

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 23 October 1980

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

PETITIONS: MEAT TRADING

Petitions signed by 158 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 Hon. W. E. Chapman and Mr. Lynn Arnold.

Petitions 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*.

LEAVE PAYMENTS

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

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: The reply is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND ENERGY

Salaries, Wages and Related Payments

TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS

Name	Last Day of Duty	Classification
Ambrose	18/4/80	Geologist
Bowering	25/10/79	Geologist
Bruggemann	2/11/79	Clerical
*Clayton	7/1/80	Clerical

Name	Last Day of Duty	Classification
Foran	18/4/80	Clerical
Harris	1/2/80	Geologist
King	9/5/80	Energy
Kostoglou	10/8/79	Clerical
Limb	2/5/80	Geophysics
Micenko	29/2/80	Geophysics
Northcott	11/1/80	Geologist
*Roberts	14/2/80	Clerical
Rimmer	20/7/79	Technical
*Rush	1/7/79	Clerical
Sachse	27/6/80	Clerical
Smith	27/6/80	Technical
*Templer	28/9/79	Engineer
Thorpe	6/7/79	Technical
White	4/1/80	Clerical
Wells	21/3/80	Technical
Whitford	24/9/79	Technical
Willcox	10/8/79	Technical
Ryan	1/7/79	Clerical
Davis	14/3/80	Clerical (Deceased)

*Resignation/retirement anticipated when estimates were prepared.

PLANT HIRE

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

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: In 1980-81 the Engineering and Water Supply Department proposed to purchase 467 motor vehicles at an estimated cost of \$2 621 050. This sum, together with the estimated cost of other plant items proposed to be purchased, comprises the figure of \$5 250 000. The following schedule provides details of major plant hire. These items are hired as required at a rate fixed by a 12-monthly contract.

Plant Item	Contractor	Expenditure for the period shown
Mobile Slewing Cranes	Consolidated Crane Hire—current	\$1 756 from 1/8/80
	Brambles Crane Services—previous year	\$16 100
Compaction Hammer	Arrow Compactor and Impactor Services	\$25 110 for 12 months
Air Track Drills and Compressor	Atlas Copco Aust. Pty. Ltd.	Contract commenced 23/2/80—no expenditure to date.
Self-propelled Vibrating Rollers	Wreckair Pty. Ltd.	\$2 790 since 23/2/80

In addition, there are numerous short-term contracts let to plant hire firms in both the metropolitan and country areas for crane hire, towing services, scaffold hire, and earth-moving machinery. Complete information in these areas is not readily available. The work which would be necessary to obtain this information is not considered justified. In all cases the reason for hiring machinery is the lack of the necessary resources within the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

PENSIONER REMISSION SCHEME

In reply to **Mr. MAX BROWN** (9 October).

The **Hon. P. B. ARNOLD**: There is provision in the present Remission Scheme for a remission on individual accounts through the Department for Community Welfare, where the applicant receives either a Commonwealth Unemployment Benefit or Sickness Benefit. Entitlement to a remission in such a case is subject to an

income test based on the same criteria and income levels at which a pensioner would be entitled to Commonwealth Health Benefit or concession cards. Application for a remission on the above basis is made to the Department for Community Welfare. The other two matters raised, viz. granting of concessions to persons over 60 years of age who have been forced into early retirement by redundancy and the provision of concessions to persons living in their own home in the same manner as applies to rented South Australian Housing Trust premises will be forwarded to the Minister of Community Welfare for consideration.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to announce the Government's appointment of Mr. E. J. Phipps as the Director-General of the new Department of Environment and Planning. Mr. Phipps is exceptionally well-qualified to fill this important position. He has had extensive experience in the private sector and in the Commonwealth and State Governments. Prior to joining the South Australian Public Service as General Manager of the Land Commission in 1976, Mr. Phipps worked with two Commonwealth Agencies—the Cities Commission and the Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development. His responsibilities at Second Division Officer level were for the administration of Commonwealth involvement in urban and regional projects and studies being carried out jointly with State Governments. Before this, he held senior positions with the project management arm of one of Australia's leading companies, Conzinc Rio Tinto Australia Limited on major mine, town and railway developments in the north-west of Western Australia.

As members will be aware from a previous Ministerial statement, the new Department of Environment and Planning is being created by the amalgamation of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. The amalgamation commenced in June this year under the overall direction of an implementation steering committee comprising the Directors-General of the two existing departments, an Assistant Commissioner of the Public Service Board, with an independent Chairman, Mr. Keith Lewis, Director-General of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The organisation structure for the new department has now been determined and I have referred the proposals to the Public Service Board for approval. This is expected by the end of this month and will allow the commencement of the implementation stage comprising:

1. The filling of executive positions;
2. The detailing and approval of the detailed organisations of the branches of the new department—and the filling of positions; and
3. The design and installation of the management information system to support the new department.

Having regard to the complexity of the integration and the need to ensure full consultation with the staff of both departments and the Public Service Association, I am delighted with the progress made to date. I have been particularly impressed with the contribution of the staff in obtaining what I believe to be an organisation structure which will serve South Australia extremely well.

Mr. Phipps will shortly take over the direction of the reorganisation, and the Implementation Steering Committee will be disbanded. It is planned that the new department will be progressively established as organisational units are determined and staff appointed so that the new department will be fully operational on 1 July 1981. I wish to express my deepest concern about the standards being used in another place by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, who has referred in debate and question recently to the Chairman of the Implementation Steering Committee, Mr. Keith Lewis.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has asked for and been given an opportunity to make a Ministerial statement. Does that mean that it gives him the right to denigrate Mr. Cornwall in another place?

Mr. Bannon: As usual.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes. I believe that Ministerial statements are for information and not to derogate some member in another place.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order in the sense that it is not in order to make any comment about members in another place which reflects upon them.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to be able to announce the Government's appointment of Mr. E. J. Phipps as Director-General of the new Department of Environment and Planning.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Bridgewater Primary School Redevelopment,
Hahndorf Primary School Redevelopment.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

REMAND CENTRE

Mr. BANNON: My question is to the Premier. What sites are under active consideration by the Government for the urgently needed remand centre, and why has the final decision not yet been made? For some considerable time the Opposition has been attempting to discover from the Government why the new remand centre has not been proceeded with and where it will be built, in view of the Government's rejection of the Regency Park site determined by the previous Government. We were told in the House earlier this week by the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the Regency Park site was totally unsuitable because it was on the site of the standard gauge interchange. An examination of a map obtained from the Australian National Railways indicating the development that would take place there shows quite clearly that the site, a small amount of land which is adjacent to the S.T.A. workshops at Regency Park, is not affected at all by the proposed railway interchange and, taking into account the industrial development surrounding it, there is still ample space available for that remand centre project, so the rejection of that by the Government is somewhat inexplicable. I am still waiting for a reply from the Chief Secretary to two letters I have written, the first as long ago as 22 September, asking him to precisely detail what the development that the Government had in train for the site was that meant this could not be proceeded with. I have received only one reply from the Chief Secretary, in which he said he will have inquiries made into this matter, a matter within his purview and his responsibility, and advise me of the outcome of my representations as soon as possible.

That is the reply: he will advise me about my representations. By way of further explanation, subsequently the Hassell Report has been published, and it shows the site allocated to a remand centre as one of the options for development of the Supreme Court area, and that is in line with the study referred to by the Premier in this place on 21 August 1980. I refer the House to the Premier's answer to my question on that occasion in regard to the site of the remand centre. He responded by saying that the study had not been completed, and one assumes, from that, that he meant the study that the Hassell Report subsequently revealed; he also said that he expected that a decision would be made about the site sometime within the next month or so. That reply was on 21 August.

It is now just over two months since the Premier gave that reply, yet we find in today's paper that the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, would not be drawn on the matter when he was questioned by the press in regard to opposition by the Judiciary to the proposal to site the remand centre on the Supreme Court area. Other sites which were mentioned and which were, it was said, examined closely by the previous Government include the Goodwood Orphanage in London, land at the Glenside Hospital, land belonging to Perry Engineering Co. at Mile End, land belonging to the South Australian Brewing Co. in the city, the former speedway at Rowley Park, and the Murray Hill building in King William Street. All of those sites were examined and rejected, and they were mentioned in my question to the Premier of 21 August. That is why I ask what sites the Government is considering and why has the Premier not honoured his undertaking to announce a decision within the next month or so of 21 August.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One hardly knows where to start. That was quite a remarkable performance, particularly in view of the fact that the former Chief Secretary, the Hon. Donald Simmons, seemed to take about four or five years not to make up his mind. Let me put a few things straight for the Leader. We are certainly not considering an orphanage site in London: that may be rather too far away and too inconvenient. Secondly, the site proposed at Regency Park, in the answer given by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, was quite correct: the Minister was referring to one of the original sites at Regency Park that was being considered.

The Hassell Report has been finalised and has been opened to public comment. A decision will be made very soon on which site of the many alternatives available will be used, and the Leader will have to be patient. As to the Leader's saying that I have not honoured my promise in regard to a decision being made within the next month or so from, I think, 21 August, I would have thought that we were still within the category of "a month or so". In the light of the previous Government's record, the Leader protesteth too much.

COAL

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Premier say what stage has been reached in regard to test work at the Port Wakefield-Bowmans coal field and when is it considered that reports will be available to indicate when the establishment of a proposed power station can proceed? For some months, work has been proceeding on a test hole at Bowmans for the purpose of sending test quantities of coal to West Germany and the United States to determine the grade and the possibility of using this coal for the production of electricity. Not so long ago, the Premier announced that there was the possibility of the establishment of a sophisticated power plant in the area and, for the sake of many local people and others in the State who are interested in the project, I ask the Premier what stage the proposal has reached.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the honourable member for his question. It is a very significant development in that part of the State, and I know of his great interest in it. The coal deposits in the Bowmans, Port Wakefield, and Balaklava area have been known for a considerable time. They extend in a large range across the head of the gulf; indeed, part of that deposit is on the other side of the gulf opposite Port Wakefield. The studies being conducted at present are between Balaklava and Port Wakefield. As members will know (and I am sure the member for Goyder will be

present also), there is to be a ceremony, I think a week from today, when the first samples of coal will be taken from the test depth that has been so carefully, and with great engineering skill, put down to find a sufficient sample. Most people in South Australia recognise that the brown coal available to us here, while present in relatively large quantities, is not particularly good quality brown coal. It is very wet and high in sodium, and it is not easy to burn but, fortunately, we have learnt the techniques of burning it and generating electricity. Leigh Creek, that monument to Sir Thomas Playford, has been in operation for many years and has provided electricity to the community of South Australia.

The problems at Port Wakefield were particularly difficult ones. The cost of the project to date is over \$6 000 000. The excavation of the trial pit near Bowmans has involved the removal of 1 700 000 cubic metres of over-burden. That covers excavation down to a depth of 60 metres. The necessary requirement is about 300 tonnes of coal to be sent overseas, some to America and some to the Rhine Braun Coalworks and Research Centre, in Cologne, so that it can be put through their testing process to determine the best way of burning it and getting the best return from it. The important thing is that, when that test pit was put down, it was found that enormous dewatering problems arose.

If any members have been to that site (I am sure that the member for Goyder would have made it his business to do so), it is remarkable to see the steps that have been taken to dewater that entire operation. Bores have been put around at various levels at the interface to take the water out of the various aquifers; it is a very sandy soil. A considerable amount of salt water is being discharged every day into a nearby creek, and thence out to sea. The \$6 000 000 expenditure was certainly not envisaged when that proposition was first put forward, but it will prove, I am certain, to be money well spent, because the experience gained by the trust's engineers in dewatering techniques will be of immense value when and if (and I have no doubt that it will be when) a decision is made to exploit that coalfield.

