask members to note the figure of 3c. We could be forgiven for assuming that that was a rather strange increase when the present Government had been elected only a month or two earlier on the basis of providing a cheaper water supply to the consumer; "at the lowest cost" were the words used. To hammer home what the Liberal Government proposed to offer to the water consumers of this State, these were the words used:

Water charges have increased dramatically by 7.7c a kilolitre to 24c a kilolitre.

It was conveniently overlooked that that increase had occurred in a nine-year period, but immediately this Government came to office water consumers were served with a 3c increase, which is virtually 40 per cent of the total 7.7c a kilolitre increase which occurred in the previous nine years under a Labor Administration. So much for that kind of election propaganda.

In Estimates Committee A, I asked the Minister how the collection figure for metropolitan area water receipts was arrived at. The figure in the Auditor-General's Report for the previous year and the figure for the year before that under a Labor Administration had been exceeded by about \$3 000 000 in the two successive years, if we compare receipts and estimates. In view of the election statement by his Party that every effort would be made to contain the cost of water, I asked the Minister whether that figure could be reviewed, because the Auditor-General's Report shows clearly that, despite the total resources of the department having been used to estimate the collection figure and the rate being set, with the receipts exceeding that amount, here was an opportunity for the Government, through the Minister, to put its money where its mouth had been.

I did not get a very good response from the Minister. If the Government had been genuine in its pre-election propaganda, a slightly lower figure could have been set, so that when receipts exceeded the estimated figure a sum would still have been obtained to meet the requirements of the Government and, for that matter, of the preceding Government; that is, in the metropolitan operation in respect of water charges collected and costs involved there is an attempt to set a break-even point, so that the costs

and the receipts are about equal.

Needless to say, after some discussion, during which the Minister's figures were shown to be wrong and mine right, the Minister declined to budge from the position that the amount estimated would remain as it was and that that amount would be collected. The only recourse I have is to await the Auditor-General's figures at the end of the current financial year, when it will be shown that the receipts will exceed the estimate, thus proving that what I put to the Minister could have been done; that is, the figure could have been reduced somewhat to honour the promise in relation to its water-charging policy made by the Liberal Party when it was elected.

Another matter which received some consideration under the lines of the Minister of Water Resources was the provision of a filtered water supply to northern towns. All members know that this matter has had a long history in the House, and that over a period of about 10 years there was perhaps some degree of procrastination by the previous Government and by even earlier Governments. Improving the water supply to northern towns (those in the Iron Triangle) is a matter that has had much airing over the years both in this House and in the press.

Despite what had gone on before, prior to the election in 1979 the then Labor Government had announced the project, estimated to cost about \$25 000 000, would proceed. Within about 19 days of the election, the following report by political reporter Greg Kelton appeared in the *Advertiser* on 3 October, under the heading "Libs may axe Labor Plans", as follows:

Two major Labor Government projects costing \$28 000 000 are likely to be shelved by the new Liberal Government.

The decision by the Minister of Water Resources to review water filtration for northern towns is the matter that I am concerned with, and the report states:

Under the Labor proposal, \$25 000 000 would have been spent to provide filtered water to the Iron Triangle area and certain other mid-North towns.

Quoting the Minister, Greg Kelton states:

Mr. Arnold said the \$25 000 000 water filtration project had been referred to the Treasury for consideration "in the light of the many financial commitments facing the State".

He went on to talk about the high priority that the Government gave to the River Murray salinity control programme, and I have no quarrel with that aspect of the present Government's policy because it was an aspect of the previous Government's policy, and I believe it would be supported by all South Australians. Within 19 days, presumably with the backing of Cabinet, the Minister deferred a project which had been long awaited and which was extremely necessary on health grounds for the people of those northern towns in the Iron Triangle and the mid-North. The previous Government's decision on this matter was probably one of the better decisions made in the interests of the people of this State. However, the turnaround was justified by the Minister when in February this year I raised the matter with him in the Address in Reply debate and pointed out that I could not understand how a decision could be reversed within such a short period on such an important matter; that is, to provide a better water supply and eliminate the possibility of amoebic meningitis occurring in the areas to which I have referred.

The Minister was at some pains to argue that the Labor Government, of which I was a member, had not really made any real progress in this matter and had not committed any funds to the project and that, therefore, we were in no position to be critical of his decision. The truth of the matter is that the Minister was incorrect in putting forward that argument. The member for Stuart, who lives

directly in the area to be served by the improved water supply and has a long history of association with the project, had previously asked the Minister:

Can the preliminary planning and design work necessary for the filtering of the northern cities water supply take place within the E. & W.S. Department without there being a special vote for this project in the Budget and, if not, why not; and if so, why has such work not been done?

That question gave the Minister plenty of time to consider any reply that he might give. The Minister's answer, given in November 1979, was as follows:

The preliminary planning has already been undertaken as part of the project's feasibility study.

Of course, there is a clear indication that funds had already been provided by the Labor Government for this project and had actually been spent, so that there is no question that the argument advanced by the Minister in order to justify his own shaky position on the matter was not correct. If further reinforcement is needed, I can provide it. The Minister told Estimates Committee A, after being further questioned on this matter:

The previous Government had provided certain funds for preliminary investigations into the northern towns filtration programme.

What on earth is wrong with that? I do not know why the Minister tried to deny that it ever happened, except to bolster his own unsound position in the matter, because that is how a project should begin. There should be the initial stages, where feasibility, estimating and the other early stages of the project are involved. That is the way a project should begin, and that is how it did begin: we have the Minister's own word on this, even though he said that the previous Government had not done anything in connection with it. He gave this answer only the other day to Estimates Committee A. On two occasions he has given a direct answer, both without notice and on notice late last year, completely in opposition to what he maintained in order to try to cover up the unsound position he presumably found himself in when he reversed the decision to proceed with the northern towns filtered water supply.

If there is still any doubt on this matter I can go further. In the *Recorder* of 3 October 1979 (a paper from the Pirie area) the following article appeared:

There now appears to be some doubt as to whether a \$25 000 000 water filtration programme for northern towns served by the Morgan -Whyalla pipe-line will go ahead.

That is what we have been talking about. The next paragraph states:

This is despite an assurance by the former Premier, Mr. Corcoran, to the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr. W. G. Jones, on a pre-election visit late in August that the programme was definite and was expected to begin within 18 months.

Is there any member of this House who will suggest that the word of Des Corcoran cannot be relied on? Certainly, Mr. Jones in Port Pirie seemed to think it had some standing and status. I have heard the Deputy Premier more than once since the Labor Party lost Government extolling the virtues, integrity and honesty of the former Premier, sentiments in which everyone on this side of the House would concur and support from their direct knowledge of Mr. Corcoran.

So, let it be put to rest once and for all that the decision taken by the incoming Liberal Government not to proceed with that Northern town's water supply project was not based on its own ineptitude and callous attitude towards what could be involved in a continuation of that poor water supply. Before the Premier gets all excited, I suggest that he ought to have been in the Chamber and listened to all that I said about this matter. I have not said that the

former Labor Administration was perfect in this matter: I said that a decision was taken, even though it could be argued that it took a long time to take. That was a correct decision, as I am sure everyone in the Northern Triangle and the Mid North who would get that improved water would agree.

The Minister of Water Resources had to live with that. For how long did he live with it? To prove my point, he lived with it for about one year, because on the Estimates that we were considering in Committee A there was a line (admittedly for only \$5 000) which, on questioning, related to the provision of Northern towns' water supply. So, the Minister has done another turnabout, and he has now agreed that the project should go on. I commend him for that. I am not quarrelling with the fact that he is now going to proceed with it. That decision should have remained and been carried through from the undertaking given by the former Government. When questioned a little further in that Committee, the Minister put forward a larger sum, I think a figure of \$30 000, that would be provided in the following year, and said that the project was to proceed. That was good news. I wish I could get answers of that nature in Estimates Committees in relation to other questions that I could ask.

Estimates Committees are supposed to have been brought into being for the benefit of the people of South Australia, so that there could be a better examination of the money to be spent as a result of the votes in this House and in another place. Also, the people's representatives (that is, the members) would be better served when trying to work out what should be done from the greater information that would be available.

Those parts I fully support, as do other members on this side of the House. In this case, I think that the system was at least indicated, to that extent, because I do not recall the Minister's making an announcement in the previous few months that this process was to re-proceed (if that is the right term) after he had turned about on a decision that he had made a few months before. Do not let it be misunderstood by anyone in this House or anyone who reads *Hansard*. I am pleased that the Minister changed his mind or that Cabinet changed its mind. I am pleased too that, whoever helped the Minister change his mind (it might have been some local government members from Northern towns or other persons who have been to see him or the Premier), a proper decision has been made.

A further matter which is germane to the Estimates Committee is an amazing answer given by the Premier to a question raised by another member that went something along the lines, "Now that we have a Liberal Government in power, we are able to let contracts at 1973 prices, and thus we are saving the people of South Australia money. It is all because they are lucky enough to have a Liberal Government which is letting as much as it can go out to private contractors." I asked the following question of the Minister of Water Resources because that reference was in relation to water resource matters:

What are the details of the contracts which have been let at 1973 prices and what is the equivalent figure which would have applied if the work had been done by Engineering and Water Supply Department labour?

The following were the answers that I got:

Question 1

1. Contract 97/77—Two 10.2 ML resurface tanks—Barossa Water Filtration Plant.
2. Contract 76/79—600 mm gravity mains. Noora Salinity Control Works.
3. Contract 104/78—Loveday surge tank.

The tender price was mentioned for each of those contracts. What about the answer I got to question 2,

because how on earth would one be able to ensure that the 1973 contract price mentioned was fair dinkum unless one could assess it at the alleged other price that would have been paid if the work had been done within the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for Example. The answer I received was as follows:

To ascertain the cost figure for the above contracts would require the department to calculate "day labour" estimates as distinct from contract estimates.

I could have told them that. That is why I asked the question. The answer continued:

This is not considered to be cost effective and would be difficult to do in retrospect.

That came from a Government which, when it was in Opposition, put the greatest number of Questions on Notice requiring these sorts of computations throughout all departments of the Public Service of South Australia. I did receive the following answer to a third question regarding how many persons would have been employed:

An average of 42 Engineering and Water Supply Department personnel could have been employed on the three contracts named in question No. 1.

So much for the policy of open government and maximum information to be supplied to members in the interests of the people of this State. I can only say that the operations of the Estimates Committee as a group were such that I look forward to considerable improvement if that system is to continue.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): From time to time the member for Mitchell (I must confess that I have been led into temptation by being in the Chamber for the past few minutes and hearing what was said) indulges in either flights of fancy or deliberate untruths. I sincerely trust that they are flights of fancy. If the honourable member really believes what he says from time to time and believes, therefore, what he is told, all I can say is that he must have been tremendously naive as a Minister. If the honourable member does not believe what he says, then, as I have said, he is dealing with the truth rather less honestly than he ought. Let us get down to the nitty gritty of this allegation which, for the umpteenth time, we have heard in this Chamber, namely, that it was the Liberal Government, which, on coming to office, deferred the water filtration plant for the Iron Triangle.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. I think that the Premier is entitled to have his back-benchers present when he is speaking.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not comment.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let us just put this fantasy to rest once again. First, certainly there was a line, as the Minister of Water Resources has pointed out on a number of occasions, referring to and covering "preliminary studies", but the fact was that, when it came to the point, when we came to office and looked at the Budget which had been prepared and on which we had to work, we found that the previous Government had made no allowance for that project to proceed in the following year. Preliminary studies certainly had been conducted and allowed for, but there was no funding at all for the matter to go forward.

Having said that, I want to make clear that we talked very carefully to the constituents of the member for Stuart. We talked to the Mayor of Port Pirie, together with the Mayors of Whyalla and Port Augusta, at a meeting of the Northern Spencer Gulf councils, and they accepted, although reluctantly, that we would have to defer the issue

for the time being. At least they have an assurance that the project will proceed.

Unfortunately, the member for Mitchell has left the Chamber. What a shame! Obviously, he does not like what I have to say about him, but I am going to continue, anyway. That member keeps on with this fantasy, rubbish and nonsense, trying to say that it was the Liberal Government, on coming to office, that deferred the project. The decision to defer the project was made before the present Government came to office, and it is a great credit to the Minister of Water Resources that we have now taken the project up again and are going to proceed with it.

I can appreciate the situation of the member for Mitchell, so embarrassed is he now that he has had to leave the Chamber. He calls on the word of the former Premier, the member for Hartley, and certainly I think the former Premier probably did promise the project. However, I repeat that his Government made no funds available in that year. Having spoken to members of local government and clarified the position for them, it is with great pleasure that I can now say that the project will go ahead and the early stages of planning are now being undertaken. This same member for Mitchell, who has found it necessary to leave the Chamber, was the author, I am told—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest to members of the Opposition that they allow the Premier to continue his remarks without continual interruption.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There will be no further interjections from my left.

Mr. Langley: What about last night, when I was speaking?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Unley that he should not interject.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This same gentleman, I understand, although I am not positive of it, was the author of a rather interesting press release that was issued earlier, I think at about this time last week, before the Federal election. It was a curious document. I gather that it had the approval of the Leader of the Opposition, and it stated that the member had it on the best authority that "last week" Cabinet had considered increases in Housing Trust rents but that, because of the Federal election, it had determined not to say anything at all about it, and that this was a reprehensible thing that the Government was doing.

It may well have been the member for Mitchell and it may have been the member for Gilles; I do not know. Certainly, however, it was something with which the Leader of the Opposition had something to do, because I understand that one of his officers promulgated the press release. I have never heard such unmitigated inaccurate rubbish. Housing Trust rents are fixed at a particular time of the year. Cabinet has not considered them, and is not going to consider them until the time is appropriate.

I have just been told that I must be charitable to the member because it is his birthday. That is no excuse for the sort of arrant nonsense that he has been going on with. The interesting thing about this exercise was that I was told in this release that the Government had taken this clandestine action because it was afraid of the results of the Federal election. I do not think we have anything to be afraid of in the results of the Federal election: the position is quite the reverse. Indeed, as against a national swing of some 6 per cent, fortunately we were able to keep the swing down to one-third of that in South Australia. It is now just a little under 2 per cent, and there is no doubt that, when that is translated into State terms, with the

removal of a 6 per cent swing on national issues, that is now worth a swing of 4 per cent to this Liberal Government, and I am very proud indeed to be leading such a Party.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the member for Unley is going home, I hope that he does it soon.

Mr. Langley: As a matter of fact, I'm still here.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sorely tempted, but I will not make the comment that immediately comes to mind.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: You do not think you ought to call the Sergeant-at-Arms, do you, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have been most lenient, and I suggest that the member for Unley cease interjecting because I do wish to hear what the Premier has to say.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: May the member for Unley blush it to the top of his head! I suggest to the member that, if he has not yet had this one steeling experience, he ought to have it as soon as possible. I am very pleased that I have unlimited time in which to speak. I return to the member for Mitchell for a moment and pass on a small message to Opposition members generally. May I suggest that it is probably better for them in the long term, in terms of credibility, if they stick to the truth.

I should like now to discuss in some detail the comments that have been made in respect of the operations of the Committees. Before we do anything else I thank the members of the staff, because there was a very heavy burden resting on them, and I thank all members for the co-operation they gave in this first trial of Estimates Committees in the South Australian Parliament. I would particularly like to thank the Chairmen of the two Committees. Their job was not easy. It required great concentration on their part for the entire proceedings, and I think that they did a magnificent job. I pay a tribute to members of the Public Service who contributed to both the preparation of the documents and the proceedings. I am sure all members would join me in expressing thanks to those people. I am grateful, too, for the positive attitude that I believe has predominated during the proceedings, despite some low periods, and I am grateful, too, for the many constructive comments that have been made to me during the past two weeks.

I want to deal with the remarks made by the Leader, because I assume that he was speaking for the Labor cause and for the Opposition. I thank him for his comments. He began by acknowledging that the Opposition had agreed to support the initiative and that the Government had consulted the Opposition as to the form and content of the Sessional Orders. He also reminded the House that the Government has promised to assess the views of all members before recommending the form and procedures to be followed next year.

The Leader also outlined the proposals that he had first made in the morning press, namely, that a special all-Party committee be established to inquire into and report upon Estimates Committee procedures. Thirdly, the Leader referred to specific matters that, in his judgment, reduced the effectiveness of the Committees.

Obviously, I regard these Committees as a very important step forward and I intend to examine the remarks the Leader has made in some detail. They have been made by some other members, but I think the Leader covered most of the points that were repeated by other Opposition members.

With regard to the consultation which preceded the

establishment of the Estimates Committees, it could have been said further by the Leader that the Sessional Order, in the unamended form in which it was introduced to the House, had been endorsed in its entirety by him, but for the minor caveat that notices should also be able to be forwarded to the Clerk, as well as to the Speaker. As members would know, the order was subsequently amended in the House on the motion of an Opposition member—not the Leader—and I suspect somewhat as a surprise to the Leader, who had already entered into an agreement that, with the minor amendment involving the Clerk, the Opposition would support the order in its original form. This was unfortunate. I think that the occurrence was more a comment on the aspirations of the member for Playford rather than on the Leader himself.

Mr. Bannon: It was quite a sound suggestion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I disagree with the Leader. If the further amendment had not been made the grounds for some of the Leader's later complaints and criticisms may not have applied since the Chairman would then have had a wider discretion. There are two points to be made in answer to the Leader's first comments. First, the Opposition's agreed support was not forthcoming in the terms agreed, either at the time the order was approved, or later, when on two occasions Opposition members staged a walk out. If the Leader does acknowledge consultation and support, then he should also acknowledge that the Opposition was also unable to foresee the problems which he now identifies.

The second point I want to make is that the Leader quite correctly reminded members that the Government has promised to listen to the opinions of Opposition members before settling its own judgment on the Estimates Committees. I take this opportunity to repeat the same assurance to the House now. I would hope that members' criticisms are constructive and well-founded, unlike some of those, indeed, quite a number of those, advanced by the Leader, and that they are directed towards improving the procedures. I am disappointed that in the spirit of co-operation the Leader did not mention (until he did this afternoon when trying to ask a question on the yellow book, and I am not quite sure what the purpose of his question was) that I had invited him to submit the Opposition's views on the value of the yellow book to the professional consultants who have been engaged and who are going to advise the Government on the development of programme performance budgeting, as I pointed out this afternoon.

Mr. Bannon: I got your letter today.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am prepared to accept that. The Government believes that a balanced report on the development of the programme and performance budgeting scheme should have the views from the official Opposition and that the consultants should have those views available to them. That was the reason for the letter to the Leader of the Opposition. I must say that in my view the Leader will have to say a great deal more than he said yesterday afternoon if that offer is to yield anything useful. To say, as he did in his speech, that the supplementary programme papers yielded less than was initially expected and to say no more is of no use to anyone.

It is fair to say that Budget papers prepared on these lines are not easy to comprehend, certainly not on the first reading, by someone accustomed only to line budgeting. But people who have taken little time and trouble to examine the details very quickly find that they contain a wealth of information and certainly far more information than the old system provided. Unfortunately, it must be said that some members did not appear to have spent the necessary time to gain an understanding of the document,

and thus they were not able to take advantage of the additional material it contained: some were simply confused. The Leader's earlier remarks do not inspire a great deal of confidence in his understanding of the yellow book or of the programme performance system. Many observers believe that the Opposition members did not take advantage of the very full information which was freely available. Indeed, many people say that they just did not know what it was all about.

The Leader's second major point was that a special all-Party committee should be established to inquire into the operation of the Estimates Committees to recommend improvements for adoption next year. While the Government will certainly consider this with other suggestions, I must remind members, if they need reminding, that there already exists a Standing Orders Committee, in whose area of concern this matter would seem more appropriately to lie. As far as I know there is nothing to prevent the Standing Orders Committee from examining this subject, as I have no doubt it will.

Mr. Becker: That's what happens in Canberra.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, it happens in Canberra. There is nothing to stop the Standing Orders Committee from seeking the considered views of all members, including those of the member for Flinders, the member for Mitcham, and the member for Semaphore. The Leader claims that the principles of effective Opposition and effective Ministerial responsibility are at stake, and that, the importance of these principles warrants a special committee. Be that as it may, I am not yet convinced that the matter is beyond the province of the Standing Orders Committee of this House.

I now come to the Leader's specific criticisms of this year's Estimates Committees. The first of these concerns the difficulty encountered by so-called sideline members because they were required to wait until Committee members had completed their own questions before they were able to personally participate. Curiously, the Leader proceeded immediately to answer his own complaint. He said quite rightly that sideline members should attend throughout the Committee hearings on those votes in which they professed to have an interest, if only for their own information, and to match their intended questions with those already asked. Also, he said quite rightly that members must arrange their affairs to suit the convenience of the House, and that they should not seek to change the affairs of the House to suit their own convenience, something that one member of this House constantly seeks to do. Then the Leader went on to back two horses by adding after these remarks he agreed "in the broad" with the complaints uttered by the member for Mitcham. The Leader said that there should be greater opportunity for sideline participation, but he offered no real suggestion as to how this should be achieved.

Mr. Bannon: No, that should be dealt with by the Committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I agree that this is a matter that should be investigated; certainly there are some problems. But I noted during my own appearance before Committee A that the member for Mitcham did not have to wait very long at all before being invited to question me, which he did (it was a most vital question, apparently, to him), on the membership of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal.

I believe that when the Budget is considered properly and fully in programme form there will be a far greater number of opportunities to invite questions from sideline members, simply because the lines that exist at present will be divided into a far greater number of programmes. That means that each programme will be examined and the

opportunity will be given to sideline members far more frequently than was the case when lines were considered during the most recent Committee hearings. I would totally agree with the comments that have been made that nowhere is this more necessary than in the area of health. I think this will prove beyond any doubt in the future the considerable value of programme and performance budgeting because the single health line will be divided into a number of programmes and projects; it may well be that hospitals will have their own entity, their own balance sheet and that that will be the subject of questioning in one section. Obviously, there will be far more opportunities for sideline members to participate, once questioning on a particular programme has been completed by Committee members.

Mr. Becker: But they are all statutory authorities.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That, too, is something that has to be looked at very carefully indeed. The Government will listen to members' opinions but, in the circumstances, I would have been grateful if the Leader had made positive suggestions on that line. Should we, for example, be looking at a fixed time limit for deliberation on each vote, after which sideline members could then move in and have priority, or would it be sufficient to permit sideline members to ask questions on any one line or programme within a total vote before the Committee proceeds to the next programme within that line? It may well be that the solution will be found in one of these two or perhaps other suggestions.

It is important that we come in some detail to the next matter raised by the Leader. We come to the oft-repeated claim that the timing arrangements were wrong in almost every respect.

Mr. Bannon: They didn't work very well.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is a difference between that comment and what the Leader said originally.

Mr. Bannon: They were inflexible.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: They were wrong in almost every respect, according to the Leader previously. First, the Leader said that no real effort was made to balance the importance of each portfolio with the different times available on different sitting days, but one must examine that statement in the context of the facts. While general inexperience may well have played a part (and that is something we would all agree on), Opposition members agreed without demur to the time table of examinations proposed to each Committee on the first day of sitting. Further, there was only one occasion when a Minister (in fact, it was I) was called back on the next day of sitting to allow further questioning, and that was largely because I indicated that I was quite willing to do so. In view, therefore, of the Opposition's ready acceptance of the time table and failure to vary that time table as the Committees work evolved, I find it difficult to accept the Leader's stated concern on the matter of priorities.

Mr. Bannon: We had no choice.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that it was possible for Opposition members to vary the times. Indeed, I was an example. I came back on the following day for the first hour of the Committee sitting. That situation was made quite clear by the Chairman at the time. It may be possible next year to take into account the times involved this year. The questioning, both in content and emphasis, however, could well change and the same difficulties could arise, even though we make a tailor-made attempt to fit this year's proceedings.

Mr. Bannon: We should be allowed to extend the period of questioning on any given day. That's what was inflexible.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The same situation arose

when I was before Committee A and agreed to come back for a further hour on the next day of sitting.

Mr. Bannon: To do that, we had to do away with another hour.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That could have been done all the way through. It is up to the Committees to decide how much time they want to spend.

One of the comments made to me on a number of occasions by a number of people was that we should remove the atmosphere of Party debate and allow members to concentrate on fact finding. I suspect that holding Committee meetings somewhere other than in the Chambers is considered by many people to be, and may be, an answer to this problem of giving in to the temptation of seeking to score political points during the Committee proceedings.

Mr. McRae: Take it out of the public view and you destroy it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Members opposite jump to conclusions too rapidly. The member for Playford knows full well that, when the Electoral Commissioners met on the last redistribution, they met in the large committee room and those proceedings were open to the public and the press and the whole situation worked extraordinarily well. I am not saying that that is an answer, but it has been suggested that, by bringing people into this forum, the old urge to score political points, instead of seeking information, is one which wasted a great deal of time that could have been far more valuably used in eliciting information from Ministers and their advisers.

The Estimates Committees of the Commonwealth Parliament prohibit the asking of questions purely concerned with policy. Those matters are confined to the second reading stages of the debate. Indeed, it could well happen that in this most recent debate that we have had, that the reports be noted, matters of policy can be ventilated, and matters of fact only are sought during the Estimates Committees' deliberations. These changes could well be considered to ensure that the time available is used specifically for its intended purpose, that is, for members to seek information and acquaint themselves with the details of the Government's administration of the State under various departments. I am afraid that that was not the case with these proceedings.

More particularly, I wish now to return to the Leader's complaints about the time available. He next stated (and I was absolutely amazed by the statement) that time was wasted by the unnecessary interchanges between Ministers and Public Service advisers and by time-consuming discussions on points of order. Those latter comments should be placed firmly in context by remarking that they came from somebody who twice led his Party in a walk-out, and whose last consideration on those occasions was that time valuable to all members would be lost as a result. That context places his credibility in its proper perspective.

Finally (and this was the most surprising aspect of all), the Leader claimed that the total time available for Estimates Committees was inferior to the former system of consideration by a Committee of the whole.

Mr. Bannon: As far as the Opposition's rights are concerned. Study my remarks carefully. Think of yourself a year ago, and then you'll understand what I am saying.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is entirely because we had long and profitable experience in Opposition—something that the Leader will also have—that we have decided, as a matter of policy, that this system should be put forward because it gives Opposition members in particular, if they use the time properly, far more opportunity to find out

exactly what is happening. Indeed, that was so, too. The assertion made by the Leader that the time available for Estimates Committees was inferior to the former system was quite absurd.

Mr. Bannon: We'll do an analysis, and I'll show you the figures.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I intend to tell the Leader the figures. This year the total time spent in Estimates Committees was 83½ hours. In previous years, the average time spent in the Committee of the whole between 1973 and 1979 was 25½ hours. I repeat that it was 25½ hours average in previous years and 83½ hours this year, with much more information available. What is more, there is probably not one member in this House who can remember the last time that all Estimates were considered by the Committee of the whole House. Under the old system large sections were simply not covered at all in the time available. This year every portfolio has been covered.

Mr. Mathwin: We didn't do education at all, one year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Exactly. If it had not been for grandstanding, political point scoring, and walking out (and I suspect that the Leader must have been ashamed on at least one occasion of the actions of members of the Committee on his side), members on both sides would have had ample opportunity, in fact, far more opportunity than they had ever been given in this Chamber before, to consider the Budget details.

The time available was increased from 25½ hours to 83½ hours, and every portfolio was covered: these two facts alone represent most significant advances and advantages provided by the Estimates Committee system. The suggestion that the old system was better because the time available for the Estimates Committees was inferior is blatantly absurd.

The varying role of the public servants was criticised, particularly as it related to the answering of direct questions and the proffering of advice to the Ministers. It was further alleged by the Leader that some Ministers improperly referred questions of policy to their advisers. The Leader gave one example, and one example only, to illustrate this claim. The case referred to by the Leader was the reference to the Police Commissioner by the Chief Secretary of a question from the member for Stuart, a question which, according to the Leader, related to the Government's policy on law enforcement. The *Hansard* record reveals that, after a long preamble and after quoting excerpts from the Liberal Party election policy, the member for Stuart asked a specific question, as follows:

Would the increase in crime be reduced only by the provision of more police officers?

That is the question that the Leader complained was one of policy.

Mr. McRae: *Hansard* does not show that at all. That was not the question he put.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest, because I have it down, very carefully, that that was the question put.

Mr. McRae: You read *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That was the question about which the Leader complained. It may interest the member for Playford, who is frantically trying to dodge the issue, to know that I wrote this myself. That question is not one of policy, and is not even a question of fact: it is hypothetical within the standards adopted by this House. The question sought an expert opinion, and an expert opinion was available and was called upon. I suspect that, if the Chief Secretary had ventured an opinion on this hypothetical question, he would have been criticised for not going to the expert and asking the Commissioner to comment. All I can say is that, if the question had been a question of

policy, it would have taken the following form:

Is it the policy of the Government to increase the size of the Police Force?

or:

Does the Government have a police manpower policy that is related to the incidence of crime?

Those two questions are policy questions, but neither of these questions was asked, and the Leader knows it. The criticism was quite out of place and out of context, and one can only conclude that it was yet another of the many attempts made recently by the Opposition to attack the Chief Secretary. He is getting used to them, but those attempts are beginning to lack any sort of credibility.

There only remains the variation in the role played by Public Service advisers. When question of fact are involved, there is no reason why advisers should not answer directly, but, clearly, this is in the hands of each Minister. I hope that everyone has learned a great deal from the proceedings of the Estimates Committees. Time and practice will undoubtedly make for better procedures. The member for Playford, in his contribution, referred to the guidelines for public servants who appear before Parliamentary Committees; he said that public servants were confused because they did not know whether or not the guidelines applied. This is not so.

Mr. McRae: Mr. Bachmann was in the gallery throughout, and the officers did not know.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is not so. Clearly, from a perusal of the first sentence of the guidelines, it can be seen that they do not apply and they are not intended to apply to Public Service advisers who accompany Ministers appearing before Estimates Committees, and the honourable member would have done well to look at those guidelines again. That sentence states:

These guidelines cover situations where officials are called before Select and special committees of the South Australian Parliament.

As the honourable member should know, only Ministers are called before Estimates Committees. That situation is made perfectly clear in the Sessional Order that the honourable member supported in an amended form and, indeed, amended himself.

In conclusion, I cannot in any way agree with the Leader's final remark that "While the Estimates Committees have been an interesting experiment, they have not been successful." While there is still a long way to go in refining the procedures, it would be more accurate to say that, although they have not been faultless, they have been successful in terms of increased time, increased availability of information, and in proving that there is room for improvement in existing procedures.

They have also shown, quite clearly, that the Opposition still suffers from the tunnel vision which was induced by the old conventional line budgeting, that is, from the preoccupation with quantitative rather than qualitative judgments on budgetary policy. Let me restate that one of the principal objects of programme budgeting is to ascertain, with more precision than ever before, just how effectively and how efficiently public money is being spent, and how relevant the different spending programmes are to current needs and policies. The establishment of Estimates Committees, together with programme-based Budgets, facilitates such an examination, but, while the Opposition still thinks solely in terms of solving problems by throwing more and more money at them, that potential will never be fully realised.

I trust that between now and the next Budget this problem will be reduced by providing briefing sessions for all members from Treasury officers, so that a better understanding will emerge of the objects of programme

budgeting and the wider range of measures that may be adopted to judge financial performance. Together with the adoption of programme-performance budgeting procedures, internal audit and revised accounting systems, deregulation, and statutory body review, the use of Estimates Committees can be a most valuable process in maintaining a high level of Government accountability.

The setting up of Estimates Committees has been a significant development—indeed a milestone—in the history of the South Australian Parliament. I am confident that the imperfections can, and will, be ironed out, with long-term benefit, not only to Parliament but to the community as a whole.

The House divided on Mr. Bannon's amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Hopgood, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. D. C. Brown, Chapman, and Goldsworthy.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the Hon. J. D. Wright's amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright (teller).

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Hopgood, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. D. C. Brown, Chapman, and Goldsworthy.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

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

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

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

Motion carried.

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

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The most recent speech of the Premier contained some statements that should not go unchallenged. Two of them particularly I want to take up immediately: one relates to the walk-outs by the Opposition.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate for a speaker to refer to a previous debate?

Mr. KENEALLY: I have not. I did not do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! While he refers to decisions and discussions within Estimates Committee B, the honourable member is in order. If he goes beyond the decisions and discussions in Estimates Committee B, he will be out of order. Because we are considering the expenditures referred to Estimates Committee B, it is obvious that there

will be reference to the remarks made in that Committee.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir; your ruling is absolutely correct. Much has been said already in the debate in this House which has related expressly to Estimates Committee B, a committee on which I served. The Premier has been most critical of the Opposition for what he called its unwarranted walk-outs in two Committee debates. Let me, for the benefit of the Premier and of the House, explain the circumstances in relation to one of those walk-outs, when the Opposition walked out on the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister, who had been filibustering for the whole of the afternoon and the evening, was asked a question, and he gave what was clearly an unsatisfactory reply, as will be apparent from a perusal of *Hansard*. A motion was moved to reduce the line. It was declared by the Chairman to be not in the proper form, and so it was then worded appropriately. The Minister, with 23 minutes left of the evening session, turned to the officers who were behind him and said, "It's all right, chaps. You can pack up your bags now. I will see out the rest of the evening."

In those circumstances, what was the point of Opposition members remaining in the Chamber? We had remained for 20 of the 23 minutes left. We tried to draw the Chairman's attention to what the Minister was doing, but the Chairman could in no way affect the activities of the Minister. Opposition members were so frustrated that they then walked out, three minutes from the end of the day's session.

The Premier has said in this House that one of the reasons why the Opposition was unable to have sufficient time to question Ministers was that its members walked out on Committee sessions. We walked out three minutes before the completion of the session after the Minister was clearly heard to say that he would complete the remainder of the session, without anyone else having the opportunity to make a contribution. That is an absolute abuse of the Committee system. The Premier has accused the Opposition of being irresponsible, but what happened at the Committee has never been related to the Parliament or in the press, and perhaps those members on the Government benches who might have felt that Opposition members were irresponsible will think again now they know what happened. That was the first criticism that the Premier chose to make of the Opposition.