Similarly, it will be important in the consideration, as the Minister of Education reminds me, of the evaluation and exploitation of the Kingston coal deposits, again an area where dewatering will play a major part in the exploration and exploitation of those deposits. It will take, after all of these months of excavation of over-burden, a relatively short time (I understand, only a matter of about three weeks) to find the necessary 300-tonne sample to send away for evaluation. The cost of \$6 000 000 is much higher than was expected but, as I say, we believe that it is an investment in experience that will be well worth while. I am looking forward to the simple ceremony of taking the first of that sample, and I would hope that all members who can attend on site will do so from the point of view of marking a most significant exploration day in the history of South Australia's energy supplies, and also from the point of view of learning a great deal about the expertise and undoubted skill which has been shown by engineers and workers of the Electricity Trust.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Is the Premier aware that, according to the latest available Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for August 1980, there are now 50 per cent fewer job vacancies than in August last year, and that South Australia now has the worst rate of job vacancies in Australia? In simple terms, that means that for every

existing job vacancy there are 47 unemployed South Australians. Does the Premier believe that this situation will continue? If not, when can we expect an improvement?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This is becoming a perennial question from the Deputy Leader, but it is no less an important one, and I wish that I were able to provide an answer for him on this occasion instead of the answer that I have had to give him in the past, which is the answer I give again now. No, it is far from being a satisfactory situation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What are you doing about it?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If I can just carry on and answer without being interrupted, it is far from being a satisfactory situation, and the Government is well aware of that. As I have often pointed out to the Deputy Leader—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If he wishes, I will spend a considerable time repeating the answer which I gave to his Leader some weeks ago, listing the number of projects agreed to and confirmed over the past 12 months. I am sure he would not want me to do that. There is now an enormous increase in the number of committed projects coming to South Australia.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member says "Rubbish", but I venture to disagree quite strongly with him on that. It is not rubbish; it is something that is happening. As I have pointed out on many occasions, and I have been criticised by the Deputy Leader and his colleagues for facing reality, it will take a lead time in almost every instance before we get buildings and jobs created from the various projects. It is quite ridiculous for the Leader, the Deputy Leader, or anyone opposite to criticise those developments simply because they have not produced instant jobs and instant activity. The frightening thing about the attitude of the Labor Party at present is that it had taken no action whatever to have any projects in the pipeline at the time my Government took office. All I can do is to remind members opposite that there has been a 60 per cent up-turn in the number of committed projects in the industrial field and a 1 600 per cent up-turn in mineral exploration and development projects since the Government took office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot help it if the Labor Party's lack of activity in the most recent year it was in Government has resulted in this long-term continual down-turn. Within a reasonable time, and certainly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier will please resume his seat. I have indicated to members previously that interjections are out of order. I have already asked for silence in respect of this answer, and I will take the necessary action if there are any further interruptions.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Certainly, within the life of this Government we will start to see the prosperity which the people of this State put us into office to bring to them, which they have every right to expect, and which they thoroughly deserve.

GLUE SNIFFING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Health give some indication of the progress being made to try to counteract

the problem of glue and spray sniffing which is causing much concern within the community with its effects on some of our young people?

I understand that the Minister would have seen the report in today's *Advertiser* which concerns the most recent case. Yesterday in Sydney a 14-year old boy died as a result of the effects of sniffing cooking spray from a plastic bag. The Minister would well know that glue sniffing and so on is a world-wide problem, and that there are some countries and some provinces in Canada that have legislation to try to counteract this particular shocking habit.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I did see the report in the paper concerning the tragic death of a young boy in New South Wales. As many members would know, I have had representations from both sides of the House since my appointment concerning this extremely worrying matter. In response to a Question on Notice earlier this week, I advised the House that the South Australian Health Commission established a working party earlier this year to look at the problem and, in the process of doing so, established a consolidated list of all legislative and administrative action, which has been taken in all parts of the world and which could be researched and investigated with a view to seeing which options had worked and which were most appropriate for adoption in South Australia. That consolidated list and the report which accompanied it have been sent to the South Australian Food and Drugs Advisory Committee and also to the National Health and Medical Research Council for study and for recommendations. I hope it will not be too long before the Health Commission receives recommendations as to action that the Government should adopt.

I should stress that one of the enormous problems in tackling this issue is the conflict which arises between the need to provide publicity to educate the community about the extent of the problem, as against the fact that such publicity inevitably tends to arouse curiosity among young people, and leads to an upsurge in the problem. This is a horrible dilemma which has faced administrations all over the world and which has been dealt with in a variety of ways. One report that I read indicated that if, for example, one wishes to proceed by virtue of voluntary or self-imposed regulation, or even legislative action, it is necessary for manufacturers, for instance, to accept the enormity of the problem and the controls which may have to be placed on them to be educated or informed, and the only way of doing that, of course, is by fairly widespread publicity. A very careful path indeed must be trod in order to resolve the problem.

The second matter that I want to stress most strongly is that we are not dealing so much with a problem of drugs and chemicals as a human problem in terms of the stresses which young people experience, the possible lack of security that leads them to experiment with drugs and with inhalents. It is a problem that can only be solved, in human terms, by proper care, by security by ensuring that young people have a sense of identity, a sense of being loved, and a sense of purpose. If these things can be achieved then I think the problem can be reduced to manageable levels.

Mr. Mathwin: It is frightening, though.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is very frightening and it is very distressing indeed. I would also say that there is a need to educate young people about the importance of caring for and respecting their own bodies and giving them a knowledge of how their bodies work. I think that if all those approaches are taken—and I accept that there is an urgent and desperate need to take action—we may go some way towards resolving the problem. I hope it will not

be long before the recommendations come from the National Health and Medical Research Council and from the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee. When they do come the Government will consider them.

PALMDALE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. McRAE: Can the Premier say whether the proposed scheme to assist persons affected by the failure of the Palmdale group will cover common law claims as well as claims under the Workers Compensation Act? This refers to a question that was asked by my Leader on Tuesday. Members do not need to be told again of the failure of the Palmdale group and the difficulties in which this has placed two classes of person: first, those persons who have suffered injury and who believed that they were covered under various policies of insurance by Palmdale and, secondly, those persons who, in the case of workers compensation were employers of the injured workers, and that includes small companies.

As I understand the position, in discussions that I had, on behalf of a constituent, with the liquidator of the Palmdale group, as the situation stands at the moment, all of those persons, whether they be direct accident victims or employers, if unassisted by the Government, would rank as ordinary and unsecured creditors and could expect to receive certainly no more than 10c in the dollar. I understand that the Premier earlier this week (or it may have been late last week) when he was speaking to a group of persons at the Master Builders Association, referred to a scheme which the Government proposed to implement. What I am trying to ascertain from the Premier, without any endeavour at all to score off the Government but to try to get some sort of clarity for both groups of person in my district who are concerned about this, is, first, is the Government's scheme framed in such a way that the worker will receive his workers compensation coverage and that the employer will receive the indemnification that he would otherwise have received?

In the case of a non-workers compensation claim, a common law claim where damages and other matters are involved, can the victim and, again, in the case of an employer, also the small firm or whoever may be involved, be reassured that that component of the claim will be covered as well? I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the indulgence you have given me in trying to explain what is a complex affair. I would be obliged on behalf of my constituents, both workers and small business people, if we could get clarification on this point.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thoroughly recognise the concern which is being shown by the member for Playford. His reputation as a man who is very interested in these matters is well known in this House and I respect his concern. I would also like to put on record at this stage my thanks to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who is expected back later today from Alice Springs, for the work he has put into this proposal because it has not been an easy proposal to finalise.

Much as I would like to give the honourable member the details, I cannot give them to him at present. I hope that, within a few days, members of this House will hear the full details and see any legislative framework that may be necessary to bring them about. At present, there are on-going discussions with insurers, employers and the Government, and the final details of what is possible are being worked out. One thing I can say is that there will be a proposition. It does have in general principle the agreement of the insurers, the employers and the Government, and it is now a matter of getting the fine

detail agreed, and we expect that to be done some time within the next few days.

ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr. RANDALL: Can the Minister of Education say what progress is being made in the provision of relief staff to replace ancillary staff within the Education Department who wish to take long service leave? My question arises from the fact that this Government has encouraged teachers to take long service leave during the past 12 months. However, there is a problem in replacing ancillary staff, who also wish to take long service leave. What action is proposed?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member has pinpointed a particular complaint within the Education Department that has become increasingly evident over the last 12 months. Members may realise that last year the Government provided approximately \$1 500 000 (and \$20 000 to \$30 000 less was in fact spent) for the provision of long service leave for teachers who were encouraged to take long service leave as it accrued, on the basic sound financial premise that leave taken when it accrues is never more cheaply paid for than at that time. It has been Government policy to encourage people to take long service leave quickly.

This year the Government has also provided for a larger sum of \$2 500 000 from the round sum allowances, again for professional teaching staff to take long service leave, but some 10 years ago a large number of ancillary staff were appointed to the Education Department. There would be about 5 500 to 6 000 ancillary staff, against approximately 15 000 teachers. The time when long service leave begins to accrue has now come upon us. As a result, we estimate about \$900 000 would be required to pay for all long service leave, were ancillary staff to request it immediately. However, indications are that approximately 10 per cent of ancillary staff are currently seeking to take long service leave.

There has been some considerable reluctance on the part of principals to encourage ancillary staff to go on long service leave because hitherto there has been no provision for replacement staff, and the Government recognises that ancillary staff is in many cases of critical importance to staffing numbers. What Cabinet has done is to agree to provide a round sum of \$90 000 which will be made available for ancillary staff who wish to take long service leave, where the principals of the schools can make a reasonable case for them to be replaced. This is a much more satisfactory position than has hitherto obtained in the Education Department.

DINGO EXPERIMENT

Mr. HEMMINGS: Did the Minister of Environment authorise officers of his department to take part in any experiment involving dingoes at the Cleland Conservation Park? Most members will have seen the huge headline in today's *News* about the suggestion that a young goat was dressed as a baby and fed to a dingo at the Adelaide Zoo. This was apparently done as a test of the theory that a dingo was responsible for the disappearance of Azaria Chamberlain at Ayers Rock in August this year. The news report added the information that not only had the test been done at the zoo after the public had left, but also at the Cleland Conservation Park. I make absolutely no complaint about the test, if it was considered necessary by the police as part of their investigations, but what concerns

me and the members on this side of the House is the suggestion that the test at Cleland Conservation Park was carried out without the knowledge of the Minister concerned. Can the Minister say whether he has had inquiries made following the publication of this report by the *News* police reporter, and, if he has, what has been the result of those inquiries?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to inform the honourable member and the House that I have called for a report on this matter from my department, and when it is available I will make it known to the House.

TOWEL SHORTAGE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Health say why there is a shortage of towels at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? In the past month I have had complaints from constituents expressing their disappointment at the shortage of towels at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. A letter I received from one constituent sums up the situation perfectly, as follows:

I am currently a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, now in to my fourteenth week there. Because of my injuries, I have visited this hospital now on eight occasions for a total of 12 operations during the last 2½ years and spent somewhere around 460 days in total in that hospital in both private and public wards during that time.

It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that this person is qualified to comment on the situation. He goes on:

Today the entire hospital has no towels. My treatment requires that I daily have a bath and undergo hydrotherapy—this requires towels; but I wasn't so fortunate. I had to content myself with a couple of towels I've been using three times daily for four days and wiping myself with a clean sheet. This problem is not isolated to my ward; but was expressed throughout the hospital. Patients are sharing towels. This is not the first occasion in the last three months it has happened.

It strikes me as being paradoxical that a system employs too many domestics, to incessantly mop, sweep, dust, wash and whirr with those confounded polishers; whilst the last supply of the usual ratty worn out towels from Friday was allowed to be exhausted and forcing us to use old towels or someone else's.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I received the same letter as the member for Hanson received from his constituent, and I called for an urgent investigation. I would be very surprised indeed (in fact, I believe that it is a completely untenable proposition) if the entire hospital has no towels. However, I recognise that there is a problem in regard to linen supply, particularly towels, in some hospitals, and I know that difficulties are being experienced. I would like to explain the reasons for that and indicate what the Health Commission and I are doing to try to resolve the difficulties.

One of the things that causes shortages is delays in delivery of particular items, and this is a problem which has always been experienced and which, apparently, cannot be overcome. Manufacturers who replace stocks are not always able to deliver those supplies on time or at short notice and, although careful planning is undertaken by the Group Laundry, problems may be occurring at the industrial level in the case of the manufacturer, and honourable members should bear that in mind. At the same time, there has been a general problem that relates back to the dying days (or perhaps I should say the heydays) of the previous Government, and this factor may not be known to the House, because I would be surprised if the previous Government had made it known to the

House—that is, three years ago, when the Health Industrial Services Management Committee was required to fund the establishment of the Frozen Food Factory, that extraordinary white elephant, the cost of which rose from an estimated \$4 000 000 to \$9 700 000—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on: you are getting away from towels.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, I am not getting away from towels, because it is the same Health Industrial Services Management Committee that provides funds for the Group Laundry.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a long way from the Queen Elizabeth.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is not a long way from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. When the food factory commenced operations, expenditure on replacement linen was dramatically reduced for that year, and that set in train the beginning of some of the shortages that are being experienced. In the past two years, normal replacement orders have been issued and, as soon as it was drawn to my notice that there were genuine shortages in some hospitals, I authorised additional funds of \$750 000 to ensure that these shortages were overcome as promptly as possible. The sum of \$750 000 has been approved as additional funding for replacement of laundry.

The Annual Report of the Group Laundry, which was recently presented to me, gives some background that will enable members to realise how things of this kind can come about in a short-term situation in individual departments of certain hospitals. On page 13 the report states:

During the year a special stocktaking was carried out of bath towels. The stock record on the day indicated there were 117 485 towels in circulation but a physical count revealed only 102 725 showing an apparent loss of 14 760 or approximately 12.6 per cent. At previous annual stocktaking checks, the percentage loss was closer to an average of 8 per cent. Every endeavour is made to control the security of linen but due to the volume involved and the large number of user locations the task is extremely difficult.

That can easily be understood when it is realised that the Central Linen Service has about 1 600 000 individual pieces of linen in circulation spread over 220 separate categories and, incidentally, valued at \$6 500 000. The annual report continues:

The committee is also concerned with the accuracy of the count at a given day. Stocks in hospitals vary and a reserve held by any institution and overlooked at the time of counting would make a variation to the result, particularly if this situation occurred in many places.

The important things to remember are that stock losses of up to 12.6 per cent may occur in terms of physical count, as distinct from the stock records (and this can occur for a variety of reasons, such as that people may use towels to mop up floors and dispose of the towel instead of sending it back to the laundry). That can happen. Obviously, it is completely unacceptable and inexcusable for any patient to have to endure what the constituent of the member for Hanson claimed he had to endure. I have called for an urgent report and have done everything possible to ensure that this situation does not recur.

YOUTH ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will give urgent consideration to extending the assistance provided by the Emergency Housing Office of the South Australian Housing Trust to single young people in difficulties, as well as families, and

when the Government will release the report of the Working Party into Youth Housing Needs? The Premier should be aware that a recent survey conducted by the South Australian Council of Social Services found that 9 000 South Australian young people were trying to cope with serious accommodation difficulties, and even homelessness in some cases. The principal cause of this problem is high youth unemployment. The report by the South Australian Council of Social Services found that average rents were between \$45 and \$50 a week, yet unemployed young people under 18 years of age were being forced to live on unemployment benefits worth only \$36 per week and those over 18 years of age receive only \$51 per week. The current poverty level for single persons is \$74 per week. The Premier should also be aware that homelessness and acute accommodation difficulties are linked with other social ills, such as drug dependence, low levels of physical and mental health, long-term unemployment and crime.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There are enormous difficulties with accommodation for young people, and single young people are no different from any other young persons. The reports that have been released recently have been most disturbing, and certainly the Government is concerned to do whatever is possible. I will take the honourable member's suggestion to the Minister of Housing and refer the whole question to him for a report, which I undertake to bring to the honourable member.

DIAGONAL ROAD

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Transport state whether the Highways Department will consider and effect alterations to the section of road in Diagonal Road, Seacombe Gardens, that has been the scene of several fatalities over recent times, the latest being the tragic and untimely death of Senior Constable Webb on Tuesday night, 21 October?

In expressing sincere condolences to the family of the late Senior Constable Webb, I must say that I have received representations from several constituents to see that something constructive is done about this notorious section of road. In the *News* of Wednesday 22 October, headlined on page 2 "Killer bend smash claims policeman", a report carried on to say:

Seacombe Gardens killer bend—
and that is what several local residents call that section of the road—

has claimed another victim—a policeman who died in a horrifying stobie pole smash last night. A young man was killed six weeks ago when his car hit the same pole on the bend in Diagonal Road at the Miller Street junction. The pole is near Sutton Avenue. Killed in last night's smash was Senior Constable James Webb, 35, of Athelstone.

It goes on to say:

Investigations today showed the police vehicle was pursuing a speeding motorcycle about 10.30 p.m. when it failed to negotiate a right-hand bend near Sutton Avenue. The driver, a young constable, "miraculously" escaped with minor injuries and was admitted to Flinders Medical Centre in shock. Residents who live on the bend today told how it had claimed several victims.

Will the Minister give earnest consideration to looking at this section of the road?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am sure I speak for the whole House when I support the condolences the member for Brighton has suggested we extend to the family of the late Senior Constable Webb. On a slightly happier note, I understand that the young constable mentioned by the

member for Brighton in his question has been released from hospital in a satisfactory condition.

Referring to the nub of the question, I have had a preliminary report on the accident, and I will ask for a more detailed explanation, including all the accident statistics relating to that section of the road. I understand from my officers that the standards on that section of Diagonal Road conform to the normal arterial road standards usual in the metropolitan area. However, the honourable member is right when he says that the matter is causing concern, certainly amongst residents in the area, as well as to the honourable member himself. I will have the matter closely examined. There are several things that could possibly be done. I believe the location of stobie poles is one matter that needs to be looked at, and I will give the honourable member a report at the completion of the investigation.

I.M.V.S.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Health say why Sir Dennis Patterson and his team were permitted to undertake at I.M.V.S. experiments on animals in 1977 which apparently reproduced experiments already carried out in about 1975? Were such latter experiments supervised by members of the Ethics Committee? I have read the honourable lady's speech, which she made in this House last night and in which she castigated me for what she said was a bad mistake that I had made.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure what the Minister of Environment—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is not going to tell us apparently, either. May I continue, Sir?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has the call. I ask him not to answer interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir.

Mr. Becker: He's not going to move a motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not answer it, Sir. The honourable lady castigated me for what she said was a bad mistake on my part when I spoke in the debate on Tuesday. I had then taxed her with misleading the House by saying, in an answer to a Question on Notice, that an unknown but small number of dogs had been used, whereas in fact I pointed out to her, I believe accurately, that 69 dogs had been involved. I may have made a mistake, but certainly the documents which she quoted did not disclose any mistake, and a far stronger argument against me—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to extend to debating the issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. She could have pointed out that the experiments written up in 1977 probably were not carried out in 1977, but she did not do that. The description of the experiments carried out by Sir Dennis Patterson given to me by Dr. Bonnin and Dr. Edwards when I visited I.M.V.S. fitted almost precisely the report in the *Lancet* which I quoted.

Before lunch, I telephoned Sir Dennis to ask him whether in fact there had been two sets of experiments, but in a heated and unpleasant conversation, which upset me because I have known him for over 40 years, he refused to tell me whether there had been two sets of experiments or not. However, since then I have been told by someone else that there were, and apparently the second set of experiments was carried out at the I.M.V.S., and reproduced the earlier set. Therefore, I put the

question to the Minister; I expect that she does not have the answer at her delicate fingertips, but perhaps she will get it, unless she is already armed with the information.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not necessary to ask the question twice.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I certainly would be pleased to get the information for the member for Mitcham. My understanding is that the original experiments which were carried out at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and which were reported in the *Lancet*—

Mr. Millhouse: Were they actually carried out at the—

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: They were carried out at the Adelaide Children's Hospital itself—the establishment at the junction of Kermodie Street and King William Road, North Adelaide—I think the member for Mitcham probably knows it.

The experiments were carried out at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and the member for Mitcham, who presumably can read, should have known that, as he quoted to the House an article that appeared in the *Lancet* which clearly attributes these experiments to the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

Mr. Millhouse: That is your answer, madam?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My answer said that the experiments which were carried out in the operating theatre at the I.M.V.S. were carried out by Sir Dennis Patterson's team from the Adelaide Children's Hospital—this appears on page 184 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Millhouse: And they were moved there afterwards. Read the whole sentence.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I understand that the conditions for conducting such experiments at the Adelaide Children's Hospital were not satisfactory, and that is why Sir Dennis Patterson's team sought to conduct those experiments at the I.M.V.S.

The member for Mitcham alleges that my speech last night did not rebut his comments. If that is the case, it shows that he is incapable of following a reasoned argument. It is clear that he accepted at face value a letter from the anti-vivisection League which is full of mis-statements and errors. He assumed it was correct, he read it into *Hansard*, and he made serious allegations, but I disproved everyone of those allegations last night. It appears that the member for Mitcham is incapable of realising when he is wrong.

DINGOES

Mr. LEWIS: Has the Acting Minister of Agriculture seen a report in yesterday's *News* entitled "Dingoes for pets scheme", which outlines the proposal the Victorian Government is considering to allow dingoes to be kept for pets and bred in captivity in Victoria? Has the Minister seen the petition which I have just this day received and which is signed by 125 of my constituent landholders to the Minister of Environment expressing concern about dingoes and the damage they are doing to their livestock in the area adjacent to the Ngarkat national park. Also, will the Minister, through whatever agencies there are at the disposal of a Government, investigate the possibility of having the Victorian Government review its policy as stated in that *News* article and thereby meet its obligations to the landholders and graziers in South Australia in controlling that pest? Mr. Speaker, with your leave I would like to explain my question.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I detect concern on your face, and I wonder whether or not I have transgressed some ruling.

The SPEAKER: Having been asked a specific question, I point out that I was trying to determine when the question ceased and the request for leave to make an explanation commenced.

Mr. LEWIS: In providing the explanatory material, I must acknowledge the assistance of Allan Schiller, of Pinnaroo, and other constituents who have drawn my attention to certain literature which indicates that this problem has been with us for well nigh 100 years. In a book called *Chronicle Cameos* written by Mary Broughton it is mentioned that the Hensley family lost about £20 000 in the decade 1872 to 1882, and that, in today's terms, at a conservative estimate would be about \$4 000 000. Dr. Hensley, the grand-daughter of the settler, said that she can never remember her father mentioning, in his reference to Pinnaroo in his memoirs, anything other than they had lost the £20 000 and that no-one had thought of investigating what the dingoes were like in the Mallee, apparently having had no trouble with them in the South-East or Victoria up to that time. Incidentally, she said:

My mother's most often-mentioned memories of Pinnaroo were the howling of dingoes (of which she had nightmares all her life) and the ever-present realisation of being a hundred miles from the nearest white woman.

In another book *Land of the Lowan—One Hundred Years In Nhill and West Wimmera* Les Blake pointed out:

Late in 1882 the *South Australian Register* reported that wild dogs threatened to surpass the rabbit nuisance in Victoria's Mallee lands. While the Victorian Government did so little to eradicate the vermin problem—

this directly relates to the article in the question I am asking—

in the north-west, settlers across the border were being invaded from the Victorian Mallee breeding grounds.

Chronicle Cameos also said:

John Hensley in the Melbourne *Argus* urged that a fence be built along the border to keep the wild dogs out of South Australia.

I refer to Parliamentary records of Friday 24 January 1902 relating to Wow Wow, which is now named Lameroo. In Minutes of Evidence of the Pinnaroo Railway Commission, Mr. J. Byrne was questioned as follows:

435. Can you cultivate successfully here without enclosing your land with vermin-proof fences?—No.

445. Are there many wild dogs?—Yes.

446. Do they trouble the sheep?—They have done so.

447. Do they tackle the calves?—They have done so.

Later on in the evidence (not wishing to detain the House other than to the extent necessary to ensure that it is realised that I am not joking about this matter), on 29 January 1903 Mr. F. LeCouteur was questioned as follows:

1315. Do you lose any of your sheep by wild dogs and foxes?

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the honourable member has explained his question in enough detail for the Minister to give an answer. I ask that you rule that way.

The SPEAKER: It has not been usual for a member to be stopped from explaining his question without "question" being called. The Chair from time to time has asked a member to come to the point quickly, and I certainly ask the member for Mallee to do that. The interest which all members have had in the explanation has led me to extend to him a degree of latitude greater than would otherwise have been the case.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude the explanation by saying, on behalf of the 125 people who have signed a petition, that I share their concern over the hundreds of livestock they have lost, and then allow the

Minister to answer the question I put to him as to whether the Government will—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am unable to ask the Minister to answer the question whilst the honourable member remains on his feet.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes, I have seen the report in the paper to which the honourable member referred. I will refer the matter to the Acting Minister of Agriculture and ask him to take up the matter with the Director-General of Agriculture and determine whether or not any discussions have been held with the appropriate department in Victoria, because I recognise the importance of the matter that he raises. I will get the Acting Minister of Agriculture to bring down a report for the honourable member.

NORWOOD UNION CLUB

Mr. CRAFTER: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what progress has been made on the development of an area of land at the rear of Glenside Hospital as an oval for the use of the Norwood Union Sports Club and generally for use in community recreation, particularly for nearby schools, which have suffered from a lack of recreation space? I wrote to the Minister about this matter on 8 July this year and have received no reply. I rang his Director about a month later and was told that the Minister was concerned about the matter and that I would be contacted shortly. I have received no further reply.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I think the honourable member is referring to the area known as Brookway Park.