He also criticised the Leader of the Opposition, who made a very constructive contribution to the work of these Committees, a contribution made with a view to assisting the Parliament to determine its future attitude to the Committee system. The Premier did nothing but make cheap political capital out of it, making snide remarks about the Leader's contribution, and totally misrepresenting what had been said. He was critical because the Leader had said that the programme papers were not an accurate guide to the Budget documents. The Premier was highly critical of that statement. Let me enlighten Government members about what their Ministers had to say. I shall refer first to a comment by the Chief Secretary on this point, and then to other comments made by the Minister of Mines and Energy. At page 295, after a member had complained about the inaccuracies of the Budget documents, the Chief Secretary said:

I understand the member's lamentations and the clear and concise way he has expressed them. However, these papers have effective reflection only on the portfolios of the Premier and Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Some work had been done on the Department of Fisheries. I am surprised that it was accurate, because generally it has not been accurate.

That is the remark of a Minister of the Government, telling the Committee that generally the programme papers had not been accurate. That was not a statement by the Opposition. We are quoting the statements of Ministers, who should know what was contained in the documents. At page 49, the Minister of Mines and Energy had this to say:

I said that there may be some vacancies in the A.D.P. establishment. I do not think that one can take too much notice of the figures on page 67 of the supplementary document.

Not more than a minute later, on page 50, the Minister of Mines and Energy, in Estimates Committee B, said:

I agree that you have to take the figures on page 67 as indicative, not as precise.

Again, he reflects upon the accuracy of the document. Later on page 50 he said:

I think that the figures have to be taken with a grain of salt. When the Leader of the Opposition uses the evidence quite clearly given to the Committee by the Ministers of the Crown, the Premier tries to score some political points by saying that the Leader is being critical of the programme papers. He does not wait to hear the basis of the Opposition's criticism, and that is not good enough. Either the information provided to the Opposition is accurate, or it is not. If it is not, that is a reflection on the Government for bringing in for Parliamentary debate material that is not accurate.

The programme papers referred to by the Minister of Mines and Energy were not accurate in the preliminary information they contained, and that started a debate lasting many minutes before that fact was acknowledged by the Minister. The papers were not accurate. When Ministers wished to hide behind that inaccuracy, they did so. That they were able to do that is no credit to the people who prepared the documents and it is no credit to the Premier for trying to get out from under a responsibility that is clearly his, as Treasurer.

Those are two fundamental issues that were taken up by the Premier in his forgettable contribution earlier tonight. The walk-out in which I was involved was warranted, and it should have been done earlier to highlight what the Minister of Mines and Energy was doing. He was filibustering, with intent; he had told his officers that they could pack up their documents and that he would see out the rest of the session.

How hypocritical it is of the Government now to point the finger at Opposition members who were subjected to that indignity. They were clearly subjected to an indignity, and now the Government wishes to make political capital out of the quite disgraceful performance of one of its more senior members. It is about time that this Parliament and members of the Government were told how the Deputy Premier acted when he was being questioned in that Committee.

From the time the Committee started until the time it finished, the Deputy Premier treated members of the Opposition with the utmost contempt. He was not interested at all in providing full answers to questions. At no time did he attempt to do that, but I want to come back to the Deputy Premier a little later. The Premier also was critical of a statement I made to the Chief Secretary when he was being questioned on the police lines. I made the comment during that session, and I make it again now, that I found it distasteful that the Chief Secretary—the politician, the Parliamentarian and the man responsible for policy—allowed the Commissioner of Police to answer policy questions, and that is clearly what he did. I will now read to the House what I said at the time when I was asking a question about the Liberal Party's election policy.

At page 264, I quoted from a pamphlet put out by the previous member for Norwood, the Liberal candidate for that seat at the last election, as follows:

A Liberal Government will make the streets safe for your daughters to walk on, without being molested by those hooligans who have been acting as if they owned the place for the last 10 years.

I also quoted the following statement by the Minister of Health who stated:

The Government—
referring to the A.L.P. Government of South Australia—
has done little or nothing about public concern about violent crime and lenient sentences.

I took up an answer that the Commissioner of Police made earlier when he said there has been an increase in crime in South Australia since the election of the Liberal Government. I asked the Minister whether, in view of the comments that his Party had made prior to the election, the promised increase in staffing of the Police Force would have the effect of decreasing the crime rate in South Australia. I was referring to the purely political policy enunciated by the then Liberal Opposition to the electorate in South Australia, and the Minister, as the Minister responsible for administering the portfolio relating to the control of crime in South Australia, passed that question over to the Commissioner of Police—a purely political question put in a purely political sense. The Minister was not prepared to face up to his responsibilities, and he asked the Commissioner of Police to answer, putting that gentleman in a most invidious position, as he did with his officers for the rest of that day. One of the most important aspects of questioning that members of Parliament have is to be able to see whether a Minister is competent enough to control his portfolio and his public servants, or whether they control the Minister. Surely the Parliament of this State should expect that its Ministers make the policy and are responsible to Parliament for that policy.

That did not happen on that occasion, and it is no good the Premier trying to defend one of his Ministers here when the Premier was not at the Committee. He has misrepresented the context in which the question was asked. Any reasonable person who reads what I said will know exactly the political content of my question and know that the Minister passed that political question over to a public servant, which is a disgraceful thing. I said at the time that I had the highest respect for the Commissioner of Police: he has been an admirable appointment to that position, and he is a first-class officer, who ought not to be placed in that invidious position. I certainly hope that it never happens again.

A number of issues arose from that Minister's portfolio, but I will ask honourable members to excuse me if I jump from one portfolio to another because I want to comment as much as I am able to on each of the Ministers with whom I was involved in the Committees. I was also involved in the Committee that questioned the Minister of Transport and Minister of Recreation and Sport. The transport portfolio is of vital interest to every member and one about which they have an understanding; indeed, if there is one matter in South Australia that all members have an understanding of, it is transport, because it affects us all closely.

On the day in question, when one would have expected that the Minister of Transport would be available to appear before the Committee from 11 a.m. until 10 p.m., the Committee was told that he was available only between 11 a.m. and 6 p.m. That was a short session for the questioning of a Minister whom we would have liked more time to question. There was considerable question-

ing which could have taken place and which did not take place—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: Even if there was time lost, it did not make up for the time that would have been available to us in the evening if the Minister had been available. I found that situation to be unfortunate. All members will recall the advertisement of achievements of the Tonkin Government in South Australia that listed about eight items that we all have all clearly forgotten, because they were not really achievements at all. However, one of them was the registration rebates for electrically-driven vehicles, which was an achievement of the Tonkin Government in South Australia. I asked the Minister to tell the Committee how many vehicle registration rebates had been granted for electrically-driven vehicles. The Minister was unable to tell me, and a check on the *Hansard* report will show that I had to ask the question again.

The question was again evaded and I had to ask the question a third time. The Minister said that he thought there had been some and a quick check with his officers showed that there had been eight registration rebates in the last 12 months as a result of this major concession granted by the present Government. That is indeed a major achievement!

One of the major aspects that came out of the discussion with the Minister of Transport as Minister of Recreation and Sport was that there had been an effective 20 per cent cut across the board in recreation and sport grants. That is the most dramatic cut in any of the Minister's lines. In 1973-74, during the Whitlam era, badly needed funds were made available for sport and recreation in South Australia, and those funds were well used in the districts of many Government members and in my own district but, since November 1975, there have been dramatic cuts in funding for those facilities. There were dramatic cuts in funding when the Labor Party was in Government, and there have been even more dramatic cuts in funding now that the Liberal Party is in Government. These grants could have been maintained, and I am very sad to see these cuts being made. It should not have happened. The overwhelming majority of people in South Australia benefit from grants in that area, not the least of these people being the younger citizens of South Australia. I certainly hope that the Minister is strong enough, when the 1981 Budget is before Cabinet, to not only make up the 20 per cent that has been lost this time but also increase the allocation.

That is an area that is well worth funding. We have a Premier and a Government that brags about so-called reductions in taxation, although this is still the highest taxing State Government that we have ever had in South Australia; the facts will clearly indicate that. The Government brags about reducing taxation for those people who are best able to pay, yet here, in the sport and recreation area, the working people of South Australia, the less affluent, suffer. I was not very impressed by that.

Before I turn to the Chief Secretary and the Deputy Leader, I want to answer another statement made by the Premier relating to the filtration of the water supply for Northern Spencer Gulf. The former Government told the Northern Spencer Gulf area that planning had been put into effect for the filtration of the Spencer Gulf water supply, but that no money had been funded in that Budget line, because the planning could be done under the existing vote. No additional money had to be provided. When the Liberal Party came to Government in South Australia, it stopped the planning process for the water filtration of the Northern Spencer Gulf water supply. It

effectively put it back 12 months because it stopped the planning. That planning could have continued without the expenditure of one additional cent by the Government, but it stopped it.

Now the Premier makes great play that he and his Minister have supported the filtration of the Northern Spencer Gulf water supply and that the planning process has been put into effect. There is not one cent on the Budget line for this. Do the Premier of this State and the Minister of Water Resources think that Opposition members are stupid? Do they think that the mayors of the Spencer Gulf cities are stupid? Do they think that residents of the Spencer Gulf area are stupid? If they do, they are sadly mistaken.

I can tell members of the Government and those people who support the Government that the Liberal Government in South Australia stopped for 12 months the planning for filtration for Northern Spencer Gulf water, and that means that we will get that facility 12 months later than we would otherwise have received it. That is a responsibility that the Liberal Government in South Australia must bear. It is no good these people trying to say that there was no funding in the Labor Budget so that the Labor Government was responsible.

Mr. Russack: Your Government did not have any money on the line for it.

Mr. KENEALLY: There is absolutely no point in my explaining to the honourable member. His colleagues understand, but the member for Goyder does not understand the point that I made. There did not need to be any money funded at that time, as there is no need for money to be funded now, for the planning process to proceed. However the Liberal Government stopped the planning process from proceeding within the department's normal activities. Surely the honourable member for Goyder is not so dense as not to understand the point that I am making. The honourable member has got it now and he knows that the Government of which he is a member has, for 12 months, delayed the filtration of the water supply in the Northern Spencer Gulf. There is no doubt about that.

I return to the Chief Secretary. I will not bedevil him with his performance on the Fire Brigade; his performance on the Marine and Harbors and about the unfortunate vessel that he still has not been able to refloat; or his performance on the Fisheries Department. However, those matters were of a similar standard to the Minister's performance in relation to the Police Commissioner. The Chief Secretary entirely allowed his officers to give the answers to questions asked. Because he did that, members were able to get information they might not otherwise have been able to obtain, and I appreciate that. When a technical question was asked, the Minister allowed his officers to answer it, and that was good. But, what came out of that question period and out of the Deputy Premier's question period was that those two Ministers are not very *au fait* with what is happening in their departments. The member for Morphett purses his lips as though that was an unfair statement, but I attended a meeting at Port Augusta that dealt with the Redcliff plant. The Deputy Premier—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Did you chair that meeting?

Mr. KENEALLY: I did and I was a very good chairman. I ask everybody to listen to this because it gives some indication of how closely the Deputy Premier is involved in his portfolio. The Deputy Premier was asked at that meeting whether the boats travelling up the Gulf to the Redcliff wharf would carry any ballast. He said, "I can answer that; I do not need to check with my officers. The answer is 'No, there will be no ballast on the boats

travelling up the Spencer Gulf to the wharf'" This immediately brought the house down. The Deputy Premier, realising that he must have made a mistake, then asked his officer from the Marine and Harbors Mr.—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Kinnane.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, Mr. Kinnane—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: So I do know something.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. Mr. Kinnane said, "Well, Mr. Minister the boats coming up the Gulf to Redcliff wharf will be carrying 20 000 tonnes of ballast." That was the small difference between what the Deputy Premier guessed the answer was and what his departmental officer knew. That is the style that the Deputy Premier adopts towards his portfolio. The honourable member for Flinders would be able to vouch for what I am saying. That was the style that the Deputy Premier adopted at that Committee meeting. He is a lazy Minister; he is catch-as-catch-can.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: On a point of order Mr. Acting Chairman, that is offensive. If anyone in this place is not lazy, it is Roger Goldsworthy and, in his absence, I must protest at what the honourable member has said. The honourable member can say what he wants about me while I am here, but not in my absence.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mathwin): I am afraid I cannot uphold the point of order. Perhaps the honourable member would be willing to retract.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take the point that the Chief Secretary makes, namely, that the Deputy Premier is not lazy, but works hard and tries to understand his department. In that case, the Deputy Premier is stupid. He can have it one way or the other: he is either lazy or stupid. I think that the Deputy Premier must be lazy because I know he is not stupid. There is no more cunning practitioner of the political art in South Australia, and there is no more cunning practitioner of the steel boot and the hard chop than the Deputy Premier. If the Deputy Premier is not lazy and not stupid, he is arrogant, and on that we would all agree, even the members of his own Party. That is the spirit with which the Deputy Premier treated that committee.

I do not blame the Premier for his attempts to try to protect the Chief Secretary. Everybody likes the Chief Secretary, and no-one wishes upon him the whole chapter of mishaps that have unfortunately occurred in relation to his portfolio. The Opposition does not say that the Chief Secretary has deliberately gone out of his way to sink ships, burn shops, spoil the fishing industry in South Australia, let prisoners out of gaol and do the whole chapter of things that bring a smile to the Chief Secretary's face. The Minister likes life to be interesting and, if that is what he likes, on this occasion he has been successful.

I must say that I was pleased with the attitude of the Minister of Transport. However, I was disappointed that we were not provided with a full opportunity to be able to elicit more information from him in areas in which we were interested. Committee B varied in relation to whether it was successful or otherwise. On balance, I would say that the Ministers who appeared before it were not as helpful as they could have been.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Mathwin): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion. All members who have spoken so far on the reports of Estimates Committee A and, in this case, the one speaker on Estimates Committee B, have expressed an opinion as to their likes or dislikes for the Committee system. As it is the first time that we have had experience with this type of system, I believed that it was only right that we should give

the proposed system a go. In the first three days of operation of the Committees, I was very disappointed at the way the system was tackled, probably by all members.

Mr. Peterson: Except the member for Flinders.

Mr. BLACKER: I make an exception in this case, in response to the interjection, because I did not participate at that time. I was an observer, taking careful note of the success or otherwise of the way in which the respective Ministers were managing their particular sections of the Committee stages. Having said that, I must pass some comment, inasmuch as I do not believe I had as much opportunity to participate in the debate as I would have had under the previous system. At least under the previous system every member had an opportunity to enter the Committee stage debate at any time he or she chose, and to that extent there was far greater involvement by every individual.

I believe that many comments made not only by the press but also by members of this House have revolved too much about the wishes and opportunities of the minor Parties. There are three such representatives, being the member for Semaphore, the member for Mitcham, and I, each representing his own political view. However, it should also be stated that not only were the three of us concerned: there were also 26 back-bench members of the main political Parties who likewise were so disadvantaged. Whilst we three have been used as an excuse, where were the 26 back-bench members of the two main political Parties?

I was in the precincts of Parliament House for the six days of the Committee meetings, and I think I could claim that I was present probably for more of the duration of the whole Committees than was any other member. One exception is the member for Semaphore, because he was in the corridors at much the same time as I was, and we tried to watch the activities of both Committees. That is where the impractical situation came.

There has been much debate about a walk-out from Committee A. At that time, I was deeply involved and interested, because of the nature of my district, in Estimates Committee B, where we had the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Fisheries, who held two portfolios of vital importance to my district. The next thing was that I had a message passed to me to come down and form an opposition in Estimates Committee A. That is where the whole impractical situation came about.

I believe that I was disadvantaged, not because I am a single member, but because I was one of the 29 members who were not active participants in the Committee system. I do not think that that is an answer in itself, because the nine Committee members involved in one Committee were completely disadvantaged and were dissociated from any activity in the other Committee, so the interests of those members and the opportunities to participate in the debate were prejudged for them. They could not represent their constituents in the manner in which their constituents believed they should.

Much has been said about all Ministers having the opportunity to participate in the Committee stages, and I think that is acknowledged, because in the Budget debate last year many Ministers (and I refer specifically to those at the latter part of the programme) did not get the opportunity to have questions asked on their portfolio and, more important, they did not have opportunity to be able to answer and clarify things, whereas that would have assisted in the presentation about their portfolios. There were considerable disadvantages to that extent.

On this occasion, whilst each Minister had an opportunity to face the Committee for at least part of the debate on that Minister's portfolio, I think that only one

Minister actually completed discussion of that Minister's entire responsibilities, at the same time giving opportunity for all members to question adequately. Many Ministers had most of their time taken up with the first one or two sections of their portfolio and in the last quarter of an hour there was a push through of the remainder, such as the Loan lines.

Therefore, while we can say that there was benefit in all Ministers having to face a Committee, it is equally true that all Ministers did not present all their portfolios and responsibilities in a full and proper way. I was quite surprised, when I arrived at Parliament House yesterday, to find that we were going to have two lots of reports of Committees. Many members are having two bites of the cherry and therefore getting an hour of reporting upon the Committees' reports to Parliament. If the intention of the Committee system was to save time, to that extent it has failed, because I think that the whole process of the Budget debate, the Committee stage and the reporting has meant that longer periods of debate have taken place, there has been far more filibustering, there have been attempts by some members to see that the system would fail, and there have been desperate attempts by other members to see that it would succeed.

We have had excellent performances by some Ministers in involving their departmental officers in providing greater explanations for Committee members who were actually involved on the Committee, and occasionally for those who waited around and asked questions by the good grace of the Chairman. I am referring specifically to the Chairman of Estimates Committee B, who allowed me to ask questions on a number of occasions. The Chairman made special requests of the Committee to see that I had the opportunity to ask questions.