Mr. Crafter: No.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: That was the alternative. The problem in finding premises for the Norwood Union Football Club has been occupying the attention of several members, not just me, and in particular the Premier has been interested in the matter, as has been the Minister of Community Welfare. I can only say that we are still trying to find a way of providing an area for the Norwood Union Football Club and, as soon as a decision has been made, we will let the honourable member know.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DINGO EXPERIMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As soon as I heard the member for Napier ask a question of the Minister of Environment, regarding a report in today's *News* about tests carried out with a dingo in relation to the possibility that the baby alleged to have been taken by a dingo at Ayers Rock and whether that could or could not be used as evidence, I asked for a report from my officers.

I have been advised that these tests were carried out by the Forensic Biology Department of the I.M.V.S. at the request of the Northern Territory Police. The goat which was dressed in baby's clothing was dead. The test was carried out to establish the amount of mauling that would be evident on the baby's clothing and to establish whether saliva on the original baby's clothes originated from dingoes. Officers of the Forensic Biology Department have been working with the Northern Territory Police since the beginning of the case and have carried out on-site tests at Ayers Rock.

In respect of the member for Napier's question of the Minister as to whether he was aware of the tests, presumably asked in the belief that it may have been his

department which had been carrying them out, I should say that day-to-day supervision of the Forensic Biology Department at the I.M.V.S. is not normally undertaken by senior officers of the institute, nor would such experiments in the normal way be referred to a Minister. This was a normal scientific investigation and would not normally attract publicity. The report in the *News* is accurate, according to the information I have received from the institute.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the vesting of title to certain lands in the people known as Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will be aware that, at a simple, but memorable ceremony on 2 October this year, Mr. Pantju Thompson on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara Council and I on behalf of the South Australian Government signed a document indicating that a Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill had been agreed between the parties and was to be introduced by the Government into this Parliament. That ceremony brought to an end many months of detailed negotiations on the contents of a Land Rights Bill between the Government, representing the people of South Australia, and the Pitjantjatjara Council, representing the tribal Aborigines that are traditional owners of the lands in the North-West of the State, to be vested by the Bill.

The fact that agreement has been reached on such a potentially difficult question has been hailed in many quarters. We believe that the main significance of this agreement is in three parts. First, the tribes that comprise the Pitjantjatjara for the purposes of this Bill are given the means to protect and preserve their culture. In this regard, it was clearly demonstrated during the negotiations that this culture is still largely intact. Secondly, it demonstrates that representatives of the Government and the Pitjantjatjara Council were able to sit around the conference table and resolve a great range of matters related to the transfer of land to the Pitjantjatjara people and its subsequent management. Thirdly, it demonstrates that with respect to exploration and mining on these lands, with which the Pitjantjatjara have a traditional association, clear guidelines can be established to achieve the proper balance between their interests, and those of the entire South Australian community. In other words, we believe we have demonstrated that a willingness to talk, accompanied by an ample fund of patience, can lead to a solution of even the most intractable problems that exist between the Aboriginal and European communities in this State and, indeed, this nation.

The history that led to the commencement of the negotiations leading to this agreement is probably well known to members. The former Government had intended to vest some of the lands in the North-West covered by this Bill in the Aboriginal Lands Trust on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara. However, this course was not entirely acceptable to the Pitjantjatjara, who wished to be more directly involved in the ownership and control of

their lands. Accordingly, the then Government established the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Working Party whose recommendations formed the basis of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill introduced by former Premier Dunstan.

The key features of that Bill were the creation of a power to vest "nucleus" lands in the Pitjantjatjara, establishment of a tribunal to hear and determine claims by the Pitjantjatjara to non-nucleus lands, and the conferring upon the Pitjantjatjara of a veto power over exploration and mining. Generous and well intentioned though that Bill may have been it was unworkable.

The Government's legal advisers suggested that it preempted the operation of the Mining and Petroleum Exploration Acts, which could have caused insurmountable difficulty in the event of any exploration or mining being allowed to go ahead. It was also legally difficult to identify how a binding undertaking could be obtained from the Pitjantjatjara with regard to exploration and mining operations in the first place. Apart from these exploration and mining considerations, the Bill also created unacceptable uncertainty for adjacent landholders because of the provisions allowing claims to non-nucleus lands.

In these circumstances, when it came to office, the Government resolved not to proceed with the former Government's Bill. Rather, the whole question of land rights for the Pitjantjatjara people was reopened. While initially this exercise was undertaken within its own ranks, as the Government's approach developed, steps were taken to involve all interested parties. A group of Government members of Parliament met with representatives of the Pitjantjatjara Council late last year. As a result of this on-going consultation, the Government took the view that the Pitjantjatjara should be granted the so-called "nucleus lands" as identified in the former Government's Bill and that adequate protection should be provided for sacred sites outside those lands.

These considerations were reflected in an announcement regarding exploration in areas outside the so-called nucleus lands in February this year. It is, to use the phrase, now history that this announcement led to representatives of the Pitjantjatjara Council travelling to Adelaide and the commencement of the detailed negotiations that have produced this Bill. I do not propose to canvass in detail these negotiations. However, two things became clear very early in discussion. One was that the Pitjantjatjara Council was not totally opposed to exploration and mining but, rather, was concerned to ensure that any such activity was carried out on terms as acceptable as possible to them. The other was that the pastoral property known as Granite Downs was of great importance to the Pitjantjatjara Council. Once these points were clarified negotiations proceeded in a positive and painstaking way.

While not wanting to dwell, on the content of the negotiations, I would like to say something about the approach that was used in the hope that it may be of assistance elsewhere. The most visible features of the negotiations were the meetings held every month or so between Ministers (usually myself, the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General, and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) and their advisers, including interested members of this House, and the Pitjantjatjara Council and its advisers. However, in some respects these were only the tip of the iceberg.

In the early stage of the negotiations the Government assembled a group of officials which advised it between these meetings as to its options with regard to the approach it should take or the response it should offer. This group was broadly based and comprised representatives of the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and the

Departments of Environment, Crown Law, Mines and Energy, Premier and Lands, and the Deputy Premier's Office. Later, as the negotiations crystallised, a smaller group of officials from Crown Law, the Department of Mines and Energy and the Deputy Premier's office assisted Ministers and conducted negotiations on matters of detail. Throughout this process a dialogue was maintained by the Government with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and the South Australian Chamber of Mines.

As proposals for Granite Downs and the Mintabie opal field were developed, discussions were held with the lessees of the property and with the Mintabie Progress Association. Mintabie is a part of Granite Downs and will be dealt with later. For its part, the Pitjantjatjara Council representatives held regular discussions with the communities on the lands, explaining the negotiations to them and seeking further instructions. The purpose of emphasising these various forms of consultation is that we believe that, as a result, the negotiations have produced a Bill that has received wide public acceptance. It anticipates many of the problems that might arise in the future. For instance, roads, which were not dealt with at all by the former Government's Bill, are dealt with comprehensively in the Bill before the House today.

Before dealing with the structure of the Bill, I wish to pay tribute to my Ministerial colleagues, the local member, our advisers and those outside groups with whom we discussed the Bill for their patience and assistance. I also wish to pay tribute to the members of the Pitjantjatjara Council and their advisers. Their willingness to discuss their views in detail and give careful consideration to the Government's point of view, if not always agreeing with it, was of great importance in ensuring the successful outcome of the negotiations. Indeed, the fact that this Bill is before the House today is a great credit to all concerned.

The body corporate which is established in the Bill, the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, is set out in the structure and content of the Bill. The lands defined in the first schedule will be granted to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, the body corporate which is established by the Bill and comprises the Pitjantjatjara as defined in the Bill. The grant will be in fee simple and will be inalienable. While there is a requirement that present interest holders in relation to those lands give their consent, it is expected that this will be a formality. Special provisions are included relating to Granite Downs reflecting the present occupancy of that land as a pastoral lease, and provision is made for the Crown's reversionary interest to vest in the Pitjantjatjara subject to the present lessee's right of occupancy continuing for the balance of the terms of the various leases which expire between 1996 and 2008.

The Bill provides for the control of access to the lands. In the case of access for purposes other than exploration and mining an application for permission to enter must be made to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Exemptions from the requirements of this section are provided for the police, certain officials, members of Parliament and genuine candidates, the lessees of Granite Downs and their families, employees and visitors, and entry in case of emergency. Special additional provisions are included in the Bill with respect to the Mintabie opal field. The provisions regarding access for purposes of exploration and mining are, as one would expect, more complicated.

The scheme in this regard in the Bill provides that—companies whose application for a mining tenement has been accepted for consideration by the Minister of Mines and Energy will negotiate with Anangu Pitjantjat-

jaraku as to the terms and conditions under which they could enter the lands; if agreement is reached with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, the Minister will proceed to the granting of a tenement; in the event of disagreement or if no agreement has been reached at the end of 120 days, the dispute may be referred by the the applicant to an arbitrator who will be a judge of the Supreme Court of a State or Territory, or the Federal Court of Australia, or the High Court of Australia, and the arbitrator will determine the dispute, having regard to the effect of the grant of the mining tenement on, *inter alia*, the preservation and protection of the Pitjantjatjara and their culture and their wishes as to the development of the lands, the suitability of the applicant, the preservation of the natural environment and the economic and other significance of the proposed operations to the State and the nation. The arbitrator's decision will be binding on the applicant, Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and the Government.

One aspect of the Bill that should be mentioned in this context is the provision that it makes for compensation payments that may be negotiated by a mining company with the Pitjantjatjara should exploration and mining be allowed. As part of their negotiations with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, mining companies may agree to make payments to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, but only if those payments are reasonably proportioned to the disturbance to the lands, the Pitjantjatjara people and their way of life that has resulted or is likely to result from the granting of the mining tenement. Indeed, the Minister is required to refuse to grant a tenement, or cancel it if it has already been granted, if payments are made otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of the Bill.

On the other hand, the Bill provides that, subject to an upper limit to be fixed by regulation, any royalties received by the State from mining on the lands will be split three ways: namely, one-third to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, one-third to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to be applied to the health, welfare and advancement of the Aboriginal inhabitants of the State generally, and one-third to the general revenue of the State. It is not possible to fix the upper limit in advance of any mining operation taking place, because of the difficulty of estimating the value of royalties that may be forthcoming from mining activities on the lands. However, in our discussions with the Pitjantjatjara council, we have undertaken that this limit will be fixed by the Government, having regard to the desire of the Pitjantjatjara to construct and maintain their own community amenities, such as education and health facilities, after discussion with and in continuing association with the relevant State authorities.

With regard to the possible participation of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in mining ventures on its own account, we believe that the powers given to it as a corporate body by this Bill will be more than sufficient should it wish to become so involved. Once again, the exact nature of such involvement cannot be determined unless and until mining takes place.

We believe that these provisions balance very fairly the desire of the Pitjantjatjara to preserve their culture (and yet enable them to derive some economic benefit from any exploration and mining activities that take place) and the interest of the State and applicants in having exploration and mining proceed. Indeed, I can report that these clauses of the Bill have generally been well received throughout Australia. One aspect of mining that has received special attention in the Bill is the opal mining currently taking place at Mintabie. Mintabie is situated on Granite Downs and is thus part of the lands to be granted by the Bill.

It also happens to be close to some especially important

and sensitive areas, from the Pitjantjatjara point of view. It is intended that opal miners, operators of legitimate businesses on the field and their families will have virtually unfettered rights of access to the field. Other persons with genuine reasons for being on the field will be subject to a notification procedure, which is not expected to interfere greatly with their freedom of movement. All other persons will be required to obtain permission to enter the lands under the provisions described earlier. It is intended that Mintabie be proclaimed as a precious stones field at an early date. This will ensure that all the supervision, controls and protection applicable to precious stones fields under the Mining Act are available at the Mintabie field.

In addition, the Bill contains provisions designed to minimise social friction between the white and the Aboriginal communities and, in fact, to encourage communication between them. A magistrates court will be given a discretion to prohibit individuals from remaining on the field if certain offences are committed. The Bill establishes a Mintabie Consultative Committee comprising representatives of the miners, the Government and Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. A representative of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku will chair its meetings. Its role will be to advise the Government in relation to the management of the field and to provide a forum for consultation between all major groups having an interest in the field. In order to protect present occupiers of residences and business premises on the field, the Bill provides for the period of notice that must be given to terminate occupancy rights, the compensation that Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku must pay if occupancy rights are terminated, and for rents for such allotments to be related to the rates of rental fixed by the Crown in comparable situations. With regard to the power to terminate rights of occupancy, the Pitjantjatjara have undertaken that these powers will not be used vexatiously or capriciously. This commitment is contained in a letter dated 2 October 1980, which I will cite for the information of honourable members. The undertaking is given to the Attorney-General, as follows:

I refer to our discussions this morning with respect to the intentions of the Pitjantjatjara in exercising their powers under clause 28 of the Bill.