Once again, I raise the point that the Chairman was good to me, but where were the other 28 members who were not directly involved in the Committees and who should have been representing their constituents? If those 28 members had been there, obviously the system would have broken down, because they would not have had the opportunity to ask questions that they were rightfully entitled to ask.

I wish to refer now to a subject that I raised during the Committee B debate, and that is Redcliff. Unfortunately, I seem to be taking almost every opportunity I get in Parliament to raise this problem. I do so now with a greater degree of concern than I ever had previously. On 25 September the Deputy Premier reported to this House that the negotiations with Dow Chemical were deferred. That very day, and by some coincidence, a group called the Professional and Business Women's Group in Port Lincoln called a public meeting and held an "information night on Redcliff".

It had been arranged that Dr. John Hails would be present at that meeting. Those members who have watched relevant television programmes no doubt would have seen Dr. Hails. He is a doctor at the Adelaide University, and as such has been vitally involved in the affairs of Redcliff. Although the Dow Chemical involvement had virtually been cancelled as of that day, Dr. Hails still went to Port Lincoln and the meeting went ahead. Ninety-eight people attended despite the fact that the news had been on radio and television that Dow Chemical was pulling out. These 98 people were vitally concerned for the future of Port Lincoln, for the fishermen and for the associated industries which hang on the future of the prawn industry.

Dr. Hails gave a very frank talk, and his comments substantiated the fears of many people, for it is now becoming quite evident that Government departments

have not been allowed to express their honest and sincere views on this proposal. More to the point, the scientists involved in the research at Redcliff Point have endeavoured to present all their submissions in such a way that a person at Leaving maths level could understand them. Even at this level, they have been dismissed specifically by the Deputy Premier and to a lesser degree by the other Ministers. It was of great concern to hear Dr. Hails say that, because he was commenting specifically on the reaction of the Deputy Premier and the Government to a model presented by Professor Green. To that extent Dr. Hails took up the cause of Professor Green and indicated that he was a man so highly respected in the scientific field that he was considered among one of the top 10 in the world in the area of pollution and more particularly in the area of petro-chemical pollution.

Dr. Green's model, as he presented it (and I have referred to it in the House before), indicated that, a 10-tonne spillage at Redcliff Point, with all the other factors involved occurring in a way that was possible, but highly unlikely—with the correct water temperature, with the tides running the right way at the right time and with all other environmental factors occurring specifically in the right way—could cause the evacuation of Port Augusta. We are talking about a theoretical model of a 10-tonne spillage with the climatic and geographical conditions associated with the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf, and, more particularly, Redcliff Point.

That model proposed by Professor Green was scoffed at. It was laughed at by the Ministers, and every attempt was made to discredit Professor Green. As I mentioned, Dr. Hails took this quite seriously and he was rather critical of the Deputy Premier and of Government officers for their treatment of Professor Green in this way.

The member for Stuart has referred to the public meeting which was held at Port Augusta and which he chaired. The very first question raised on that night concerned the ballast that these vessels would carry. I think it is only fair to use the member for Stuart's words, namely, that he brought the House down with the *faux pas* that he made when answering that question. There are many such examples of doubts having been raised, and I feel quite confident that I could sit down and write 30 or 40, if not 50, questions which have not yet been answered. We do not know how much it will cost taxpayers if there is a spill; we do not know whether the taxpayer will be protected from that financial responsibility. All of these things are involved. We do know that there is very little water exchange in the upper regions of Spencer Gulf, and that it takes 20 years for 60 per cent of the water of the upper regions of Spencer Gulf to exchange. We do know that the proposed Redcliff site is on a fault line; we know that a solid construction built on that fault line will endure at least one major tremor during the life of the plant.

It has been said that the wastes are to be stored on land. How are they to be stored? They cannot be stored in a concrete vat, because the area is on a fault line. We do not know whether any plastics can survive over that time. We do now know, if there is torrential rain in the area, what happens to the leaching of contaminated water. Until the public meeting at Port Augusta, no-one knew that facilities had to be provided for the pumping ashore of vessel ballast, a 20 000 tonne minimum—I believe it is nearer 25 000 tonnes for a 75 000 tonne dead weight vessel. We just do not have the answers for these sorts of problems. My suspicion is (and I think the member for Semaphore, who is following me in this debate, would agree) that the majority of that ballast would be tipped out in the gulf before it reached Redcliff Point.

We have seen contamination from ships loading live

sheep, with carcasses being disposed of overboard before the vessel has reached the international waterline. These carcasses have washed up ashore. We know that ship owners and agents are not always completely honourable in following the letter of the law. Until that public meeting at Port Augusta, no-one ever mentioned the massive facilities that would be required to pump 25 000 tonnes of ballast ashore in order to treat that ballast before the water is returned to the sea. No-one knew about it, yet it is a point that has cropped up just in the past few weeks.

I am very gravely concerned. I do not believe the Government has been fair and honest in its assurances of the future of the gulf. We know that there are contaminants in the gulf at present, and that there are fish that are deformed because of heavy metal contamination—lead, mercury, zinc and cadmium. We can only assume that any further contaminants, particularly from a petro-chemical plant, will add to the extreme problems. I genuinely believe that the Government is prepared to allow the fishing industry to slip out of its grasp in its desire to get a new big industry. We are talking of \$500 000 000 plus—almost a million dollars a job.

Mr. Russack: Where do you think it should be?

Mr. BLACKER: As I indicated in my question today, any area further south, even just south of Whyalla, away from the residential area, where there is a larger exchange of water, would be better. Even if were situated at a spot 15 miles south of Whyalla that would be preferable, as the gulf is at least 60 miles wide there, whereas at Redcliff Point the main channel is only a few hundred metres wide. We know that the jetty at Redcliff Point must extend 3.4 km. What we do not know is whether a wharf can ever be built there that can carry vehicles across the mud flats, as there are no foundations. These are the types of questions that nobody can answer, and nobody is prepared to give an assurance on them.

My greatest concern today, when I posed my question to the Premier, was whether the new companies being involved in the assessment of the area with their feasibility studies have been given the opportunity to look at alternative sites before they undertake any real assessment of South Australia for the establishment of a petro-chemical plant. The Premier said there was good reason why the site should be at Redcliff Point, and he quoted as examples the pipeline for the raw materials and the trucking of salt. It is acknowledging that massive quantities of salt and gas are required. To shift the project farther south may involve a further \$30 000 000. But the fishing industry presently employs, either directly or indirectly, over 700 people. Can we risk that industry for the sake of a mere \$30 000 000?

Mr. Russack interjecting:

Mr. BLACKER: In the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf, in the prawn industry and associated processing, as well as the scale fishing industry that operates from Port Pirie and Port Augusta, there are 700 jobs involved. This is the type of problem that we are presently facing.

I indicated at the very outset that I was prepared to support the noting of the report. I believe that the experiment of the Committees was worth undertaking. I believe that during the latter part of the Committee stages on the fifth and sixth days there was more of a genuine effort by all Parties concerned to see that the Committees could work. Initially I believed that there was a real attempt to sabotage the Committee system. Maybe I am a little strong in thinking that way, but I am sure that many members were not acting in the best interests of this House and Parliamentary procedures when they first attempted questioning in the Committee system. I support the motion and I trust that my comments, particularly relating

to the proposed petro-chemical plant at Redcliff Point, will be noted by the respective Ministers.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): Much of what I was going to say has been said by the member for Flinders in relation to the Committees, but I can add to it. It has been stated previously in the House that the procedures undertaken by the Government were to comply with pre-election promises. Apparently, they were supported by the Opposition on the principle of giving the experiment a fair go. I found very useful the information provided in the yellow book ("A Programme Description of Departmental and Selected Agencies and Manpower Allocations proposed for the financial year 1980-81"), although I cannot speak for other members. It could have been extended a little more, but it was quite useful.

I cannot say that the method of consideration by the Estimates Committees as applied in the recent exercise gained my support at all. The Premier was quoted as saying, "There may well be unforeseen problems, but they are likely to be problems of procedure and not principle." As far as I am concerned, there were grave problems in both procedure and principle in the system. The Leader of the Opposition has provided me with a copy of a letter he has sent to the Premier which contains his observations on the new procedures and in which he expresses his belief that a thorough evaluation is called for and that a special Select Committee would seem to be the best way to carry out that evaluation. In light of what we have seen and what has been said, that would be the best way to do it. I cannot see the point of a private company doing the assessment. I cannot see that there is anyone better qualified to survey the problems of the system than the people who have just experienced them in the Committees themselves.

I do not think that I have made any secret of my feelings of the system of considering the Estimates. Indeed, in one Committee I was fairly abruptly cut off by the Chairman for attempting to express my opinion of the system of consideration.

Mr. Russack: Now is your chance.

Mr. PETERSON: I do not think that I will be cut off here. I will briefly outline my objections to the system as I see them. The member for Flinders has touched upon plenty of them, but I still have a few. I would like to be cheeky enough to suggest a different system. It seems that the greatest injustice of this system is to have two Committees running at the same time. That means that anybody at all—a Parliamentarian or a citizen—is limited to one Committee. No-one can attend two Committees sitting at the same time. With the best of intentions, one is effectively blocked from half of the operation. It is quite possible that this may suit the Government—it may be by design rather than accident—but I cannot understand why the Opposition agreed to it.

It may suit those who can control the inputs to the Committees and the information from them, but it certainly does not work in the cases of the member for Flinders, the member for Mitcham and me. It should be considered that we three members represent about 50 000 to 60 000 people in this State, and hold 6 per cent of the seats in this House, and we should therefore be given some consideration. Whatever the considerations of the major Parties are towards the smaller Parties or the Independents, they should not in any way support any proposal that denies the right to anyone to participate in any phase of the proceedings of Parliament or that denies them their democratic right to represent the people who elected them to this House. The system that we have just experienced does not protect that right. Many times, as the previous speaker mentioned, I and other members went from

Committee to Committee with no hope of keeping up with what was going on. With the best of intentions, one could not keep in touch with what was happening.

The major objection I have is that the two Committees ran at the same time. The limiting of the Committees to eight members seems to be far too restrictive. It effectively reduces Parliament to eight people and a Chairman. When we are debating the entire State's Budget for a year, I do not think that that is representative, especially when there are 47 members in the Chamber. The interpretation of the Sessional Orders also presented a problem, and there was some confusion, with people moving from Committee to Committee, in trying to get some points across. That matter was also covered in the letter from the Leader of the Opposition, and he suggested that it be investigated.

While I have given due regard to the suggestions made by various members (and I must admit that most of these members have much more experience than I in Parliament), I fail to see the benefits of this restrictive Committee system. I reject this method of debating the Estimates, and I protest at the very real restrictions placed on every person in this State, not only Parliamentarians but also citizens. The arrangements made are between the major Parties and, at times, they appear to be almost in secret, and also act against the best principles of this Parliament.

Many of the arrangements were never transmitted to other people in the Parliament. The restrictions acted against a principle that was expressed by the Speaker in the House on 16 September in a statement concerning a different matter, but the principle is the same. The Speaker's statement referred to the reading of speeches, and the principle expounded in that statement is valid in regard to any debate that takes place, and it is at least as valid in regard to the Estimates Committee system. The Speaker stated:

The purpose of this rule is primarily to maintain the cut and thrust of debate which depends upon successive speakers meeting in their speeches to some extent the arguments of earlier speeches . . .

My experience of Estimates is limited to last year's debate, which was carried out in this House, with all members participating. There is no doubt in my mind that that system was much better. It is just not possible for a committee of eight people to delve into the facts and points of the Estimates, and I believe that the serious restrictions imposed were not in the best interests of the Parliamentary process.

After that criticism, I will outline some of the improvements that have emerged from this system. The practice of all Ministers of the Government facing the Parliament is a good, sound principle, as is the attendance of public servants. That principle is to be supported, and I hope that it will continue. The yellow book was a vast improvement on the previous system, because it gave an immediate reference point in a reasonably detailed form. I would like to suggest a different system on the basis of what I regard as this system's good points. I would like to see the same Committee system used in the Committee as a whole, whereby the Minister and his advisers would attend the House in the presence of the 47 members. A much fuller debate on all points and more access to information would be possible, and I cannot see that this would be a retrograde step—it would be an improvement.

Mr. Russack: It would take twice as long.

Mr. PETERSON: Time limits could be agreed upon, with possible extensions of time, and they could relate to the different sections of the Estimates, as they have previously. I do not see why these things cannot be agreed. The benefits of such a system are fairly obvious: every

member would have access to Ministers and public servants, and there would be better debate because everyone could participate, and, thus, the Parliament would benefit. I shall be interested to see what happens to the Committee system.

An article that I read recently made me think of this system; this article appeared in the *Motor Trade Journal* in June this year under the heading "Politics—a matter of power". It is an excerpt from an address by Dean Jaensch, and states:

You need to understand from the beginning that politics is not about morality. It's not about doing "right" for the community; it's not about those statements too many politicians make at elections: "We will serve the community; we will give minorities their rights; and so on". Politics is about one thing—power. The sooner everybody realises that, the better. Politics in Australia is a matter of power—seeking power—getting power—using power—and losing power. And that's all it's all about. There's little morality in politics.

The approach to the Estimates Committees will show whether that is right.

I now refer to the Department of Marine and Harbors section of the Budget. An allocation involving several thousand dollars was made in regard to seven people in the marketing section. Some relevant points about marketing were made in an edition of the *South Australian and Shipping Journal*, in the directors' statements, under "Shipping services—South Australian trade". It is stated:

In my reports for previous years, attention has been drawn to the importance to South Australia of the shipping services provided through the shipping conference system and of the department's support for the conference system.

The annual general report of the Marine and Harbors Board, under the commercial section, explains how the board has tried to sell Port Adelaide and South Australian shipping. It states:

Intensive continuing negotiations with shipping lines and conferences, both in Australia and overseas, have been at the core of the division's programme during the fiscal year . . . Development by the department of the State Government's shipping and maritime trade policy, which continued to hinge on dismantling inefficient centralisation of South Australian containerised cargoes through interstate ports in favour of direct Port of Adelaide shipment, was supported with increasing urgency by commerce and industry. In particular, the initiative of the Minister and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in inviting the State's major importers and exporters to discuss shipping problems of mutual and growing concern gave the division the opportunity to assist in the formation of a strong South Australian Shipping User Committee. This committee has taken positive steps, in discussion with the conference lines and in consultation with the State Government, towards eventually achieving the establishment of those direct container shipping services not already provided by the conference with the State's main international trading areas.

Members must understand what is a conference in the shipping industry. The maritime transport report states:

The "conference" system of world shipping is a great monopoly operation which was developed by the British Shipping Council under the first Earl of Inchcape in the 1870's. The Australia-Europe conference is one of the oldest of these set-ups. Under this system, one freight rate is set for all the lines making up the conference, and its line has its share of the volume of cargo. Shares are redistributed from time to time.

The report goes on to say basically that the conference is the strongest monopoly operation going. The operation of the conference is a monopoly; it dictates where it will go, what it will carry, and at what rates. South Australia has,

historically, experienced problems in attracting ships to this State. At the opening of the Largs jetty in 1882, the Hon. W. Morgan, M.L.C., stated:

If we were the last port on coming from England instead of being the first, and if the vessels laid here without going on to the other colonies, then the proposed dock might be of greater advantage . . .

So, even in 1882 we had problems in getting ships to come here. The real problem now is the conference, which will not bring its ships to Adelaide. Every now and again there is a non-conference break-away. The *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal* of October 1980 gives a photograph of a ship, and the caption underneath the photograph states:

A.B.C. Containerline's *Prestigious* exchanging 276 teu at No. 6 Outer Harbor in September, marking the independent line's first visit to the Port of Adelaide . . .

Also on the front page of that edition is a report of the Premier talking with the conference about a direct ship pool. It is interesting to note that the A.B.C., which is a relatively new line in the container trade, is coming to Adelaide. Many of these independent ships have used a ploy like this to break into the conference. They come into a port that is not serviced, try to take the trade, and, when they manage to get some of the trade, many times they are accepted into the conference and, therefore, only compound the influence of that system. It is interesting to note also that the A.B.C. line is mentioned on the front page of this edition, under a heading "Aussies into A.B.C.", as follows:

T.N.T. and Bell Group have taken a 22-22 per cent stake in A.B.C. Containerline and a further 11-11 per cent of A.B.C. is believed to be available for another Australian buyer. T.N.T., already agent for A.B.C. in Australia, will now be in direct competition with the traditional shipping lines, and the deal gives the company an almost world-wide shipping operation through Bulkships in Australia and its subsidiary, Trans Freight Lines, on three Atlantic routes.

So, T.N.T. is running an independent ship. It is interesting to note also the structure of T.N.T. in this matter. T.N.T. is now one of the largest Australian companies. T.N.T. bought into the O.C.L. system, which is one of the major conference line operators in Australia; it is a British company. That independent, which is part of a major line, is trying to break in as an independent. It is not likely to happen.

One of the problems in Australia with shipping is the great competition between ports for the trade. There are terminals in Fremantle, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane. Fremantle was at one time linked into a land-bridge system that was to be the concept of a one-port Australian drop, the containers to be moved across Australia by rail, but it did not work at that stage. Adelaide was late on to the scene with a terminal well after the other ports started, and has been fighting ever since to catch up. Melbourne has expanded its capacity since 1969 and now has a substantial set-up. Sydney has just built a new container terminal called Botany Bay, which, I understand, has the capacity to handle all of Australia's container trade. There is also a container terminal at Brisbane. There seems to be two problems in getting shipping to South Australia: first, the conference, which is a closed shop, and it will go only where it wants to go; and, secondly, the port rivalry. I also see another problem, for selling Port Adelaide as a shipping port, in the installation of a standard rail link. The standard rail system will link all capitals. It has already been said in publications that A.N.R. intends to put a standard rail freight terminal at Islington. Another factor of significance in this matter, I think, is the amalgamation of the Transport Workers

Union and the Storemen and Packers Union. One of the largest groups of workers employed in container depots is the S.P.W. If S.P.W. amalgamates with the T.W.U., they would have a monopoly of work into freight depots, and I think that they would move into rail and road areas rather than into shipping terminal areas. So, I wish the Commercial Section of the Department of Marine and Harbors well.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): Earlier tonight, we heard the point scoring of the Premier when he accused my Leader of attempting to point score. One of the things that apparently has escaped the memory of Government members is the disgraceful episode of the Premier, in the early days of the Estimates Committees, being quoted in the press as saying that Labor Party members were going to boycott Princess Alexandra's visit. This was subsequently denied, and I give credit to you, Mr. Speaker, for the steps you took to remedy the misleading information that was imparted to the public through the media by the Premier, who had clearly embarked on a political point-scoring episode.

During the Committee B proceedings, I, like many others, found it frustrating, as I said last night in my contribution, that there were many members who, having spent considerable time researching the documents provided, could not question the respective Ministers.

As I also said last night, I wanted to refer many questions to the Minister of Transport, because of my previous occupation in the rail industry, and having had some knowledge of that industry. One that I intended to raise was the question of the delays to commuters in South Australia. Over a period, I have continually written to the Minister seeking details of the number of trains that have been delayed over certain periods. As an example, I refer to a reply I received yesterday from the Minister (Question No. 544) in relation to the delays that have been occasioned to commuters in South Australia. I asked:

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 with this equipment, what action has been taken to rectify these faults, how many delays have been occasioned to commuters since 14 June 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 Minister replied, on 21 October, as follows:

The problem referred to in the answer to Question No. 982 of last session have not yet been rectified. Commonwealth Engineering have 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 June 14, from various faults:

June 14-30, 4 trains delayed

July 1-31, 28 trains delayed

August 1-31, 14 trains delayed

September 1-29, 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.

I have repeatedly asked this question because many of these commuters, particularly those employees who work at General Motors- Holden, find themselves in the position that, where these trains are delayed, and where they are late for work, they are docked the time from their pay.

At 7.15 this evening, while I was having tea, I received a

telephone call from a constituent who told me that he picks up an early morning train from Rosewater and commutes daily to G.M.H. He said that about 100 other employees use the same service. He has a take-home pay of about \$151, out of which he pays \$4 a week, or 43c a day, for those journeys.

Mr. Slater: They should pay him.

Mr. HAMILTON: Sure. Last Tuesday, my constituent was 17 minutes late for work when the suburban railcar arrived late at G.M.H. The train was delayed at the cross-over into G.M.H. from the main line, and my constituent sat there from 7.15 to 7.45 a.m., first, because he believed that the train was waiting on another service operating in the other direction and, secondly, and this concerns me somewhat, because he alleges that the signalman did not know the signal cabin in which he was working. If that is so, I would ask the Minister to investigate the matter. The signal man should have known the signal cabin. I should like the Minister to ascertain whether the signalman had had sufficient time to be taught that signal cabin and, if not, why had that occurred. If he was in the cabin without any experience, how had that situation come about?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What was the date?

Mr. HAMILTON: Last Tuesday.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: As long as you mention the date—otherwise I will have to write it down.

Mr. HAMILTON: It was last Tuesday, and I will come back later to the point about the Minister's writing things down. My constituent informs me that, a week previously, the corresponding service was delayed eight minutes and subsequently money was docked from his pay. We hear a great deal about people being encouraged to travel on public transport, and I could not agree more with that, but I am concerned about instances such as those I have outlined, particularly in relation to delays experienced with the new generation railcars, and answers given by the Minister in reply to Question on Notice 544. This situation concerns me, as it no doubt concerns many other commuters, particularly day workers who travel daily to places such as G.M.H., in which case I understand that these trains are guaranteed by G.M.H. It is harsh treatment for employees who, through no fault of their own, have money docked from their pay because of delays which they cannot overcome and for which they cannot be held responsible.

Other questions to which I would like answers from the Minister involve the issue that was raised today by the member for Semaphore in relation to the route for the new standard gauge line to Outer Harbor. This matter was brought to my attention some time ago by Mrs. Fenwick, who has moved into the area, but who originally resided in my district. She rang my home one Sunday evening, much distressed, telling me that the home she had recently purchased was possibly in the path of the new line. There was a report in the *News* about this and, although I tried to get a copy from the library, it was not available, and could not be found.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Where is the house?

Mr. HAMILTON: I think it is in Largs, but it is in line with the new route. I referred Mrs. Fenwick to the member for the area. She told me that she had purchased the home and was unaware when she did so that it could have been in the way of the proposed line. I raised this matter with the Minister, as I had raised another matter in relation to road widening in my electorate. I believe that, when people purchase a home, they should be able to contact the relevant Government departments, or the land agent should contact those departments, to ascertain whether there is to be any widening of the road in the area, or the proposed extension of a line.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Everyone should check with the local council.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is true, but this is the issue I am raising. As I understand it, the land agent in this case has not made any investigations. It was most distressing to this lady, because she had bought the home to accommodate her aged mother, whom she wished to live with her.

I now take up the matter raised by the Minister about his writing notes on paper. Some time ago in this House I approached the Minister in relation to the study of the future gauge for the rail system and the standard gauge line for the metropolitan area. I spoke twice to the Minister, and he wrote something down. I did not receive any reply, but subsequently I furnished him with a copy of a document to find out what was the future of the standard gauge operation in metropolitan Adelaide. As yet, I have received no reply, and I recall what the Minister said today in Question Time. However, in relation to the standardisation of gauges in metropolitan Adelaide, if Mrs. Fenwick and other people in a similar situation could obtain from their local member, or through the media information such as that which I had been seeking, their position would not be so difficult, and they could find out what was to happen in the area.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: She could have rung my department.

Mr. HAMILTON: Perhaps so, but the Minister has not replied to the question I asked him twice in this House, even though he has put it in his black book and received correspondence on the matter. The Minister said that he would furnish me with a copy of the report when it was available. Is the report available, and when will I get a copy of it? We must consider these people, whose biggest investment in their life is their home. Mrs. Fenwick is a personal friend, whom I have known for many years. For that reason, and because other people in the area could be affected, I am concerned. Although Government members smile, this does not seem to me to be a laughing matter. I ask the Minister to furnish me with a reply.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you talking about the route for the connection of Outer Harbor to the standard gauge?

Mr. HAMILTON: That, and also—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You will not get a report on that. You will get an announcement of the route when it is decided.

Mr. HAMILTON: Has the study in relation to the effects of standardisation in metropolitan Adelaide been completed yet?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You'll get that information, but you'll be told about the route when it is decided. As I told you today, it hasn't been decided yet.

Mr. HAMILTON: The points I make are, first, the route to be adopted and, secondly, the effects upon people of gauge standardisation in metropolitan Adelaide. The Minister knows that this programme will affect many people.

I now refer to a report that appeared in the *News* on Thursday 2 October 1980, headed "Leaflet sparks union row". On that morning I arrived at the office shortly before 9 a.m. and at two minutes past nine I received a telephone call from an organiser of the Australian Railways Union whom I had known for many years. He told me that the Federal member for Kingston (Grant Chapman) was handing out leaflets on a State Transport Authority train (I think it was the 8.8 train from Noarlunga Centre to Brighton) and that the guard and members of the public were complaining about being inundated with political material from that member of Parliament.

The organiser asked me whether this was illegal and I said that, on my understanding, having worked in the industry previously, it was contrary to by-laws and that he should be asked to desist. Shortly afterwards I received another telephone call from Mr. Brian Bush, of the Australian Transport Officers Federation, who also told me that his secretary was travelling on that same train and was furious that she should be inundated with this political material because, like many others on that train, she was, to repeat the term used in the newspaper report "a captive audience" who wished to travel to work in peace without being inundated with this material.

There was talk of employees refusing to work those trains if the member for Kingston persisted with that practice. I understand he has been advised not to use that material but to put on a T-shirt with a Liberal slogan on it, although whether that is so I do not know. Although I cannot track down the source of this information, I understand that a member of his own Party advised him that he could do that without contravening the by-law.

Last week I was provided with a special traffic circular No. 126/80, from the State Transport Authority, which was issued to all stationmasters, guards, station assistants, ticket examiners, ticket clerks, enginemmen, and rail motor drivers. It is headed "Election material—Unauthorised distribution of" and states:

Staff are advised that election pamphlets and literature for any political Party are not permitted to be distributed on metropolitan trains, stations or authority property. If instances occur when members of the public violate this instruction, the people concerned should be politely requested to refrain from distributing further material and the circumstances reported immediately to the Traffic Manager.

The instruction which is signed by Mr. J. R. Renshaw, Traffic Manager, Rail, is dated 3 October 1980 and has the reference initial DCM:AT.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Is that the next day or the day after?

Mr. HAMILTON: I think it was the day after.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You're not complaining about that, are you?

Mr. HAMILTON: No, but I would like to know from the Minister whether the member for Kingston contravened S.T.A. by-laws and, if he did, what are the penalties for such contravention. Further, what action does the Minister intend to take or what action is the S.T.A. intending to take in relation to what I understand is an alleged violation of the by-laws of the authority?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The same violation occurred in 1977 when I was not the Minister of Transport.

Mr. HAMILTON: I am not arguing about that. I want to know whether the Minister intends taking some action and, if not, why not. The Minister is responsible for policing the by-laws of the authority. He well knows what his responsibilities are, and I cannot be held responsible for what took place under a previous Government. I am asking the Minister what action he intends to take, and he can provide me with that information if he so chooses.

Another matter I wish to raise with the Minister concerns the safety of the travelling public in South Australia. As the Minister is well aware, having worked in this industry, I come in to contact with many of my former workmates and with personal friends, and it has been pointed out to me that there are problems involving the gaps between the new generation railcars and the platforms. The Minister was kind enough to reply to a letter I wrote him on this matter, and he said in effect, that the gaps between the new generation railcars and the curved platforms was not so great that it caused major

concern to the authority or the travelling public. I apologise if I have not quoted the Minister correctly, but I point out to the Minister that it only requires one person to fall and be injured or killed, and the cost to the authority would be enormous.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It wouldn't be the cost to the authority: it would be the loss of life.

Mr. HAMILTON: True, but let us face reality: a cost is involved. I agree with the Minister that loss of life would be most important. I was going to raise this matter next, because it was raised by a constituent of mine who lives adjacent to my electorate office.

One of the other problems with the new generation railcars is that employees have told me (and I have travelled on them) the staffing of these trains is not sufficient. Whether he has taken that up with his union or not, I am unaware but, from my experience, having worked on the old red hen railcars in the past, I know that one guard or employee could look through the whole train to ascertain whether all passengers had boarded or alighted from the train, whereas this is not the case with the new generation railcars, I have been told, and my inspection has proved it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You cannot look straight through.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is so. My inspection has revealed that with the new generation railcars employees cannot see through into the adjacent car to check whether passengers are boarding or alighting. This also raises some problems in relation to the operation of the automatic doors. One of the booklets published by the S.T.A. in August 1979 states:

Doors will have automatic closing and press-button opening. A built-in safety device enables the driver to interlock all doors . . .

I have been told that these doors are not operating correctly and that the guards experience some difficulty in co-ordinating the opening and closing of these doors in concert with the driver.

Will the Minister look into this matter, because a number of people have been locked in when a train has moved off, or have not been able to join a train? Because of the wide bodies on this type of car, particularly when on curves, employees cannot ascertain whether sufficient time has elapsed to allow people to get on and off the train.

The other matter that I raise relates to the transfer agreement for the railways and more particularly to the Riverland rail service. I understand that recently the member for Chaffey (Hon. P. B. Arnold) advised people at Berri that the rail line going to the new regional freight depot at Loxton would not, in fact, be flooded.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It is all to do with the Noora salinity basin.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is right. The advice imparted to me by A.N.R. is that a regional freight centre is to be established in the Riverland area at Loxton and, with the inundation of the Alawoona-Barmera line at Noora with the construction of the Noora evaporate salt basin, the A.N.R. proposes to cancel all rail services beyond Meribah and not seek re-instatement of the line by the State Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: No, there has been a change, because it is thought now by the State authorities, (and the A.N.R. was not aware of this at the time) that it may be possible to save the flooding of the line. It is all in the negotiation stage at the moment.

Mr. HAMILTON: That has answered that, and I thank the Minister. The other matter that I raise with the Minister relates to disabled people in South Australia,

about whom, I understand from listening to him today, the Minister is concerned, for which I commend him. I understand the difficulty that the Minister faces and that authorities are experiencing with this matter. However, I refer to the problem of toilets. A matter that has been raised with me by a number of elderly people is the closure of toilets on metropolitan stations. I understand the problems experienced in relation to vandals, but I also understand that the State Transport Authority has its own constables and that it can call for assistance from the Police Department to check stations.

At stations such as Grange and Dry Creek there are no toilets or, where there are toilets, they are locked and the public cannot use them. I pose the scenario to the Minister of a member of the public who, having had the call to nature, decided to go to the back of the block to relieve himself and was caught doing so by the police. Because of that act, that person could be charged with indecent exposure.

An honourable member: And the Minister could appear on his behalf.

Mr. HAMILTON: I very much doubt that, but this is a problem. I have seen many people who have been very much embarrassed by not being able to use a toilet. I can recall one gentleman who was very distressed and embarrassed because his call of nature was something he could not contain. Therefore, I ask the Minister to look into the question of opening and policing of toilets, particularly at Dry Creek. I cannot understand why that toilet should be locked, as employees are engaged there 24 hours a day. So, there is no reason those toilets cannot be kept open.

Mr. Lewis: What about bus travellers?

Mr. HAMILTON: There is the same problem for people who use trains. I know that people have become accustomed to this.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): Before I proceed with my remarks about Committee B, I could perhaps pursue the line taken by the member for Albert Park earlier. I had the same problem regarding toilets. The member for Mallee may find that rather amusing, as I think the Minister of Education found it amusing earlier. However, we pursued this matter. Although I am speaking from memory, the Minister gave the usual excuses. I use the word "excuses" lightly. I think that the reasons that the Minister gave were quite valid, although I do not necessarily agree with them. The Minister wrote back saying that, if there was any need for a person to use public toilets on stations in my district, they only had to ask at the ticket counter and the toilets would be opened. I overcame that problem by running off a few copies of the letter that the Minister sent me and distributing them at the station in the early hours of the morning so that all persons who used the trains in my area understood the message. Quite remarkably, the toilets in my district at Wooma, Broadmeadows and Elizabeth are kept open, so perhaps the member for Albert Park might take that up in his district. That is the way to keep the toilets open.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Well represented, those people.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It was very well done. I would like to make one comment before referring to the problems in education, Aboriginal affairs and community welfare. I must remark about the different attitude taken by yourself, Sir, in the Estimates Committee. I am not having a shot at you because you are in the Chair now. I was fortunate (or unfortunate) enough to be first cab off the rank at the start of the Estimates Committees dealing with

the Department of Services and Supply. I remember quite clearly that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, made the point quite correctly that, if any member other than a member of the Committee had any questions to ask, that member would have to wait until all Committee members had asked their questions, and he could then ask his questions of the Minister. We all felt that that was quite correct.

On the following day, when I was sidelining at the time that Committee B was dealing with education, I was sitting patiently waiting. I think you, Sir, may recall that I had a question to ask on the Teacher Housing Authority. I came to you quite concerned because, wishing to ask that question, I found that the line had already been voted on and I could not therefore ask my question. It seemed that there had been a change in the rulings covering that Committee. I do not say that that change was yours, Sir. Perhaps you had taken advice about it. However, this does highlight the problems we had in both Committees A and B where members were not quite sure of what was going on or of the Chairman's ruling. Unfortunately, in Committee A we had rather drastic problems, while in Committee B they were minor problems. I am happy that I can use this time to raise the matter relating to the Teacher Housing Authority that I, as a sideliner, was going to raise when the Committee was dealing with education.

In August I received a letter from a constituent who was a teacher in my district and was quite concerned that the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority was, in effect, going to evict him early in 1980. The letter stated—

Mr. Lewis: Oh!

Mr. HEMMINGS: Perhaps people on the other side are not concerned about evictions and that kind of thing. As I said last night, there is no such thing as compassion on the side of the Liberal Party. It upholds those people who want to tread on the small man in society. I will omit the name of the teacher to protect him, otherwise it may go against him next year. The letter states:

The South Australian Teacher Housing Authority has reviewed its housing stock and has determined that the residence occupied by you at . . . is surplus to requirements. In accordance with Government policy, the property is currently being offered for sale to other Government departments or statutory authorities. You are hereby informed that should such sale be negotiated the authority will require you to vacate the premises by 1 February 1981. Should there be no requirement by Government, then the authority will be prepared to offer the residence for your purchase at the authority's valuation. If purchase does not proceed, the authority will require that you vacate the premises at 1 February 1981. The authority is concerned that as little inconvenience as possible occurs and requests that you do not hesitate to contact the writer for assistance and information.