I am instructed to undertake that it is not the intention of the Pitjantjatjara to exercise the powers vexatiously or capriciously.

The Pitjantjatjara do not have any intention presently to exercise their rights under clause 28 against persons lawfully in occupation of residential or business premises who act in accordance with the provisions of the Bill.

Yours sincerely,
Pantju Thompson,
CHAIRMAN
PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

We are also assured by the Pitjantjatjara that they will consider favourably any applications from individual opal miners to prospect and mine in certain areas to the south-west of the present field. The Bill provides that, in relation to such activities, no financial compensation is payable to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

We believe that, given goodwill on the part of the Mintabie miners and Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, these provisions will work satisfactorily. There is already evidence of sufficient goodwill in moves for discussions between the Pitjantjatjara council and the Mintabie Progress Association as to these clauses of the Bill. Also of importance in this Bill are the provisions relating to roads. The reconstruction of the Stuart Highway to Alice Springs along a new alignment is the subject of a separate agreement between the Pitjantjatjara council and the Commissioner of Highways, referred to in the Bill. The

Stuart Highway and the Granite Downs to Oodnadatta road are roads to which the public will have unrestricted rights of use. Use by the public of other roads on the lands will require the permission of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku according to the access provisions I described earlier. The persons who have access to Mintabie have special rights over the two access roads to Mintabie.

The Bill also contains provisions providing for the construction of new roads (other than the Stuart Highway) and the maintenance of all roads upon the lands. Generally, these rely on negotiations in the first instance followed by arbitration in the event of disagreement. It is the belief of the parties that these provisions will be adequate to meet the present and future requirements for roads upon and through the lands. As I have indicated earlier, the Government's legal advisers identified serious difficulties that could arise under the previous Government's Bill in determining, for example, how agreement could be reached with the Pitjantjatjara and be legally binding. This Bill overcomes these serious problems with detailed provisions that are clear and precise.

That, in broad terms, outlines the contents of this Bill. I commend to honourable members the detail of it which, as a hybrid measure, will be referred to a Select Committee. I emphasise in closing that it is a measure resulting from extensive and intensive discussion and, ultimately, agreement. Because of its importance not only to the Pitjantjatjara people but also to the whole question of relationships with Aborigines in this State, I urge that it be considered without delay. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it the detailed explanation of the clauses.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 contains a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Honourable members should note that "Pitjantjatjara" is defined to include members of the Yungkutatjara and Ngaanatjara people who are traditional owners of the land. "Traditional owner" means an Aboriginal person who has, in accordance with Aboriginal tradition, social, economic and spiritual affiliations with, and responsibilities for, the lands or any part of them. The "lands" are defined by reference to the schedule.

Clause 5 establishes a body corporate under the title Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and provides that all Pitjantjatjaras are to be members of the body corporate so established. Clause 6 sets out the powers and functions of the body corporate. Clause 7 provides that Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku shall, before carrying out proposals relating to the administration, development or use of the lands, consult with and obtain the consent of traditional owners who are affected by the proposal.

Clause 8 provides for annual general meetings of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. Clause 9 establishes an executive board of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. This board will consist of a chairman and eight other members elected at an annual general meeting of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. Until the first Annual General Meeting, the Pitjantjatjara council is to act as the board. Clause 10 provides for the meetings and procedure of the executive board.

Clause 11 requires the executive board to act in conformity with resolutions of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and provides that no act of the board done otherwise than in accordance with such a resolution is binding on Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Clause 12 deals with proof of actions by Anangu

Pitjantjatjaraku. It states that an apparently genuine document purporting to be under the common seal of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, to be signed by four or more members of the executive board and to certify that a specified act of the board has been done in conformity with the Act, shall be conclusive proof that the Act is binding on Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Clause 13 requires the executive board to keep proper accounts of the financial affairs of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and provides that the accounts are to be audited and lodged with the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission. Clause 14 provides that the proceedings of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku are to be governed by a constitution approved by the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission. The constitution must specify an address at which legal process, notices and other documents may be served on Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku or the executive board and must be in conformity with this Act and the law of South Australia.

Clause 15 empowers the Governor to issue a land grant in fee simple of the whole or any part of the lands to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. The land grant is not to be issued (except in the case of Granite Downs station) unless all persons with a legal or equitable interest in the land have surrendered or agreed to surrender their respective interests. When the Governor issues a land grant in respect of land comprised in Granite Downs station, any pastoral lease then in force continues as if Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku had leased the land to the Crown and the Crown had subleased it to the lessee. However, upon the surrender or expiration of the lease, the land is not to be re-let by the Crown. Upon the Act coming into operation, the lessee is to be entitled to compensation from the Crown for diminution in value of the lease as a result of the loss of expectation of renewal. This compensation is to be calculated as if the land subject to the lease were unimproved. Upon surrender or expiration of the lease, the lessee is to be entitled to compensation from Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku for the value of improvements upon the land.

Clause 16 deals with the land grant that is to be issued. It provides that it shall be expressed in the English language and the Pitjantjatjara language, but that the interpretation of the land grant shall be governed by those portions of the land grant expressed in the English language. Subclauses (2) and (3) empower the Minister of Lands, on the recommendation of the Surveyor-General, to correct any error resulting from incorrect or inadequate description of the land.

Clause 17 provides that the land that has vested in Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in pursuance of Part III is to be both inalienable and free from compulsory acquisition pursuant to the Land Acquisition Act. Clause 18 provides that all Pitjantjatjaras are to have unrestricted rights of access to the lands.

Clause 19 makes it an offence for a person who is not a Pitjantjatjara to enter the lands without the written permission of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. There are certain exceptions to this principle. For example, a police officer acting in the course of his official duties, a statutory officer acting in the course of his statutory functions, a person acting on the authority of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, or a member of Parliament, a candidate for election, or a person accompanying and generally assisting such a member or candidate, may enter the lands without permission. This also applies to entry in the case of emergency. Where a pastoral lease remains in force in relation to a part of the lands, the holder of the lease, members of his family, employees, and members of an employee's family, and other persons authorised in writing

by the lessee, may enter land comprised in the lease without permission from Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Clause 20 provides that any person who carries out mining operations on the lands or who enters the lands for the purpose must have the permission of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. But where Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku refuses permission or grants permission subject to conditions that are unacceptable to the applicant, the applicant may request the Minister of Mines and Energy to refer the application to an arbitrator. The clause deals with the appointment of the arbitrator and the criteria to which he is to have regard in determining the matters in dispute. The arbitrator's determination is to be binding on Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, the applicant and the Crown. Subclauses (20) and (21) provide that, where the application is for permission to prospect and mine for precious stones within a prescribed area, no permission granted by Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku shall require payment of compensation.

Clause 21 deals with the interaction of the Mining Act and the Petroleum Act (both of which will continue to apply to exploration and mining authorised according to the provisions of the Bill) with the proposed new Act and contains a number of provisions to ensure that mining operators do not pay bribes or make unauthorised gifts in connection with obtaining permission for carrying out mining operations.

Clause 22 deals with royalty. It provides that royalty in respect of minerals recovered from the lands should be paid into a separate fund maintained by the Minister of Mines and Energy. Of these moneys, one-third is to be paid to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, one-third is to be paid to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to be applied towards the health, welfare and advancement of the Aboriginal inhabitants of the State generally, and one-third is to be paid into the General Revenue of the State. Where the income from the fund exceeds the prescribed limit in any financial year, the whole of the excess is to be paid into the general revenue of the State.

Clause 23 makes it an offence to give or offer a bribe in connection with obtaining the permission of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku for carrying out mining operations. Clause 24 provides that payments or other consideration made or given to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in respect of carrying out mining operations on the lands must be reasonably proportioned to the disturbance to the lands, the Pitjantjatjara people, and their ways of life, that has resulted or is likely to result from the grant of the relevant mining tenement.

Clauses 25 to 29 deal with the Mintabie precious stones field. Clause 25 deals with entitlement to be on the Mintabie precious stones field. Clause 26 provides for the appointment of the Mintabie Consultative Committee. The Committee is to consist of two Pitjantjatjara nominated by Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku, a nominee of the Commissioner of Police, a nominee of the Minister of Mines and Energy, and a nominee of the Mintabie Progress Association. Thus, the committee will be representative of those who have a major interest in the field. The committee will discharge statutory functions under clause 27 and will also act as an advisory committee to the Minister of Mines and Energy on matters related to the field.

Clause 27 empowers a court of summary jurisdiction upon the application of the consultative committee, or of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to make an order prohibiting a person from entering or remaining on the Mintabie precious stones field. It sets out the kinds of offence or conduct that must be established in order to ground an order. Clause 28 deals with residential or business premises which had been constructed, or were in the

course of construction, on the Mintabie precious stones field at the commencement of the new Act. The clause confers rights of occupation which may be terminated by Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku by giving six months notice in writing to the occupier. Where rights of occupancy are terminated, an appropriate compensation must be paid to the former occupier.

Clause 29 provides that the consent of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku is not required for the pegging out of a precious stones claim on the Mintabie precious stones field. Clause 30 deals with the premises occupied by the Crown for purposes connected with the health, education, welfare, or advancement of the Pitjantjatjara people. Where such premises were occupied before the commencement of the new Act, the Crown may continue in occupation for a period of up to 50 years without payment of rent or compensation to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Clauses 31 to 34 deal with the construction and maintenance of roads on the lands by the Commissioner of Highways. Clause 31 provides that the consent of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku is required for the purpose of carrying out road works on the land. Clause 32 deals with the submission of detailed proposals to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in respect of proposed road works and provides that any dispute between the Commissioner of Highways and Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku may be referred to arbitration. The proposals relating to the construction of the new Stuart Highways which have been approved by the Pitjantjatjaraku council are to be regarded as approved proposals for the purposes of this new provision.

Clause 33 provides that land within 100 metres to each side of the centre line of roads referred to in the second schedule is to constitute a road reserve. The Commissioner of Highways is entitled to unrestricted use of the road reserve for purposes related to road works. The public will have access to the roads referred to in the second schedule and also to land comprised in a road reserve. Clause 34 provides that the permission of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku is not required for the purpose of routine maintenance of roads referred to in the second schedule.

Clauses 35 to 37 deal with the resolution of disputes involving Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku or its members. Clause 35 provides for the appointment of a tribal assessor. Clause 36 provides that a Pitjantjatjara who is aggrieved by a decision or action of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku or any of its members may appeal to the tribal assessor against that decision or action. The tribal assessor may give such directions as he considers just or expedient to resolve any matters in dispute.

Clause 37 provides that a local court of full jurisdiction may, on the application of a party to proceedings before the tribal assessor, make an order compelling a person to comply with directions of the tribal assessor. Clause 38 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 39 provides that a court may award compensation to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku for damage suffered by it as a result of commission of offences. Clause 40 exempts the lands from land tax. Clause 41 is a financial provision. Clause 42 provides that the Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act does not apply to the lands. Clause 43 is a regulation-making power.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS: HUNDRED OF KATARAPKO

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs):
I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1975, sections 83 and 84,

Weigall division, Cobdogla irrigation area, hundred of Katarapko, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto. Sections 83 and 84 contain 111.5 hectares and 26.08 hectares respectively and are located adjacent to section 80, which has been vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust and is being leased to the Gerard Reserve Council.

Sections 83 and 84 were originally part of section U and part section E which were held under annual licence conditions by P. A., F. G. and T. A. Bartsch, who also held section 80 under perpetual lease conditions. The Gerard Reserve Council, after negotiating with the lessees, purchased sections 80 U and part section E with the approval of and funds provided by the Australian Government.

The land contained in section U and part section E comprised approximately two-thirds highland and one-third river flats subject to inundation. Following negotiations by the Minister of Lands with the Minister of Community Welfare and the Aboriginal Lands Trust, it was agreed that the Crown should retain control over the river flats. A survey of the area was carried out resulting in the renumbering of the highland as sections 83 and 84.

The Gerard Reserve Council made a request to the Minister of Community Welfare, in August 1975, to have the area transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, subject to the trust leasing the land back to the council for 99 years with a right of renewal on expiry of the lease.

The permanent residential population of Gerard is dependent at present on the farm and irrigation activities. The acquisition of additional land is vital to the continued survival of the community, as it will allow for agricultural and horticultural expansion sufficient to ensure the continued employment of the growing population, whilst at the same time providing a training medium for the younger people who wish to be employed and skilled in this direction.

The Department for Community Welfare and the Aboriginal Lands Trust agreed to the proposal, and sections 83 and 84 have been absolutely surrendered to the Crown as a necessary step to enable the vesting to proceed.

A plan of sections 83 and 84 is exhibited for the information of members.

In accordance with section 16 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, the Minister of Lands has recommended that sections 83 and 84 Weigall division, Cobdogla irrigation area, be vested in the trust, and I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Holidays Act, 1910-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two main objectives: first, to declare 26 December a public holiday in lieu of the public holiday on 28 December and, secondly, to enable variation to proclamations issued in respect of the observance in 1981 of the public holiday commemorating the birthday of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

For many years, representations have been made to successive Governments for a variation of the present arrangements for the celebration of the public holiday on 28 December. Every other State in Australia celebrates a

public holiday on 26 December. Those people in South Australia required to work normal hours between Christmas and new year are required to work the day after Christmas when the rest of Australia is on holiday. Working the day after Christmas is of general inconvenience, but is particularly inconvenient to the many people, especially bank employees, who work some distance from their relatives. Many employees have requested a change in the date of the public holiday to the day following the public holiday for Christmas.

Many employers in South Australia have also requested a change in date of the public holiday because of the complications caused by Federal awards specifying a public holiday on 26 December and employees under State awards receiving the public holiday on 28 December.

The purpose of this Bill is to declare 26 December a public holiday in lieu of the public holiday on 28 December. When 26 December falls upon a Saturday, the following Monday shall be a public holiday, and, when it falls on a Sunday, the following Tuesday shall be a public holiday in lieu of that day.

This means that the public holiday for Christmas Day and 26 December will be continuous, and not interrupted with a requirement that shop assistants, bank officers and many other employees and employers may be required to work in between the two public holidays, so causing inconvenience and discontinuity of their holidays.

Discussions with the Mayor of Glenelg and officers of the Corporation of the City of Glenelg have revealed that the council is aware of the difficulties emanating from the present arrangement and is amenable to a change being made. It has indicated that, should the proposed change be made, the official Commemoration Day old gum tree ceremony and associated activities will still be held as at present on 28 December, or on the following Monday, if 28 December falls on a weekend.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has discussed the proposed change with the President and Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council who have claimed that approximately 50 000 employees are currently gaining the benefit of having holidays on both 26 and 28 December, these being mostly Federal awards. This number is out of a total of 460 000 wage and salary earners in civilian employment in South Australia. It has been further claimed that if South Australia celebrates a public holiday on 26 December in lieu of 28th December that these people will automatically lose one public holiday each year.

That is not the case. Most of the awards which grant both days as public holidays refer specifically to granting a public holiday for Proclamation Day or Commemoration Day. However, the Holidays Act makes no reference to Proclamation Day or Commemoration Day. Therefore, as the way most, if not all, of these awards are currently written, a second public holiday on 28 December or the following Monday, if it falls on a Saturday or Sunday, will still be retained for those workers.

The majority of employees who currently have a public holiday on both 26 and 28 December are employees of Commonwealth Government departments or instrumentalities. Commonwealth employees have always been granted the public holidays that apply in the State in which they are employed, as well as the normal Commonwealth public holidays, which include Boxing Day. However, by a long standing arrangement, Commonwealth employees in other States are granted an extra holiday during the Christmas-new year period in most years and action has already been taken by the Commonwealth Public Service Board for Commonwealth Government employees in South Australia to be granted a public holiday on 29

December this year (28 December falls on a Sunday). Accordingly, no Commonwealth Government employee will be deprived of a public holiday this year by the amendment to the Act contained in this Bill.

This amendment to the Act will mean that this year most employees will not be required to work for four consecutive days from Thursday 25 December to Sunday 28 December, inclusive. Surely that is more sensible than requiring many people to work on Friday 26 December and some on the morning of Saturday 27 December, in between the public holidays of Thursday 25 December and Monday 29 December 1980.

The Queen's birthday holiday has traditionally been observed on the Monday following its observance in the United Kingdom on a Saturday in June. This practice had been adopted by all States except Western Australia so that the announcement in the United Kingdom and Australia in relation to honours conferred by Her Majesty on the occasion of her birthday would coincide. This resulted in the holiday being observed on some occasions on the second Monday and, in other years, on the third Monday in June. This uncertainty resulted in a number of organisations requesting that a fixed formula should be developed to facilitate long-term planning for sporting, recreational or similar events.

The matter was raised at the Premiers' Conference in 1979, and agreement was reached between the States (excluding Western Australia) that agreement should be sought to have the Queen's birthday holiday observed on the second Monday in June of each year. Before these negotiations could be concluded, advice was received indicating that in 1981 Her Majesty's birthday would be celebrated in the United Kingdom on Saturday 13 June. A proclamation was, therefore, issued declaring that the holiday would be observed in South Australia on the following Monday, that is, 15 June 1981.

Some weeks later, further advice was received indicating that the request from the 1979 Premiers' Conference for this holiday to be celebrated on the second Monday in June each year had received Royal approval and, accordingly, in all States, excluding Western Australia, the holiday will be observed in 1981 on 8 June.

It was subsequently established that, whilst the Holidays Act provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, declare a particular day as being the day on which the Queen's birthday will be celebrated, there is no power to amend or substitute an earlier proclamation where that proclamation is subsequently deemed to be inappropriate.

Accordingly, this Bill alters the date of the Queen's birthday holiday for 1981 and future years to the second Monday in June and, at the same time, provision is made for varying proclamations under section 5 of the principal Act to meet similar problems in future.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals sections 3 and 3a of the principal Act and enacts a new section 3, which fixes holidays by reference to the second schedule and makes provision for variations. If the twenty-fifth day of December or the first day of January falls on a weekend, the holiday will be celebrated on the following Monday. Australia Day will be celebrated on the Monday following the twenty-sixth of January, if the twenty-sixth is not a Monday. If the twenty-fifth of April is a Sunday, the Anzac Day holiday will be held on the following Monday.

Boxing Day will be held on a Monday if the twenty-sixth of December falls on a weekend, but where the twenty-fifth also falls on a weekend, Boxing Day will be the following Tuesday.

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act to empower the Governor to vary or revoke a proclamation made under that section. Clause 4 substitutes a new second schedule for the existing schedule. All holidays now appear in the schedule in one undivided list.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

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 B be agreed to.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1355.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to address the House on the motion and, in doing so, to commence with one or two remarks about the Committee system itself. These matters have been canvassed quite extensively in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Didn't you deal with it in your other speech on Committee A, though?

Mr. BANNON: Yes, but I am not going to allude to that. The Premier has invited us to give our suggestions as to the means by which the process could be improved and an assessment of the Committee system. In view of the response the Premier has made to those suggestions, I rather feel that this has been somewhat of a waste of time. In the previous debate, I spent some considerable time in what I thought was a fairly sober, realistic and, I would have hoped, constructive contribution to analysing the Committee system. I used as a basis for that a letter which I had written to the Premier suggesting a means of expeditiously and thoroughly assessing the Committee procedure through which we have been.

I would have thought that that was a reasonable suggestion and that, if the Premier had properly read my contribution, he would see that the Opposition was approaching this exercise constructively and carefully. Instead, he chose to respond with fairly cheap political point-scoring and a considerable deal of abuse. He totally misrepresented some of the points I had made, in such a way that I can only believe that he did not properly consider my remarks. If it was his intention that members were to make their comments, I would have hoped that it was his intention that those comments would be taken as serious contributions, would be seriously studied, and would be seriously responded to.

In my view, it was a pitiful performance, and I think it would not have been too well received by members on his own side on this occasion. There are many debates in which political points are made and taken but, in respect of that part of my speech which dealt with the Committee system, I felt that it was aimed at and was intended to be a constructive contribution to the assessment that the Premier had invited. His response makes one somewhat depressed and leaves one with the feeling that he will go ahead willy-nilly, and to hell with the views of members on any side of the House or views any different from his own.

I thought the most significant point was his failure to allude to the letter I had written to him and the suggestion I had canvassed extensively about a special committee or a Select Committee of this House to consider the matter. Perhaps his silence means that he has not yet rejected the

idea and is still thinking about it, but I was disappointed that, in his desire to make cheap cracks and promote a bit of abuse, he chose to ignore the suggestion. He wrote off my raising of some problems in the Committees as being destructive. He said that I came up with no answers to one or two points he instanced. Of course I did not. We must assess this situation, and the answers to the problems that arose are not easy to find. That is why I proposed the system of assessment that I put before the Premier, so I hope that his attitude will not remain as it was previously.

When I make the point about opportunities afforded to the Opposition, I am not suggesting in any way that we have not, in the course of these debates and the Committee investigation, had very much more opportunity in terms of time allotted than has been the case in the past. That is true, and it is welcome. It is one of the very positive features of the new system. On the other hand, the point was made by me, and I thought quite clearly, although it was misrepresented totally by the Premier, that, as opposed to the old system, various facts had to be considered: the fact that the Committees were guillotined, having only a set and specific amount of time in which to consider each set of Estimates, with very little flexibility to change that time (indeed, one could change it only by referring that Committee's deliberations to another day, and thus cutting into the time allowed for another Committee); the fact that the Ministers spoke at much greater length, and indeed on many occasions politically, and polemically; the fact that Government members took a far more active part in the proceedings than under the old system of the Committee of the whole—all these facts mean that, despite the extra time opportunities afforded overall, the record will show that the actual opportunities afforded to the Opposition are not as great as one would have thought. This was the point I wished to make, and it was a valid point worthy of serious consideration, not of cheap abuse.

The walk-out that took place in two of the Committees has been referred to. In Estimates Committee B, that occurred in the case of the Minerals and Energy vote. I should like to speak about that Committee and then deal with a broader point which affects that Committee at large. What were the circumstances of the occasion on which members walked out? After frequent questioning of the Minister of Mines and Energy, we were in a situation where it was apparent that he was not prepared to give any further information about the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. We had had a fairly frustrating day and, in accordance with Sessional Orders, a motion was moved that, in the opinion of the Committee, the Government's handling of the negotiations for the plant should be condemned.

It was quite valid and legitimate to move a motion and expression of opinion of the Committee. In the normal course, members of the Committee would speak to it, we would conclude the debate and a vote would be taken. There were procedural discussions as to the form of the motion and the way in which it should be handled. At about 23 minutes to 10, that is 23 minutes before the end of that session (10 o'clock was the time at which no further questioning or no further business could take place), the Hon. E. R. Goldworthy, as recorded in *Hansard*, said that he was going to speak to the motion as was his right, and he began to speak. At about that time one of our Committee members heard him say to his public servants who were sitting there with him words to the effect, "Don't worry chaps, you can put away your stuff; I will take this out to the end."

His public servants were seen to be closing their bags and collecting their papers together while the Deputy

Premier embarked on his diatribe against the Opposition on this matter. It was quite clear that the Minister was going to talk until 10 o'clock came, and that no other member would be able to speak, and no opportunity would be afforded to the Committee to vote on the motion that we had before us. We sat and copped that for a while and, when it became apparent that the Minister had absolutely no intention of reconsidering his intention to filibuster, at five minutes to 10 we moved a motion that he no longer be heard, in an endeavour to draw to his attention and highlight the fact that he was apparently talking the Committee out.

That motion was defeated on the casting vote of the Chairman. I realise, Mr. Acting Speaker, that as Chairman on that occasion you were in a fairly invidious position, because the Sessional Orders certainly did not provide for a time limit on the Minister, so you could not make a ruling as to time. However, I had hoped that the Government members on the Committee, preferring their responsibilities as Committee members to their responsibilities as members of the Government Party, could have found it possible to agree to that motion to allow at least a vote to be taken on the motion. Of course, they were not prepared to do that, and the motion was defeated. It was at that point, and at that point only, that we packed up our books and did precisely what the public servants had done, at the instruction of their Minister, some 20 minutes before, and walked out of the Committee, because there was no point in our further participation, as the Minister intended to talk the Committee out, and he went on and did so.

Is that the sort of deliberation about which the Premier is talking? Is that the spirit in which these new Committees are conducted? Is it right for him to accuse Opposition members of in some way ruining or rejecting the Committee system by walking out when in fact in those circumstances we had absolutely no opportunity to speak, no opportunity to vote on our motion, and, indeed, no point in staying there, because the Minister had made a deliberate decision that he would abuse his power and that he would speak until the end of that session, until the guillotine fell. It was outrageous behaviour on his part and I think our reaction to it was very reasonable. I would have hoped that the Premier would have some sensitivity to that; certainly that was a case of a Minister's disagreeing with the Premier about the value of the Committees and about the way in which they should be conducted.