I understand that the teacher did contact the writer for assistance and information and received little of either. When that person came to me, I looked back at the Liberal Party policy, bearing in mind that, as the letter stated "In accordance with Government policy", perhaps in the Liberal Party's 1979 propaganda there may have been something dealing with the reduction of the number of houses under the authority's control. Dealing with country housing, there was a two line policy that stated:

We will reduce rentals on South Australian Teacher Housing Authority homes as a part of country teacher incentives.

There is nothing in the policy about reducing the number of homes: it is just a matter of reducing the actual rentals. I wrote to the Minister in August. It was only a brief letter, saying that my assistance had been sought, and so on. In the letter, I stated:

I would appreciate it if you could outline your Government's policy quoted in the letter so that I can pass on the necessary information to my constituent.

In line with the usual replies from the Education Department, I received an acknowledgement that said, in effect, that the matter was receiving consideration and the Minister would inform me accordingly. I waited the necessary four weeks, then five weeks, and at six weeks I telephoned. When I telephoned, my constituent had come to me with a copy of the lease. He was concerned that perhaps I had not bothered about the complaint. I tried to explain to him that, with the Education Department these days, one has to wait at least eight weeks before one gets a reply from the Minister. I said that, in the meantime, I would pass on the additional information he had given me about the terms of the lease. The lease is quite specific and states that, under the normal leases, the tenants should not, in effect, destroy the property. It states:

The authority will: allow the tenant to peaceably occupy the premises without any interruption or disturbance by the authority, provided that the tenant has not breached any of the conditions or covenants contained in the conditions of tenancy; in premises owned by the authority, use its best endeavours to maintain the premises in good order and condition and to promptly carry out repairs at its own cost except those caused by the fault or neglect of the tenant or any other occupants of the premises or any guests of the tenant.

I looked at the premises, and they were in good order. There were no rats or mice, no windows were broken, and the place had been kept in good order. The lawns were well kept and roses were growing. The gardens were well tended, fruit trees were well watered and fruit was coming through. So, there was no way in which the tenant could be accused of breaching the tenancy agreement. I then telephoned the Education Department and asked to speak to the Minister. As usual, the Minister was not available, but I spoke to one of his underlings and, when I pointed out the problem to him (and perhaps this is also the experience that many of my colleagues have had in the past), he said that there was something coming through; it was just waiting for the Minister's signature and I would get a reply in a couple of days. I said that that was a waste of time because I had additional information that there was a breach of the tenancy agreement by the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority. The person, whose names escapes me, said, "Hold everything. We will get a Crown Law opinion and let you know." Within a week, I received a reply. Members should bear in mind that I had written in early August, and I got a reply late in September. I will not read the whole letter, because it is fairly long. It did not say anything about Government policy, which had been quoted to the teacher in question, but it stated:

You have asked a question on Mr. X's behalf, whether the authority is breaching its obligations under the Act in respect of termination of the tenancy. The conditions of tenancy in a tenancy agreement include the statement that the authority will allow the tenant to peaceably occupy the premises without any disturbance or interruption by the authority provided that the tenant has not breached any of the conditions of covenants contained in the conditions of tenancy. There is, of course, no suggestion that Mr. X has breached any of the conditions or covenants and, if you have intimated that in any event the authority has no right to evict Mr. X. Further, the conditions of the tenancy also contain the following:

Tenancies shall be determinable by at least 14 days notice in writing by the tenant or authority or at any time by the Minister of Education in the State of South Australia and shall cease on the last day of the last pay

period during which rent is payable and during which the tenant has been in occupation.

No-one is disputing that part of the agreement, but that clause provides for when a teacher who is in possession of a Teacher Housing Authority home leaves the employment of the Education Department.

The Minister and his department are using this shabby means of disposing of Teaching Housing Authority homes in my district. There are quite a few in the Elizabeth area, because in the early days one incentive given to teachers to come out and teach in the then satellite city of Elizabeth was to provide them with teacher housing. It is part of the present Government's policy to get rid of those homes. The constituent concerned is in his late 50's or early 60's.

He really has no means of obtaining a rental home in the area; he has no means of obtaining a mortgage to buy a home. From what we understand, the valuation placed on that home is current market value; there is no reduction whatsoever. The Minister has glibly passed this off. In no way is the Minister worried that this person should be inconvenienced. The Government is trying to get rid of teacher housing homes in the metropolitan area. There is no way that we can defy the Minister in law. I would just like to ask the Minister (who thus far has given us an idea that he is a compassionate man, not like his colleagues) to take a hand and allow this person to keep his home. He has only something like between five and eight years teaching left in Elizabeth, and he will then be retiring and forced to give up that home. I would like the Minister to intervene in this matter. I realise that the Minister signed the letter, but he signs many letters without really realising what is going on. I urge the Minister to intervene in this particular case so that my constituent is not forced to go on the open market and pay exorbitant rent, or forced to put a millstone around his neck by purchasing a private home.

I now refer to the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio. If one looks at legislation going through this House and at other areas concerning Aboriginal people and at the actual vote and the time spent in the Estimates Committee dealing with Aboriginal affairs, one would think that this was a part-time portfolio. The land rights legislation has been negotiated by the Deputy Premier and the Premier. The Deputy Premier's role has been fairly obvious—he wants to dig up every sacred site so that we can sell uranium, but fortunately the Premier has shown a little bit more foresight and got his way. An area that this Government should seriously consider during its remaining two years of office is that, if it is going to have a Minister dealing with Aboriginal affairs, it should pass on all aspects of Aboriginal affairs to that Minister. The Minister of Education understands the affairs of Aboriginal people, and perhaps he could understand the problems better than the Deputy Premier, the Premier and the Minister of Health.

Today we had a Dorothy Dixier question dealing with the matter of nursing sisters in Aboriginal communities. In her usual style the Minister of Health, in effect, turned the question of that shortage of nursing sisters into an attack on the former Labor Administration. In fact, the Minister said that there was \$120 000 underspent by the former Labor Administration in 1978-79. If one looks through *Hansard* it can be seen that when I questioned the Minister previously the Minister agreed that that money had come from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in mid-1978 for the benefit of Aboriginal people in this State. The then Minister of Health, my colleague, the member for Elizabeth, set up a working party immediately in conjunction with the Aboriginal people to decide how best the money should be spent for the benefit of Aboriginal people in this State. Unfortunately, an event occurred

which stopped that decision, namely, the election of September 1979. From September 1979 nothing was done with that amount of money.

The Hon. H. Allison: It had to be spent by the end of June 1979. It was forfeited.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am pleased that the Minister of Education is at least aware of exactly what that sum of \$120 000 was for, and how it had to be spent before a certain time. It was a question not of its not being spent by the former Labor Administration but of no avenue being found for the spending of that amount. However, an avenue for spending that amount was set in train by the former Minister of Health, and that was in the training of Aboriginal health workers. I am sure that if the present Minister had that portfolio under his control that money would have been spent as soon as the Liberal Party came into office. However, the present Minister of Health procrastinated and decided that she really did not know what to do with the money and, after the conclusion of the financial year 1979-80, that sum of \$120 000 went back to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra.

A submission was eventually put forward to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra requesting that there be funding reintroduced in this State for the training of Aboriginal health workers but, because the submission went in far too late, it was not included in the Department of Aboriginal Affairs Budget. What we are now relying on is a verbal assurance by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra to the Minister of Health in this State that that money will be made available. In the meantime, funding has been made available under general revenue to pay for the salaries of two people who will be dealing with the training of Aboriginal people for health purposes.

In fact, what we have is a Minister who has the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio in this State but who has no say in any negotiations with Aboriginal people in relation to land rights; he has no say in the funding of Aboriginal health; he has no say in the funding for the training of Aboriginal health workers. So what does the Minister do as far as Aboriginal affairs are concerned? When one looks through the questions and answers printed in *Hansard*, the only area that the Minister deals with is that concerning Aboriginal housing. But the Minister of Housing deals with Aboriginal housing, so that the only area for which the State Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is responsible in dealing with Aboriginal people is Aboriginal education.

If the Minister was honest he would agree with me. I do not particularly agree that he should be restricted in that area. He should be more involved in Aboriginal health, housing, education, and land rights. Of course, he is being upstaged continually by his Deputy Premier and his Premier under the bureaucratic Health Commission, there is no chance that Aboriginal health will come his way. Perhaps the Government should come clean and admit to the people of this State that, when it created the portfolio of Aboriginal Affairs, it was in effect a position in name only with no power whatsoever.

In my remaining minutes I would like to deal briefly with the disaster of the Chief Secretary. Some time ago I was coming into this House and, although one is used to demonstrations outside Parliament House by people wanting to have various causes brought to the attention of the people of South Australia—

Mr. Trainer: Democratically expressing their rights.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, they are expressing their real rights to demonstrate. One demonstration frightened me and that was the demonstration by the Fire Brigade. It was the most orderly demonstration that I had ever seen. It

was in full uniform. All representatives of the Fire Brigade Board were there, as were representatives of the different ranks going from the top right down to the ordinary fireman. They were there and were concerned about the way in which this Government and the Chief Secretary were treating them as far as fire control was concerned in this State. That demonstration (perhaps that is a harsh word to use)—that orderly gathering—

Mr. Trainer: It was a demonstration; it was a display of their feelings.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It was a display of their feelings. It was addressed by the maverick, the member for Mitcham, and by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House. The Chief Secretary, who was in the House at the time, could not find time enough to go out and address the firemen.

Mr. Slater: He was not game to go out.

Mr. HEMMINGS: No, he was not game to go out. He was not game, because there was not an adviser to put his hand behind his back and, in effect manipulate the strings and tell the Chief Secretary what to say. Various disasters have befallen the Chief Secretary: we have had the sinking of the *Joseph Verco*; the problems of the prisons; the problems of the new police uniform; and, the problems of the new type of hand guns that the police are going to use. I do not have enough time to mention all the problems that have befallen the Chief Secretary. However, not once on television or in the daily newspapers have we had the Chief Secretary saying anything. It is always one of the departmental officers or the Directors who appear on behalf of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. Langley: He said "Mr. Minister" eight times.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right. The Chief Secretary telephones the Directors in the various departments he administers and says, "what shall I do?" We have a Minister who has to telephone his Director, and we have evidence that the Minister has written to one of his Directors and asked, "What shall I do in this situation?" If that is Government, we will let it flounder on for the next two years, and then we will restore confidence.

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Never have I seen a performance like that of the Government in relation to the Olympic Games this year. During the course of events this year, the usual advocate of the Government, Mr. Murdoch, has never forgotten to support our friends opposite.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: Everyone in this House knows that it is a numbers game. During the course of the Olympic Games this year it was a six to five vote. Neither the Premier nor the Minister of Recreation and Sport agreed with the six to five vote. Members opposite agree now with the result of divisions because the vote goes their way, but when it is the other way around they do not believe in it. I congratulate every person who went across to the Olympic Games. A headline in the *News* stated, "Protest at the Games snowballs". The Premier and the Minister were not in favour of the games at all.

Mr. Gunn: Tell the Afghans.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Eyre says, "Tell the Afghans". When one competes in sport, colour or race does not come into it. If the honourable member thinks that colour or race comes into sport, that is okay with me. He has people in his district of different colours, and I am sure that he treats them just the same. If he does not, let me know that he does not. The Minister and the Premier did not support the games being held or the people who participated. If members opposite were selected to be in

the Olympic team and had put that much time into the sport (and plenty of time has to be given), they would ask why political argument should come into it. It should never come into it. If one is good enough to represent one's country, one should be allowed to go.

The Hon. H. Allison: This Government paid their wages while they were over there.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not worried about that. I am perturbed about the fact that the Minister and the Premier protested about their going to the games.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister of Education can say what he likes, but the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Premier were against the games, as was the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister won the election—good on him. The news brought in reference to Fraser versus Fraser, Dawn Fraser is not a bad athlete! She fought for Australia and stood up to the Prime Minister and won. Bad luck, six to five. If you win by one, you will take all the kudos in politics and sport. If you are one up you win. There is no prize for second, as members opposite know. I know that the Minister believes in sport.

Mr. Gunn: I didn't think you read the Murdoch press.

Mr. LANGLEY: According to you, I have to get something from the Murdoch press to know what is going on. The Murdoch press is on your side 1 000 per cent. As I said last night, the Murdoch press is worth nothing. When the decision was made, the Minister moved away. I have nothing against the Minister, but I have plenty to say about what the Minister did in regard to the Olympic Games. He was wrong and, as far as I am concerned, he will be wrong for ever more in this regard. The Minister is connected with sport in Australia. We must all learn one thing in life; if a person runs around the block, trains hard, and practices, why should anyone in a Government say whether or not that person will be allowed to attend the Olympic Games? The Minister may say that this is irrelevant, but I say right from my heart that anyone on the Government side who has trained hard would be upset if the Prime Minister suddenly decided that that person could not attend the Olympic Games.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He didn't say that.

Mr. LANGLEY: Didn't he what! He tried to stop anyone going and, what is more, he was not game to congratulate people who participated when they won. Members opposite offered no congratulations either, as they well know. Members on this side held a little evening, which I was not able to attend, to which we invited those who would participate in the Olympic Games. They attended in their Australian blazers, which they were proud to wear. I can assure the House that I would be proud to wear one, too. If members opposite were given this honour, I am sure they would be willing to wear the Australian blazer.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister did not want these people to go, as stated in the *News*.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's their own choice.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is a lovely attitude! Why shouldn't these people be allowed to go? Why should they not make the choice? How many times have people pulled out of teams? Very seldom. The Prime Minister and the Premier did not want these people to go.

The Hon. H. Allison: A chap in Mount Gambier pulled out of the team of his own accord.

Mr. LANGLEY: Maybe he did, but these people were under terrific pressure, and you know it. I am sure that the Minister's constituent would have gone to the games if the issue had not become a political football. Anyone who was good enough to get into the Australian team would have

gone if this had not happened. I will give the Minister the benefit of the doubt, but I give the Premier nothing on that score. Hardy's and people like that (and I will mention no individuals concerned) pulled out, and that was shocking. What is more, the Government has gone further.

Mr. Slater: A great sportsman is coming in now.

Mr. LANGLEY: He is a member of the Painters and Dockers Union. Could the Minister tell me honestly that his constituent would not have gone if the issue had not become political? I am lucky enough to be a member of this House, and I am very disappointed that the Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Sport took this attitude. The more that we do for sport in this country, the better. There is no doubt about that. I was the Government representative on the Sports Council and, as the Minister knows, I resigned from that council. The Minister was kind enough to accept my resignation, which was right, because someone else should have a turn. I challenge the Minister to say that his constituent would not have gone to the Olympic Games if there had been no political trouble.

Raelene Boyle, who is not a bad athlete, would have gone to the Olympic Games if there had been no political pressure. She talked about her decision not to go to Moscow, saying that she was angry about the whole stinking business.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: She had a right to make that decision.

Mr. LANGLEY: Of course. She was so embarrassed by some people that, in the end, she decided not to go. Sport should be above politics. The Minister, in this article that I have, has moved sport into the political field. Our athletes did well. Why get into this political set up?

The Hon. H. Allison: Why not tell the Russians that?

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister has the old red flag. I will have a word with the Minister's constituent.

The Hon. H. Allison: Come to my district any time, please.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister's father lives in my district and he tells my constituents awful things about me, but I still win elections. I may go to Mount Gambier; I love door knocking. I hope that the Minister goes door knocking in Unley, because I may stand again, and that will upset him. I can assure members opposite that we have had the greatest majority that we have experienced for some time.

If that is the case, the honourable member should have a word with Mr. Nicholls, who will have to go around again and tell people that I am not a Christian, and that I am going to retire quickly. What a terrible thing to do: when I played cricket, I did my best for my country, and politics did not enter into the game. I even shook hands with Sir Robert Menzies. I reckon he was a Liberal. He shook hands with me at every test match. "Games boycott looks certain", reads a headline in the *Sunday Mail* on 20 April. You might think that the writer was an April fool. Mr. Murdoch, whom the Liberal Party approaches to help it all the time, was beaten six to five. The Prime Minister wrote a personal letter to almost every Olympic athlete, but he would not accept the umpire's decision.

Mr. Mathwin: I'll nominate you for the House of Lords.

Mr. LANGLEY: I may get over there one day, but I believe that it needs refurbishing. I was pleased to play cricket at Lords, but the players did not ask me my political allegiance. If this Government played politics, I probably would not be a member of the South Australian Cricket Association. Government members have been kicking me for 18 years now. They kicked Don Dunstan for almost as long, and he is still alive. Nothing hurts me more than politics in sport, and this has been brought

about by the Premier and the Minister. I have more time for the Minister than I have for the Premier, because the Minister understands what happens.

Mr. Mathwin: He rides a bike.

Mr. LANGLEY: So does Robin Millhouse; is that anything in their favour?

Mr. Becker: We all have our problems.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have no problems with sport, except that Government expenditure on sport has been decreased.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's been static for three years.

Mr. LANGLEY: There has been no increase this year over last year. I served on a Sports Advisory Council. Ray Stewart was a first-class Chairman, but the Minister got rid of him. He was available for selection. What about the others on the council?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They did what you did.

Mr. LANGLEY: I had to do it, because how could I be a Government appointee?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I've never sacked people like them.

Mr. LANGLEY: If they had wanted to continue, they would have continued. They must have had a reason to retire.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They thought it was time for new blood (they had been there since the formation of the Sports Advisory Council), and I admire them for that.

Mr. LANGLEY: Did Mr. Stewart say that?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I can't remember that.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not question and answer time.

Mr. LANGLEY: I stick by what I said: I do not think that these people really wanted to leave. The Minister has explained his position, but I am sure that the former Chairman did not want to leave.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He did a great job for sport.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am speaking about something I know about, and about what has happened, and I do not want to retract what I am saying. Politics should never enter into sport. I have even spoken to Russians in England.

Mr. Mathwin: I was talking about sport to Rumanians in Rumania.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not worried about what the honourable member spoke about. I doubt whether he could speak the language, so he must have had an interpreter. If he told them that he had been a member of the Painters and Dockers Union, he might have had some trouble. Politics should be removed from sport.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I am glad that Government members agree with me, "Progress at games snowballs", reads a headline. Have Government members heard of Football Park? I went down there once and got pleurisy; that is why it is named "pleurisy park". If lights which are warming are installed down there, they should be turned on in the daytime. When will the lighting matter be finalised? Adelaide Oval is the finest oval in South Australia. The Minister and I are friendly, and sometimes we watch the cricket and football. Both of us would no doubt agree that that oval would be a great place to have lights. There has never been room for two major ovals in this State. I put it to the Minister of Environment that he should appoint a committee to study the matter and see what was going on.

The Hon. H. H. Allison: Where would you put the lights?

Mr. LANGLEY: Perhaps we should put them at Mount Gambier to suit the Minister. Government members know that the league had a chance to have an oval at the sewerage farm, where there is good grass. That was a perfect opportunity to have another ground. The greatest

mistake made in sport in this State has been moving away from the Adelaide Oval. Anyone who has moved away from it I believe has been a fool.

Mr. Becker: What about Sir Donald Bradman?

Mr. LANGLEY: There was another fellow mixed up in it, but I will not mention names. There was a feud, but that often happens in politics, too. The Adelaide Oval is one of the best ovals in the world. I am speaking sincerely when I say that. Few ovals in the world are of the same class, but we use that oval on only about six days a year.

Mr. Mathwin: But the seagulls like it.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg has them in his district, too. I hope that we will be able to boost sport in the country as well as in the city. A cricket bat today would cost about \$140. If we want to keep people off the street, we must get them into sport, but no sporting club can afford to pay 15 per cent sales tax on sporting equipment. I know the Minister will look into the matter. I do not mind if the Government takes 15 per cent, as long as it ploughs the money back into the game. The Government, whatever its persuasion, must do something about this. I spoke today to a member of the Grange Cricket Club.

Mr. Randall: That's my area.

Mr. LANGLEY: Well, I will call it some other cricket club if it worries the honourable member. I am not taking any kudos from him. Members of that club pay \$25 to be a member and \$2.50 a week. If they break a bat, the club is almost insolvent.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: If you let soccer pools through we will get the money for sport.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not talking about soccer pools. The Federal Government should not take the 15 per cent: it should be ploughed back into sport. The Minister is a reasonable gentleman, and I hope that he can do something about the matter.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I should like to make a few comments on the education line dealt with by Committee B, in relation to corporal punishment and the unholy mess that the Minister got himself into with his guidelines on that subject.

Dr. Billard: Are you going to give us a caning?

Mr. TRAINER: No, just a mild chastisement. For the benefit of the people who will be reading *Hansard* and who will wonder what guidelines I am talking about, I will refer to the first public announcement of them. That was in the *News* of 7 October 1980, when Trevor Gill had obtained the guidelines from the *Education Gazette*. I remind the Minister of an undertaking that he gave to put me on the mailing list for that august journal. He has not got around to doing it, although three or four months has passed since he undertook to provide me, the member for Baudin, the member for Salisbury, and the Hon. Anne Levy, from the Legislative Council, with the *Education Gazette* and the 1980 Schools List. That has not been done, and the Minister has been very slow on other occasions with undertakings and with response to correspondence. A few of the Government Ministers are very prompt in replies to my requests, but the Minister of Education seems very slow indeed.

Mr. Hamilton: It's a long way to come from Mount Gambier.

Mr. TRAINER: It could be, as the member for Albert Park said, a long way to come from Mount Gambier to post a letter.

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, 300 miles.

Mr. TRAINER: We should have that in metric distances nowadays. I understand that a few of my colleagues have had similar difficulties in getting replies from the Minister

of Education. Earlier this evening, I heard the member for Napier describe the difficulty he had in getting a reply from the Minister on a matter in relation to teacher housing. I am still waiting for an acknowledgement of some of my correspondence. It is most unsatisfactory. Possibly, it could be put down to the fact that the Education Department is a giant monolith and things move slowly within it, but I am sure it has not always been the case that correspondence has taken so long to get a reply.

I return to the matter of the guidelines as published in the *Education Gazette* and taken up in the *News* on 7 October. Under the heading "New rules require written request", the report states:

Parents can request their children be exempted from corporal punishment in schools under new guidelines set out by the Education Minister, Mr. Allison. The new rules state a parent or guardian can make a written request a child not be caned for serious misdemeanors at school. The new list of conditions, being circulated to schools throughout South Australia, state:

First, corporal punishment may be imposed when all other reasonable means of remedying undesirable behaviour have demonstrably failed, and it is considered by the principal, head teacher or teacher that such punishment may have the desired remedial effect.

Secondly, principals or head teachers shall keep a punishment book in which full particulars of every case of corporal punishment shall be immediately reported.

Thirdly, the principal or head teacher must keep a written record of all delegations of authority to inflict corporal punishment, and reviewed at least annually.

Fourthly, corporal punishment shall only be inflicted with a light cane on the palm of the hand.

Fifthly, in no event is corporal punishment to be administered unless a child is at least nine years old.

Sixthly, if a parent or guardian makes a request in writing that a child is not to be caned—

and this is the controversial section of the guidelines—the principal, head teacher or delegated teacher must be given to understand that the child is not thereby exempt from the discipline of the school, but subject to appropriate action other than corporal punishment.

Finally, before or after the administration of corporal punishment, the principal or headmaster may notify in writing the parent or guardian of a child the reasons for inflicting corporal punishment and the nature of it.

Those guidelines were released in early October and were then withdrawn on 16 October. They lasted a little longer than a week and were surrounded by total confusion. It is not surprising that they were withdrawn. The guidelines presented an administrative and a disciplinary nightmare. How would the school keep up with the job of maintaining the records of who could be caned and who could not be caned?

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr. TRAINER: There would be a separate set of records concerning who was eligible for punishment and who was not.

The Hon. H. Allison: You can delegate anyone under the old regulations; you can delegate only principals now.

Mr. TRAINER: One of the biggest defects was the creation of two classes of children in school—those who could be punished in this manner and those who could not, although that problem already exists in one sense, as the Minister is probably aware: we already have one class of children who cannot receive corporal punishment because we have the sexist division, or the division by gender, that girls cannot receive corporal punishment in the same way that boys can. This is somewhat strange to understand,

because, if corporal punishment is as effective as it is claimed to be, it should be equally effective whether the recipient is a male or female.

Anyway, after that bungle by the Minister he withdrew the guidelines. Earlier he implied that the guidelines had been formulated in consultation with the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the South Australian Association of State School Organisations, but since then both SAIT and SAASSO have denied that there was any real consultation. The Minister will have to do a little better before the next set of guidelines is released.

The Hon. H. Allison: SAIT simply said that it hadn't consulted its school staffs, but they were accepting the responsibility as a unilateral decision that the executive had made. We consulted with SAIT.

Mr. TRAINER: Is the Minister saying that it was the internal consultation within SAIT that was inadequate in providing the information needed?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes.

Mr. TRAINER: The whole subject of corporal punishment is a contentious issue, especially in a pluralist society where there are so many different opinions on what is right or wrong, what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. A teacher is in a very difficult position of being in *loco parentis*—in the place of a parent—but which parent is he in place of? Is he in place of the parent who believes in corporal punishment or the parent who does not believe in it? Parents have different ideas about what is reasonable discipline to apply to a child. What some would consider reasonable discipline other parents would consider to be straight-out assault, and it is quite a minefield that the teacher has to walk through.

There is a bit of a dichotomy in our attitude towards physical punishment of children. I would hope that we all abhor child bashing, yet we accept the inflicting of pain on a child as a form of discipline. The types of corporal punishment, licit or illicit, that exist in a school vary from the cane at one extreme, which is normally administered by the principal, the deputy head or someone appointed by them, to the other extreme, involving perhaps just a tap on the head with a forefinger to gain the attention of a wayward child.

There are other types of physical activity in a classroom that might be considered corporal punishment. I am not sure whether throwing a piece of chalk to gain the attention of a child not facing the front would constitute corporal punishment or assault. Teachers face a large number of legal difficulties and are in a real legal minefield in many aspects of their work, let alone in regard to corporal punishment.

Personally, I still have some doubts about whether or not the total abolition of corporal punishment in schools is necessary. I tend to lean that way, but I do have an occasional doubt. However, one thing on which I have no doubt whatever is that I am firmly opposed to some of the brutal corporal punishments that were administered in the past. Probably they are best described by the old-fashioned word "flogging". This took place particularly extensively in Catholic schools about 20 years ago, although it is no longer so in Catholic institutions now: they are normally humane and caring institutions, but it was a little different 20 years ago, particularly in those schools run by orders such as Christian Brothers, where discipline was very harsh and almost Draconian.

The Christian Brothers themselves were good godly men, but they were products of their own background, and somewhat anachronistic at times in many of their social attitudes. I attended one such school—Rostrevor College—from 1956 to 1960 via the courtesy of a scholarship—at a time when the sort of harsh corporal

punishments I am about to outline were still very much in vogue. Because of that background, I read with much interest the description that Matt Abraham gave in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 14 October headed "Memories of the strap". That article aroused a great deal of controversy shortly afterwards. Matt Abraham stated:

If one memory haunts me from my school years to the grave it will be the canes and straps I have known . . .

Like every Catholic-educated lad, I have a thorough first-hand working knowledge of corporal punishment—from the cane with the split in the end to the layered leather "bombs", the ever-handly yard rule and the well-aimed kick in the pants . . .

For Catholic schools, in particular the Christian Brothers College in the asphalt jungle of Wakefield Street, had corporal punishment down to a fine art. I was belted, cuffed or booted almost every day of my secondary school life—and I was one of the good guys.

The strap was a 45 centimetre length of leather, usually black, about eight layers thick and heavily stitched with white or black cotton. The punishment was usually dealt out in front of a class hushed like the Romans waiting for the Christians to cuddle the lions.

The victim's hand would be extended at about shoulder height with the eyes either focussed on the impending doom, clenched shut or turned away, depending on one's cowardice (I usually opted for the turned eye in a bid for pity from my attackers).

Then came total silence as the strap was raised, a swish through the air, the thwack on the sweaty palm followed by a spreading, throbbing numbness.

The variations were endless, strapping could alternate from left to right hand, be given on the seat of the pants, or with the brother hiding behind a cupboard so only the falling strap could be seen. By far the greatest spectacles were the massed class straps.

One occasion which sticks vividly in my mind is the strapping of the entire 53 students in our Inter. purple class, six "cuts" each, with the brother reduced to a perspiring wreck after a machinegun display of leather wielding. I forget why.

There was somewhat of a furore in response to that article, by way of several letters to the Editor. However, based on my own experience, I would say that very little of that article is exaggeration. Most of it is factual, although perhaps the accompanying cartoon, which also received some criticism, was a little unfair. In my school days, like Matt Abraham, I was belted regularly even though, like him, I was perhaps one of the good guys. The punishment, as seen through my eyes and in the eyes of many of my fellow students, that we received was often unjust.

The weapons that were used were rather terrible: six or eight layers of leather stitched together, or in some cases rubber stitched together with a leather casing around it or, in another case, six layers of leather with a rivet through each end so that the resulting weapon was somewhat like an iron bar because of its rigidity. It seemed to us at the time that the Christian Brothers had special pockets in their cassocks, something like holsters, and we often wondered who manufactured the weapons that they used.

Like Matt Abraham, my fellow students at the time referred to the strap as "the bomb", because of the noise it made. I can remember the expulsion of one student in the mid-1950's for using berries to write on the wall of the chapel the then topical slogan, "Ban the bomb". The detonation of the leather hitting the fist would cause a quiver, spreading through the whole class, whether the impact of leather on flesh was taking place in that room, the room next door, or further down the classroom block.

One would retreat to one's seat already blue with bruising and with the hands numb so that one could not write.

I often wondered what was the sanity, if any, of a piano teacher inflicting this sort of punishment on the fingers of his piano students. In the case of boarders at the school, it was a raised dressing gown and belt across the behind or, in some cases, a lowering of the pyjamas before the application of leather to buttocks. A fair amount of force was applied. The brothers would leap up on to the tips of their toes in order to get the maximum downward thrust of the leather.

I remember the glee of a particular class when a student pulled his hand away at the critical moment and the teacher, who had an elastoplast bandage on his knee which was rather weak at the time, made violent impact with his own knee, and rolled for a short while on the floor. At that time, we were not sure whether to laugh or cover our faces and conceal our mirth. It could have been worse: it might not have been that part of his anatomy with which the leather made contact in those circumstances. It was not advisable for one to pull one's hand away because one would get even more than one would have got before.

This sort of punishment went all the way up to what would now be called Matriculation but which in those days was called Leaving Honours.

I remember one day on which I had not, for various domestic reasons, done a particular part of my homework and I had not been able to have any breakfast that morning. Having travelled the long way to school, I was feeling seedy. When asked where that section of my homework was, I was unable to give a satisfactory response. I got six, three on each hand, and passed out. The worst feature of it all, apart perhaps from the savagery with which it was inflicted, was that it was so often used not only as punishment for misdemeanors but also for unsatisfactory work, even for work beyond the capacity of some of the students. For example, in the language classes students might be given a dozen Latin words to learn as vocabulary for the night. The next morning, after a vocabulary test, they would receive one whack of the strap for every word that they got wrong. That did not do much for the confidence of those students who were struggling anyway.

Mr. Slater: Where did this happen?

Mr. TRAINER: This was at Rostrevor College. Things are completely different now, and I hope members are aware that my criticism is directed towards something that no longer exists. This sort of practice has pretty well vanished in those schools, but, 20 years ago, despite the fact that many people think that Matt Abraham exaggerated in his article, this was going on. Like Matt Abraham, I can remember the massive "class straps", when the entire class would receive the bomb, as we called it. The technical name for this type of leather instrument is a ferrule, which I think is an old Irish word. Perhaps it was the Irish ancestry of the Christian Brothers that was responsible for the introduction of this weapon into this country. It think it should have been banned by the Geneva Convention. I suppose because of the noise of these massive class straps, one could describe it as a variation on a gang bang, with the bomb being used on up to 70 students in a row. Some of the classes were large, with up to 70 students, and perhaps it was because the classes were so large that that weapon of fear was used to such a large extent. Perhaps teachers could control such a large class only with total intimidation. As Matt Abraham described, it was not that unusual for an entire class to be punished in this fashion. Perhaps one boy had called out something and did not own up, so the entire class would be punished in that fashion.

The college to which I referred, in answer to an interjection by the member for Gilles, has changed. People who have gone there since, sent their children there, or have taught there, have assured me that everything that I have described has completely vanished and that it is now a humane institution which does not provide the sort of environment I experienced from 1956 to 1960.

Yet, the distaste that was engendered by my experiences then has resulted in my never wishing to set foot in that school again, except on an informal visit, such as when I drove through on a Sunday afternoon to show my children the torture chambers, as it were, in which their father had been. I have never formally set foot in that school since.

I can understand the difficulty that the whole issue of corporal punishment presents. It is a difficult situation for the Minister, and he has a certain amount of sympathy from me. At the same time, I must criticise the way in which he has muddled that particular issue by putting out his guidelines and pulling them back so rapidly.

I should like now to turn my attention to a subject covered by the portfolio of the Minister of Environment, namely, the dangers from a series of chemical compounds known as polychlorinated biphenyls. These are considered so dangerous that they are a banned import. Some statutory rules from the Customs Department of September 1973 state the following:

- (1) This regulation applies to the following goods:
 - (a) substances obtained by chlorinating biphenyls; and
 - (b) goods containing substances obtained by chlorinating biphenyls.

- (2) The importation into Australia of goods to which this regulation applies is prohibited unless a permission, in writing, to import the goods has been granted by the Minister.

- (3) A permission under this regulation shall be subject to such conditions imposing requirements or prohibitions on the person to whom the permission is granted with respect to the custody, use, disposal or destruction of the goods, or with respect to accounting for the goods, as the Minister thinks necessary to ensure that the goods are not used otherwise than for the purpose for which he grants the permission.

Rules have been developed by the O.E.C.D. for the protection of the environment by control of polychlorinated biphenyls. They issue guidelines to member nations regarding these products, as follows:

1. Member countries shall ensure that in their respective territories, polychlorinated biphenyls (P.C.B.s) shall not be used for industrial or commercial purposes, except in the following categories of use:

- Dielectric fluids for transformers or large power factor correction capacitors;
- Heat transfer fluids (other than in installations for processing of foods, drugs, feeds and veterinary products);
- Hydraulic fluids in mining equipment; and
- Small capacitors.