At that stage, we did not know something that would have been of even greater concern to us if we had. I refer to the knowledge that the Minister had at the time he was appearing before the Committee, which he refused to disclose to the Committee with regard to the negotiations with the Pitjantjatjara people on the land rights Bill. At page 76 of the Estimates Committee debates as recorded in *Hansard*, a line of questioning was begun by me (and at various stages the member for Mitchell also took part) that dealt with the progress of those negotiations with the Pitjantjatjara. A number of detailed questions were asked by us; the situation concerning the Mintabie opal fields; what blocks were there to agreement; what progress had been reached in the agreements; and in all of those questions the Minister answered in a way that was meant to suggest to us that the whole issue was still proceeding, that though there was hope that negotiations would be completed there was still a way to go. For instance, I asked the following question (*Hansard*, page 76):

Is the Minister saying that all those other matters have been resolved and that this remains the one unresolved matter?

The Minister replied:

The honourable member will know the outcome of the negotiations in due course but they are near completion.

Later on he said something about the possibility of not reaching agreement was hypothetical and that he was not prepared to jump that hurdle until he came to it. The Minister repeated (*Hansard*, page 77):

I think I will be able to announce agreement in the near future. I cannot be more precise than that.

Earlier in the day, the Minister had said something else about the near future, and he made it clear that that was a pretty expandable concept, that it could be a matter of some weeks or some months, but he said he would be able to announce an agreement in the near future and that he could not be more precise than that. I asked the Minister the following question:

Will legislation be introduced in this session?

The Minister replied as follows:

I am optimistic that legislation will be introduced in this session but, until we have reached final agreement, the last "t" is crossed, the last "i" is dotted and we have argued about detail, I am not prepared to be more specific than that.

That is what the Minister was telling the Committee on Tuesday 30 September. Unknown to us on the Monday and Tuesday final agreement had in fact been reached. All arrangements had been finalised and were in train for a major public relations exercise which took place on the following Thursday at which the final ceremonial signing of a completed agreement took place—a completed agreement which had been made but which had not been formally signed at the time the Minister was addressing the Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you saying that he deceived the Committee?

Mr. BANNON: I am, yes. As my colleague suggests it is a clear case of the Minister's deceiving the Committee, at all times giving the impression that there was more to be done, that negotiations would be completed in due course, and avoiding the questions that were asked, giving absolutely no details. We are asked to take this procedure seriously, when the Minister can do that to the Committee. We are asked to take him seriously and to take the Premier seriously, when the Premier says that this Committee exercise is all about getting information from the Government. Specific questions were asked to obtain specific pieces of information. That information was within the Minister's knowledge, but he chose not to give it because he did not want to spoil the public relations exercise that was to take place a couple of days later. He deliberately misled the Committee in order to preserve his announcement.

That is outrageous behaviour; it is behaviour which was paralleled by the Attorney-General when he, also, refused to answer questions about the report which that very day was released to the *Adelaide News* and published for all the public to see, yet members of the Committee who had been asking questions about the matter had to walk out from this Chamber and pick up our copies of the daily paper to see that in fact the Attorney-General had been totally misleading. I cannot go into that matter, because that relates to another Committee, but with regard to the one I am discussing here is a classic instance of the abuse to which this procedure was subjected. It is all very well to say that we did not ask the right questions, that we were not probing enough on some occasions. What more can one do other than undertake the sort of cross-examination that was undertaken by myself and the member for Mitchell, such as that in relation to the land rights issue? What more can we do, and what more can we achieve, if the Minister is prepared to tell the Committee deliberate,

evasive, deceitful untruths—and I put it as strongly as that?

Of course, that instance epitomises the whole way in which the Minister of Mines and Energy has conducted his portfolio; he is abrasive, combative, and abusive, and I think the people of South Australia are getting heartily sick of it. Mineral and energy development is vital to this State, but it is a controversial area and one that must be sensitively handled. There is no way in the world that we will have adequate mineral development and adequate protection of our resources for the good of the public while we have a Minister with the sort of attitude that the Deputy Premier has.

Let us consider the boosting that has gone on in recent months as far as the Premier and he are concerned over this matter. They keep talking about the resources boom. They say that will be the saviour of South Australia, and will produce the jobs and the prosperity that this State needs, they say. Let us examine those claims in a realistic context. How real is the resources boom and how far off is it? Who exactly will benefit? What does any resource boom mean in terms of extra employment? They are three key questions, and I will examine each of them because, until we are able to answer them, we will not be able to judge what weight should be given to the inflated pronouncements of the Government on the boom in prospects for mineral and energy resources.

How real is the boom? The electorate, especially in recent times, has been bombarded with superlatives about the future use of our natural resources. Part of this has been fairly legitimate, talking up by the Government which has a duty to encourage people and industry about the future. We have always argued that there is a need to have basic confidence in our economy and its prospects, but I think part of this has gone well beyond legitimate optimism and, by doing so, runs the risk as in any boom and bust mentality of plunging us into even greater pessimism and gloom when the fantastic promises are simply not realised. Much of that excessive bonanza talk goes back to a key document in this whole debate, one which appears to have been swallowed whole, without any critical evaluation by the present State Government. There have been warnings given about its contents, but that has not stopped the unalloyed enthusiasm of the Premier and his Deputy in talking of it. The document was issued under the authority under the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, Mr. Lynch. We know something about Mr. Lynch and his activities. He could easily—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: What do you mean by that?

Mr. BANNON: He is a man who knows quite a bit about development, investments, family trusts, tax avoidance, and one or two other things. Mr. Lynch had quite an interesting period in the three years he was on the Opposition benches. He epitomises a certain type of get-in-and-get-it-out-of-them mentality that we find so often in the Liberal Party. He issued this great document on the development of Australia's resources and the projects which were in the pipeline and which would yield us untold wealth and benefits. It was suggested (and an examination of the document would support that suggestion) that it was really part of the Liberal Party's run-up to the Federal election. This document stated that Australia had projects worth \$29 000 000 000 that would go ahead in the 1980's—all there ready to go for this bonanza of the 1980's. At the time, I issued a warning to be wary of the claims in the analysis of this prospective boom.

Certainly there are great resources there which must be tapped and used to the benefit of the community, but just look at the list such as the one issued by Mr. Lynch. Some of the projects included in that \$29 000 000 000 were

mutually exclusive—if one project went ahead, one or two others could not go ahead, because the market demand would be met. Other projects needed different time scales; they needed one project to be approved before the other for there to be any realistic development in those areas. There were all sorts of conditions and qualifications which had to be met, and yet both were added in.

The Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy drew many times on that survey. They have a tendency to forget that much of their enthusiasm about some of these projects relates to projects begun or planned long ago. Yesterday, in the *Advertiser* in the "South Australia '80: State of the State" supplement the Premier, when talking about the 1980's, referred to exciting new developments. It would be easy to imagine that his Government discovered brown coal in the upper South-East and at Lake Phillipson, that the Cooper Basin had only just sprung to life, and that it was under his Government that exploration at Roxby Downs had begun. That is just not true. All of these things were happening and were actively encouraged by an extremely progressive Government policy and a Minister acknowledged throughout Australia as being at the top of his field, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who regrettably is no longer a member of this House. He, his Government and the successive Premiers of Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Corcoran made sure that South Australia was actively and progressively involved in all those developments that were taking place, and nothing has happened since that is new, that was not planned or on the drawing board at the time the previous Government went out of office.

I am not denying, nor do I wish to do so, that there is increased demand for our natural resources and that there are great benefits to be gained from developing them. I am only asking for a sensible perspective to be applied to them. Who exactly will benefit if all these projects actually come to pass? I think that is a far more important question than boasting about the size of the projects and their development. Earlier this month the *National Times* suggested:

The boom will change the face of Australia but the average family may have little share in its benefits. Massive wealth is about to be distributed but for the many, lost jobs and rising prices will be their only share of the action.

A word of caution, a note of warning. Local economist, Barry Hughes, has said that energy politics is beginning to backfire in Australia, and if it backfires it will not be because there is not a genuine energy boom of resource development going on in Australia; it will backfire because of the inflated and ludicrous claims made about it and what it can achieve made by people such as the Premier.

It will certainly take more to alter this than the bland assertion of the member for Rocky River in his column in the *News*. This member put on record his view, in referring to the development of the State to its fullest potential including mining exploration and discovery, that it will ensure our standard of living can be maintained and improved and jobs will be created for all. That will not happen simply by these developments taking place. It will happen only if the benefits of those developments can accrue, in a fair and equitable way, to the community and the people involved in these projects.

Look at the remarks made by Dr. Robert Gregory, who published a most important article in the *Journal of Agricultural Economics* in 1976, entitled, "Some implications of the growth of the minerals sector". Dr. Gregory was not pushing any political barrow. He contended that, if mining does boom, there may be a massive build-up of foreign reserves. The effect of that could be inflationary, unless the Government reduces tariffs or hardens the

currency. Yet both these actions, tariff reduction or changes in the exchange rate, have dire consequences for the population. He takes the argument further. It is an extremely technical argument and obviously one on which there are a number of variations and interpretations, but the message in it is quite clear. It might seem to be giving Dr. Gregory too much credibility to base reservations about benefits to be derived from the mining boom entirely on his arguments, however persuasive, but he is not alone.

Some members may recall the famous analysis of the contribution of the mineral industry to Australian welfare undertaken in 1974 by Mr. Tom Fitzgerald. That analysis was an extremely controversial and interesting one. He concluded that the Federal Government (and thus the Australian community) contracted a net loss over mining over the six years 1967-73, and that the relatively small sums accruing to State Governments through royalties were insignificant, compared to the huge surplus paid to foreign shareholders of the principal mining companies. Great amounts of public funds, he reminded us, are involved in tax concessions to mineral companies and in infrastructure support.

I think that Mr. Fitzgerald must get a lot of credit for opening up that debate, providing hard data and putting the argument fairly clearly. That debate must go on, but it must go in terms of realism not in terms of the somewhat hysterical approach we hear so often from the Premier and his Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister is often pleased to take recourse to history to support his arguments.

He points out the great tradition of mining in South Australia, how indeed on a number of occasions in our past from the time of foundation in 1836 the colony of South Australia was saved by the discovery of mineral wealth and its development and exploitation. Indeed, he is correct, and that is certainly historically true in this State. However, there are always problems with basing the State's development in that area of our economy. Obviously we had to build and concentrate on a manufacturing base and I think something else has also changed, and this is an important fact to remember. Mining is not the same today as it was then. Then it was a massive generator of employment. Towns sprang up; many thousands of people were provided with direct and indirect employment there on site; it was labour intensive and, as a result, those immediate benefits to the people in the community, to the population, accrued instantly and, from the taxes they paid, accrued to the Government in terms of the services they could provide to assist those people.

Today mining is extremely capital intensive; it does not provide the same sort of employment opportunities. Therefore, one cannot equate the great benefits that occurred historically from those developments precisely with what benefits we might get today. We can get those benefits only if our economy is organised properly to ensure that those benefits are enjoyed by the whole community. I think Australian manufacturers are at last getting the message on this. We must not forget that South Australia depends heavily on manufacturing for much of its employment and wealth.

Some of the businessmen who have sympathy for the philosophy of the present Government are now showing signs of restiveness about the consequences of a mineral boom and the neglect of manufacturing in the course of it. They are faced with a highly organised boosting campaign, and that exercise, I think, is beginning to disturb them because they realise that, if all efforts and energies, both political and social, are placed in the mining boom and the

resources development, then indeed they will be in a lot of trouble. The Australian Industries Development Association publicly criticised the basis for that Lynch survey, complaining about the double counting involved. It warned the Government roughly in terms of the argument propounded by Dr. Gregory. It noted that a resources boom could cause pressure on the industrial sector of the economy, and that it was manufacturing industry that provided the bulk of employment. There was a major report in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Government hit over reports", in which that manufacturing employer's body gave its analysis and criticism of the Lynch document.

Only this week the powerful Victorian Chamber of Manufactures questioned how long people had to wait for the coming resources boom, and for how much longer the Federal Government would continue to avoid solutions to industrial problems by hoping for relief via some future resources boom. I suggest that the Prime Minister and the Premier are caught in the same bind. Immense effort is being spent to try to persuade the public generally that the only area on which we should concentrate, the only El Dorado we should look at in terms of developments and benefits to the State is that provided by mining and resource development. We are coming to suspect very strongly that it is quite possible that is not the only answer, that indeed in some instances the reverse could apply.

In the middle of all this, and making the situation even worse, I suggest, we have the complicating distortion of the purely speculative mining ventures, with profits being taken not from minerals or developing our resources but from people playing the share market, with false rumours about major discoveries which, in a sense, represent a sort of fraud on the Australian people. People are investing in the stock market not to provide the capital for important development work to take place, but instead it is rather like buying tickets in the lottery or betting on the horses at the racetrack hoping for some massive windfall gains out of speculative share market trading. South Australia certainly has not been immune to this socially disruptive greedy blight.