In pursuit of those uses, member countries shall:

- (a) control the manufacture, import and export of bulk P.C.B.s;
- (b) institute adequate arrangements for the recovery, regeneration, adequate incineration or other safe disposal of surplus and waste materials;
- (c) institute a special, uniform labelling system for both bulk P.C.B.s and P.C.B.-containing manufactured products; and
- (d) establish safety specifications for containers and transport.

These chemical compounds are extremely dangerous. The only safe method of disposal of them is in special high

temperature furnaces and, although there are large quantities of these compounds in Australia, no special high-temperature furnace yet exists in this country, although the New South Wales Government is constructing a furnace to dispose of chemical waste. However, it will not be coming into operation for several years and extreme caution will be needed because large quantities of these compounds are still in use in some of those applications I have mentioned. For example, the Electricity Trust uses 131 000 litres of P.C.B. and G.M.H. 35 900 litres. There are several other large users. Because there is at present no method of adequate disposal, waste P.C.B.s are stockpiled.

The following quantities of waste P.C.B.s 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
Phillips	130
ETSA	700
General Motors Holden	700

The compounds are particularly potent. In recent years, there have been a number of incidents where food has been contaminated with polychlorinated biphenyls (P.C.B.s), usually from accidental spills, improper disposal, and unintentional misuse of P.C.B.-containing materials and equipment. P.C.B.s are now known to have extremely hazardous health and environmental effects, even at low levels of concentration. P.C.B.-containing equipment, such as electrical transformers, have been extensively used in food and feed processing facilities.

P.C.B.s are a class of chemicals called chlorinated hydrocarbons, which range in consistency from heavy oily liquids to waxy solids. There are several hundred chemicals that fall into the category of P.C.B.s. They have been very useful for certain applications because of their chemical stability; low flammability, high boiling points and their low electrical conductivity.

Since their development (with the growth of organic chemistry) in 1929, they have been used in a variety of industrial applications: in electrical transformers, capacitors, electro-magnets, and so on. P.C.B.s have also been used as plasticisers in paints, adhesives, and caulking compounds; fillers for investment casting waxes; and dye carriers in carbonless copy paper.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. TRAINER: I was outlining those examples in connection with the Customs Department here and O.E.C.D. rules. Other countries have been concerned about the dangers of P.C.B., about their toxicity and about their persistence in the environment. As a result of these concerns, the U.S. Congress has prohibited their manufacture, processing or distribution in commerce. However, the chemicals have for economic reasons been permitted to remain in older electrical transformers and other industrial machinery. However, these must eventually be disposed of. The only method is by a high-temperature furnace, and I hope that the Government will investigate the possibility of establishing one of those here for these very dangerous compounds.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I want to make a very brief contribution. I have listened patiently tonight for some constructive comments from members opposite. A few moments ago one member called for a quorum. I would not blame any member for not sitting in this House and listening to the diatribe of nonsense that we have had to

put up with tonight. I believe that members opposite are attempting to filibuster for the sake of filibustering. It is absolutely ludicrous that people should be here at 1.5 a.m. with the threat of having to come back here tomorrow night and listen to the nonsense that is being put forward. Not a constructive comment has been made during the past few hours. I believe the public quite rightly can look on us with scorn for this sort of conduct.

It is an absolute waste of the Parliament's time. The Parliament has far more constructive things to do than to keep people here, such as members of Cabinet, who have important decisions to make tomorrow in relation to the welfare of the people of this State. The Opposition has had more than a fair go; the Committee system has given them a great deal more time. The exercise in which members opposite are now engaging is purely an attempt to exhaust the Government. They are not making constructive criticism in relation to the manner in which the Government is administering the State, but they are just keeping members here for the sake of seeing how long they can talk. I believe that a reasonable 10 minutes each would have been fair enough, and that no-one would have complained.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: Members can say that I want to stifle the debate. I would suggest that they calculate how long members have had and compare that with the time that the Liberal Party members took when in Opposition. Members opposite got far longer last year when we went through the spectacle of seeing members, who a few weeks earlier had been Ministers, did not even know what was in their own Budget. We had the member for Mitchell asking the most ridiculous questions, and it was quite obvious from the questions he was asking that he did not know what was taking place in the portfolio he had been administering a few weeks before.

On this occasion they have now been in Opposition for 12 months. Of course, they are entitled to make constructive comments in relation to the Budget, as it is an important area, but they also have a responsibility to use some common sense. The member for Mitcham is probably home in bed asleep. I do not blame him, but, unfortunately, Government members must keep the numbers in this place. I believe members opposite are wasting Parliament's time, turning the debate into a farce, and doing nothing constructive for the people of this State. They are doing nothing to enhance their own image. The only course of action that has been achieved is that the public look on the Parliament with more scorn. It is about time members opposite lifted their game a bit and stopped this continual diatribe that we have had to listen to.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): For the benefit of the member for Eyre, I hope that I can be constructive. I want to exercise my rights to discuss matters in relation to Estimates Committee B, and it is the right of members of this House to have the opportunity to do so. After all, the Government introduced this particular system, and Opposition members have endeavoured to assist. I think that all members should exercise this right. I regret the fact that we had to sit until 4 a.m. yesterday, and that we are here at this time today. However, I served twice on Estimates Committee B and I want to refer to those Committees. On the first day, owing to the indisposition of the member for Hartley at very short notice I was co-opted on to that Committee in relation to services and supply. I asked the Deputy Premier (*Hansard*, p. 58):

I refer to "Contingencies—Office of Minister—Overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved) and officers". The allocation is \$25 000. What is the purpose of

the proposed visit overseas, and when is it likely to be undertaken?

The reply was:

The honourable member may have seen an announcement on Friday that I was to undertake an overseas visit . . . I am leaving on Sunday.

The Minister gave a resume of the places that he would be going and the purposes of that visit. The member for Elizabeth then sought to ascertain the class of air travel to be used by the Minister (*Hansard*, p.58):

I ask the Minister whether he intends to follow my precedent and travel economy class, or whether he is going first class.

The reply was that the Minister thought he was travelling first class. It appears that the Minister is travelling first class. It is significant to look at the contingency lines for the various Ministers, as there are quite a number of instances of travel. For example, in the Premier's vote, nothing was voted in 1979-80 for overseas trips. However, an amount of \$30 867 was spent. In 1980-81 the proposed allocation is \$40 000.

The Deputy Premier, as I have already mentioned, is presently overseas and his allocation is \$25 000. I note that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has an amount proposed of \$70 000. Although nothing was voted in 1979-80, \$15 565 was spent under the agriculture vote. As far as the Minister of Agriculture is concerned, \$33 000 has been allocated for this coming year. The Minister of Water Resources had nothing voted in 1979-80 but \$23 859 was spent. A further allocation of \$30 000 is made for 1980-81.

The significance of this is that, during the Government's term in Opposition, they were extremely critical of trips overseas by Ministers of the previous Government. It is rather ironical that in the first year of office a significant amount of money was spent in regard to overseas trips. Even more significant is the large amount of money that will be spent this year for Ministerial overseas trips. I believe that the Government has taken a rather hypocritical attitude in regard to overseas trips, being critical when in Opposition but when in office doing worse than the previous Government did. I do not doubt that, if I studied the Estimates a little more closely, I would find further allocations in different ways for trips, this time in relation to expenditure on Ministerial travel within Australia.

Two Ministers are absent at present. I know that the Minister of Agriculture has been ill, so I do not reflect on that, but the Minister of Industrial Affairs has gone to Alice Springs, I understand, perhaps on Parliamentary business and perhaps not.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: For one day.

Mr. SLATER: For two days. I understand that another Minister is away on Parliamentary business. The point I make is that members opposite were very critical of our Government when we were in office. They asked Questions on Notice particularly of the Premier, about who travelled with him, how much it cost, and what he had for breakfast. It is hypocritical of members opposite to do the same or worse.

The Leader asked a question today about consultants, for whom funds have been allocated in the Estimates: P. & A. Consultants are involved. If one looks through the Estimates, one will find that quite a number of Government departments have employed private consultants to prepare various reports. Under the Premier's Department, \$58 000 was allocated for consultants under the Department of Tourism, \$77 000 was allocated; under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$75 000 was allocated; \$8 200 was allocated to the Minister of Local Government, but \$8 156 was spent in 1979-80;

under the Department for the Environment, \$26 000 was allocated; and under the Recreation and Sport Division, \$10 000 was allocated for private consultants.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: They did a very good job.

Mr. SLATER: They might have, but that is a matter of opinion. I make the point that there seems to be a bit of an epidemic in regard to the Government's appointing consultants in every situation where it needs some kind of so-called expert advice. There is plenty of opportunity, as the Leader has said, for this sort of advice to be obtained within the Public Service. I was not a member of the Estimates Committee when it considered the recreation and sport lines and I was denied the opportunity to ask questions; I do not blame anyone for this.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Not by me.

Mr. SLATER: I do not blame you: I just said that. I was not given the opportunity, perhaps because of an error on our part, because of the nature of the lines, to question the Minister in regard to some aspects of recreation and sport until Committee members had finalised their questions and before the matter was put to a vote. I am not saying that I was denied an opportunity to question in the long term, but I had to wait for almost the whole day to get that opportunity. I appreciate that the transport lines are very important and, as I said, the Department of Transport and the Highways Department were dealt with under "Miscellaneous", and I had the opportunity to pursue, to some degree, the matters that I wished to determine, and I am grateful for the information that the Minister provided. I asked the question:

There is a reduction in the recreation and sport section of about \$329 000. In the programme papers in relation to the Loan Estimates it is stated that the reduction this year represents a decrease in the total amount of grants to be made available to the division in 1980-81. Can the Minister state the decrease in the grants to the various bodies?

The *Hansard* report continues:

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I agree that the amount looks significant, but there is a logical explanation for most of it. The former Government granted \$300 000 to the department for the construction of the Port Adelaide Recreation Centre, on the condition that that amount would be recouped from the department's loan over a couple of years, and that has happened. You are really talking about a difference of far less than that.

Mr. Slater: A difference of \$29 000.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Something like that. The level of allocation for the recreation and sport capital assistance has remained static for three years and the amount for the Port Adelaide recreation Centre has confused the issue. You are looking at a broad amount.

The Minister said earlier that the allocation to sport and recreation had remained static for three years. If that is the case, taking into account inflation, there has actually been a reduction in the allocation. I concur in the remarks of my colleague, the member for Unley, that we ought to give a higher priority in the Budget to sport and recreation. It is important, because, as people have more leisure time, they need facilities with which to exercise that leisure time, either in passive or active recreation. There are so many divers aspects of sport and recreation that we need to be able to provide, particularly to what I call the smaller or peripheral aspects of recreation and sport, an increased amount, because they are the ones that are often unable to finance themselves.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: If we got \$1 000 000 from soccer pools—

Mr. SLATER: I was going to refer to that in due course and to the Minister's comments about soccer pools. I think that the Minister agrees with me that more money should

be allocated. Recreation and sport have been given a low priority by State and Federal Governments over the past few years. We can divide sport into a number of categories. I look at the professional sports, which attract groups, the crowd-pleasing aspect of sport, which can be self-sufficient to some degree. There are also the minor sports in which many people participate. They might not be attractive as crowd-pleasing sports, but they are important to the participants. Many thousands of young people participate in these forms of activity. They are the sporting bodies that I would support more extensively by providing greater funds to them, both for administration and for the necessary facilities.

The Minister has mentioned his proposal to raise money for sport in this State through the introduction of soccer pools. I suppose I do not disagree with the principle—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's a very harmless form of gambling.

Mr. SLATER: It may be. With our modern outlook, we spend plenty of money on gambling in South Australia, although, in comparison with other States, we are one of the lowest States in gambling figures. When we compare all the aspects of gambling, a great deal of money is involved. It is a matter for the individual to decide whether to participate in lotteries, the T.A.B. or the soccer pools if they come into operation in South Australia.

Mr. Trainer: What about Aussie Pools?

Mr. SLATER: I think Aussie Pools is a bit of a rort. The member for Ascot Park exposed it for what it is. I had some doubts about that organisation in the first place, but one must have evidence to condemn such an operation. Of course, it was run by private entrepreneurs. Good old free enterprise came in to make a buck out of people's gambling habits. Perhaps I should not say that the Sangster organisation of Vernon Pools is akin to Aussie Pools, because that is not so. It is a much larger organisation, and it does not set out directly to fleece the customer, but it does so perhaps in a more indirect way.

If we compare the other States and the percentage of the consumer dollar that goes into soccer pools, we find that the South Australian Lotteries Commission pays 61 per cent, or 61c in every \$1 of its return to the prize winners. With soccer pools, the money that is ploughed back to the individuals in prize money is 35 per cent, or 35c in each \$1. There is a vast difference. I appreciate that the Minister wishes to introduce some method of obtaining money for recreation and sport. If he is not listening to my remarks, I hope that he will at least read them in *Hansard* tomorrow. I believe that the soccer pools should not be conducted by a large private entrepreneurial organisation. Our State Lotteries Commission was set up to conduct these forms of gambling, and it has done so very effectively.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I agree, but if it tried to run soccer pools it will not get the patronage.

Mr. SLATER: It is a matter of judgment.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Indeed, and I have made the judgment.

Mr. SLATER: It is an expression of opinion, perhaps. The Lotteries Commission has proved very effective in its operation. I am glad the Minister can find some mirth in this. The Lotteries Commission has, in the period of its operation, ploughed back into the Hospitals Department significant amounts of money. I would need the reports of the commission before me to analyse the amounts, but they have been most significant. I am afraid that the activities of soccer pools may in some way affect the activities of the Lotteries Commission, because there is little difference, in my view, between X-Lotto and soccer pools. It is a numbers game.

Mr. Mathwin: But you work on the ball with soccer.

Mr. SLATER: I am not particularly familiar with the activities of soccer pools, as I have never participated in that game and on only very rare occasions have I entered X-Lotto.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: About \$30 000 a week goes out of the State now.

Mr. SLATER: I am aware that many people play soccer pools in South Australia quite illegally. It is illegal. I agree that there are people from overseas countries who desire to participate in soccer pools but, at the same time, I do not think that is a good excuse. I do not believe that the fact that \$30 000 goes out of the State is an excuse for us to introduce soccer pools to be run by large private entrepreneurs. We might as well argue that, as we have S.P. bookmakers in South Australia, we should legalise them. It is the same principle. We should be looking at a way to give more money to sport and recreation.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I am doing that.

Mr. SLATER: I do not know whether it will work that way, because of the effect it will have on other gambling areas. For example, the Department of Recreation and Sport has administered small lotteries. It has been a good innovation and has assisted small sporting and social clubs throughout the State throughout the years. The previous Government introduced the regulations under the Act. Certain requirements are needed to be varied from time to time in the regulations. Many small sporting clubs obtain significant funds for their activities and, if there is a proliferation of opportunities for people to spend their gambling dollar, especially in times of economic recession or when things are not so good economically, funds are taken from other areas: for example, T.A.B. results could decline.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That would apply whether soccer pools were run by the Lotteries Commission or the pools organisation.

Mr. SLATER: That may be, but at least the money would be going to a Government instrumentality instead of being siphoned to the proprietors of a large organisation. I do not want to be critical of it but, at the same time, I know that it has operated in other States. I know that it is a large and well organised operation. The Minister should consider this matter seriously, because we will certainly consider it seriously when the legislation is introduced.

I hope the Minister has had discussions with the Lotteries Commission and will consider seriously the small sporting organisations that run other forms of fund-raising activities, for example, bingo. He should ensure that the T.A.B. is not affected by the introduction of further forms of gambling in this State. We should consider whether the benefits that we will obtain from the introduction of soccer pools in South Australia will be as great as the Minister claims. It may reduce the Government's other revenue-raising gambling sources.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: If you had stayed in Government, I think you would have introduced it.

Mr. SLATER: I do not have any idea. I do not know of any approaches that were made to us. I was not privileged to know at that time what approaches were made to the Ministry in regard to the introduction of soccer pools.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I just say that I think you would have.

Mr. SLATER: That may have been the case. As I have said, we are not in Government (the Minister's Party is in Government at the moment), and I want to be able to cooperate because, as I have said, I believe that we need to raise funds for sport. I do not want to pursue that line any further at this late hour. I just want to say, again, that the Estimates Committees system has its failings. It has

problems that I think are not insurmountable, and, once again, I think we ought to support the remarks made by the Leader about forming a committee of this House to make sure that the Estimates Committees work better next year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: VISA

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Tourism): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In reply to a question from the member for Fisher this afternoon on the response to the VISA campaign, I inadvertently gave a

figure that related to the results of the campaign of about two or three weeks ago. I would now like to correct the wrong impression that I gave then by giving the up-to-date figures, which are more impressive. The actual VISA inquiries from the start of the campaign to 14 October numbered 7 218. The total inquiries for September 1980 (that is not related directly to VISA but total inquiries) numbered 34 247, compared to September 1979, when 27 148 were made. The break-down of the VISA inquiries is: from Melbourne, 3 874; from Sydney, 1 623; and from Adelaide, 1 721.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.37 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 23 October at 2 p.m.