The *National Times* has pointed the finger at Meekatharra Minerals, which suddenly discovered coal in August in the Arkarunga Basin. But when Mintaro Slate started pushing its back too far even the Minister of Mines and Energy had to call it to order and step, if you like, into the market place and warn people that this was not anything to do with development of resources but a stock market heist, as the Americans say. The *National Times* commentator observed that the coal and lignite sheets of South Australia were certainly proving to be a new take-off pad for the stock market. There is nothing there about what the long-term value will be in substantial terms to the community.

We could do without these manipulators, but I am afraid they are going to stay with us and make their profits and in fact create losses for a lot of unfortunate people, unless the Government acts, and the more the Premier talks about the Government's getting out of the way of business, and the more he suggests, by those sorts of statement, that it is going to be just an open go and an open slather in the market place in these areas, the more these frauds and manipulations will take place and, I would suggest, the more mining and resources development and its image will suffer in Australia. It is in the interests of mining companies themselves to raise their capital in a way that does not create these mad gambling outrages in the Stock Exchanges of Australia.

Some of the extravagant hyperbole that surrounds the mining sector these days is so unbalanced that even some

of the miners have to take part. The Chairman of Western Mining, Sir Arvi Parbo, himself has had to blow the whistle. The other day, in Melbourne, he said, when addressing the United States Chamber of Commerce:

Mineral developments need enthusiasm and optimism, but it is also essential to keep our feet firmly on the ground. He warned that the boom could suddenly burst. He said that some of the advantages we enjoy are only temporary. Of course, he is sounding a very suitable and, I think, a very responsible note of caution in this; one that unfortunately the Premier and his Minister are just not interested in being cautious about. One knows it is a fact that the mining industry depends on the prices that can be paid on fairly unstable markets for its product.

Let us look at that controversial area of the development of uranium. The facts are that, at the moment, there has been a major down-turn in the uranium market, the price has slumped, and the anticipated consumption level is far below the estimates made only a matter of some months ago. There has been a quite rapid change around in the demand for that particular mineral and, of course, with it the change-around in the prices it can command and therefore the viability of the various mining operations that can take place. There is always that risk involved, and therefore to put everything into that sort of area, everything into a market which fluctuates so widely is wrong, and it is wrong on the part of Governments to encourage that to be done. Another problem has been highlighted by Sir Roderick Carnegie of C.R.A.—the reliance on foreign capital. I am not one of those who says that we could do without foreign capital at all, that there is absolutely no need for it; I think that the facts of life in our economy are such that we do at times need assistance and investment from overseas. Sir Roderick said in a television interview:

I think the present attitude is too often that we should continue our reliance on the international oil companies for sources of capital. That is an easy way but in the long term I don't think it's going to create the kind of jobs for young Australians which I want for my kids.

In other words, we have to have some equitable social share not only in our resources but in the capital put into those resources to ensure there is the social input on the part of Australians for Australian resources.

I deal now with my final point. What does any resources boom mean in terms of employment? We all know we have a massive unemployment problem in this country, a problem which is far more acute in this State than in any other State. Since the election of the present Government, which promised to create 7 000 and then 10 000 jobs, we have had a rapidly deteriorating job market in this State.

It is a matter of grave concern, so grave that the Premier is prepared to concede that it is a difficult problem, although he has not come up with many solutions. What does the mining boom have to offer in terms of jobs at this stage? I can find few authorities who suggest that mining will be of much help; in fact, most authorities suggest that the major employers of labour in the manufacturing industry will suffer extra pressures because of the boom that will make their position worse. Mr. Arnold Schrape, from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, told a symposium on population projections:

A big mining boom, including large-scale mining and export of uranium ore, can greatly increase export revenue, very significantly improve our balance of payments position and vastly augment foreign reserves. However, it will not necessarily provide any significant increase in direct employment of labour, while its indirect effect on employment should not be exaggerated.

We should heed those words. Mr. Schrape, when he

mentioned indirect employment, referred to the infamous multiplier effect. The Minister of Mines and Energy has gone on record as saying that, ultimately, 50 000 or 60 000 people could derive income because of Roxby Downs, from an initial labour force of 5 000. As opposed to that, the Minister of Industrial Affairs talked about an initial work force of 10 000, and said there would eventually be 30 000 to 40 000 jobs, double the direct employment and less indirect employment.

Entirely different figures were offered by Mr. Lynch when offering his department's survey of major mining and manufacturing projects. His computation of construction and production jobs in October 1979 totalled 4 100, so none of the figures and projections agree in regard to what precisely this multiplier effect will be. Yet, it is central to the cause. These figures and projections seem to agree on one thing: that, in regard to mining developments, there will be a multiplier effect, but what precisely will it be? Kenneth Davidson, the economist from the Melbourne Age, commented on a statement made by the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, Mr. Viner. This statement indicated that Australians do not have to worry too much about unemployment, because of the energy boom. Mr. Davidson cited this very defensive statement made by Mr. Viner, which is relevant to our present considerations. Mr. Viner stated:

The spin-off or multiplier effects of these developments can extend the demand for additional labour right through the economy into every occupation and industry, requiring new skills and new technologies as they go. Let the economists argue and the commentators cavil at whether the multiplier effect on jobs is 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10 times the number directly created.

As Kenneth Davidson quite rightly says, referring to whether we should be cavilling about the exact multiplier effect:

Surely this is precisely the point. If the job multiplier is two, then all the billion dollar resource projects taken together are not going to make any dent in the present level of employment, given the skills required and the natural growth in the work force. On the other hand, if the multiplier is 10, then Australia should either be gearing up for another mass migration programme, or deciding on which projects should be postponed in order to avoid an inflationary boom.

However, it can be said even now that the multiplier from these projects will be higher during the construction phase over the next three to five years and less during the operational stage . . . the energy boom is unlikely to eradicate unemployment but will still place pressure on key points in the economy which will have inflationary pressures unless action is taken to schedule projects in the context of man-power policies designed to expand the supply of skills.

In some areas there is already a skill shortage and that skill shortage is not being met by adequate manpower training schemes for those in our labour market at present or for those leaving the schools. It must be met, because of the suddenness and the short-term nature of the demand, by importing that skilled labour from overseas. Where is the slightest indication that either the Federal or State Government intends to direct the boom in such a way as to maximise employment or to ensure that wealth created is spread right across the economy? Dr. Barry Hughes put the present policy in a fairly earthy capsule, as follows:

Are we going the way of the phosphate island of Nauru—
an economy based on guano—

inviting a whole list of foreign companies in to dig quarries in Australia, employing largely migrant labour to do the quarrying, exporting the product and the loot, and wrecking local industry to boot.

That is a pretty succinct and direct way of saying what

could happen unless Governments in this country act responsibly. The Opposition sincerely hopes that the present Minister's objective is not to create some sort of guano-type economy, but we could be excused for thinking, from the way the Minister talks and the exaggerated statements he makes, that he does not understand the problems and that that, indeed, will be the effect of his policy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): First, I should like to give my impressions of the way in which the Estimates Committees functioned. I would be less than honest if I did not say that I believe that the whole exercise was a great big con trick on the part of the Government. The Government has had a lot of experience in Opposition and it knows what can be done to tie up a Government, particularly in the House. I believe that the Government was looking for means by which to avoid having to put up with what we put up with when in Government when the Committee of the whole discussed the Budget Estimates.

My reasons for saying that are perfectly clear: they have been touched on by the Leader this afternoon and by some other members. Frankly, the amount of extra time that members were supposed to be given (as the Premier claimed) just did not work out. First, the guillotine was applied in regard to every department. A specific time was set down for each department, and the Minister knew the amount of time during which he would have to occupy the crease. Some Ministers are very adept at occupying the crease and, in the first Committee on which I served, during the first hour and a half, the Minister occupied the crease for 57 minutes, his advisers for three minutes, and the remainder of the time was split up between the eight members of the Committee.

One can see that the individual members of that Committee had little opportunity to ask questions. Many members spent a great number of hours in preparing questions so that their input into these Committees would be proper, only to be completely frustrated by the fact that they had no chance to ask any questions. The lines under the Minister of Marine did not come up at all. I was on that Committee and I waited for most of the day (because one never knows whether a Committee will fold up, so one must be here), and into the night, only to be told that the lines would not be examined. That sort of thing is not good enough.

During my experience as a member in this House, I have previously been able to ask any Minister questions about aspects of the Budget or Loan Estimates in Committee, but in this case I was deprived of that opportunity. Questioning was impossible at times because I could not be present at both Committees at the one time and, unless I was prepared to wait until members on the sidelines were entitled to ask questions, I was denied the opportunity. Thus, the situation that applied to the member for Semaphore, the member for Mitcham and the member for Flinders applied to every other member who was not a member of the Committee—they were deprived of an opportunity to ask questions. I know, from my own experience in Opposition going back some years, that members had an opportunity in the past to address themselves to all aspects of the Estimates, but that facility is now denied.

You lose the atmosphere of Parliament, and I do not think that we should do that. Some people have the idea that we should get into a huddle in a little committee room, and away we go. That completely inhibits a member, in my view. Even the present system of sitting in the House close together with public servants inhibits members, to a certain extent, from doing the sort of thing

they may have to do in a political scene. I do not think that that is of any advantage to a member who may want, in the most strident terms, to put forward an argument about a particular matter in a particular department. He may want to castigate the Minister, but he would not feel as much at ease in a scene like that or in a committee room as he would doing it in the House. We should not be deprived of doing that.

There are other reasons that I will not go into now, but I hope that the Government will see (and Government members must recognise that they will not always be in Government) the way in which this system can be manipulated so that Opposition members can almost be frozen out and, indeed, prevented from doing the things that they should do in the querying and probing that should go on in these Committees. I briefly support what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I see no reason why the Government cannot bring in its programme and performance budgeting in a Committee of the whole House just as simply as it can into the two separate Committees.

I would not object to the Government's guillotining the debate in a Committee of the whole House, provided that there was some discussion with the Opposition. The Opposition, as I understand it, had no chance at all to decide what length of time would be given to various portfolios: that time was laid down by the Government. That, in itself, is wrong, and I believe that the Opposition should be consulted regarding the amount of time given to the various portfolios. The Minister sitting on the front bench now would know full well that, from the way in which the House conducts itself as a Committee of the whole House, it is possible that a particular line or a Minister's allocation will go through in 10 minutes, whereas another might take 10 hours. There should be consultation.

I would not object to the Government's guillotining the various departments, after consultation with the Opposition, in a Committee of the whole House. That could easily be done. I should like to see a return to the old system. I had the opportunity, in Committee, to raise a question about Samcor, which is a statutory authority, and I will address myself to the matter of statutory authorities, because much was made of the number of statutory authorities, their accountability, etc., by the Premier, who, when Leader of the Opposition, condemned the then Government many times for not doing something about them. In his policy speech, I think that the only real reference he made to this matter was that his Government would introduce sunset legislation. He seemed to believe at that time that that would be the be all and end all of everything. I do not agree with him. Even though, I believe, he is still considering the matter, and has referred to it a couple of times since being Premier, I believe that he would be well advised to leave that legislation alone. Why do I say that?

I had the matter of sunset legislation thoroughly investigated when I was Premier. It does not work in the U.S.A., despite what people may say. It is not possible to have statutory authorities, such as some that we have here, going flat out and, in the middle of vital decisions, having to cut off their operations because the three-year or five-year period has ended and must be reviewed. It is black and white; indeed, it does not take into account the nature or type of operations of some of the authorities we have in this State. I strongly advise that the Premier closely examine not the advantages (I do not think there are any) but the disadvantages of this legislation. I am certain that he will be convinced that it would not be in the best interests of this State, the Parliament, or the statutory

authorities themselves to proceed with that measure. That is not to say that I do not believe that some steps can be taken to sort out the massive number of statutory authorities we have in this State.

When I had the matter investigated, I found, almost to my horror, that there were about 250 of these authorities in South Australia. On closer investigation, we found (and I was about to move in the direction that I am going to talk about) that there were a number that, first, we could do away with, because the function for which they were set up was no longer necessary. The reasons for their establishment had disappeared. Secondly, a number of them could be amalgamated; indeed, one board could perform the functions of a whole series of boards, and I will give some examples of that. Thirdly, legislation could be introduced in some of the enabling Acts of the authorities to see that they were properly accountable to Parliament.

It is vital that they be accountable to Parliament; I do not argue about that. The people of this State should be able to inform themselves on how the authorities are spending their money and what they are doing. This is a complicated and sensitive issue. We cannot just blunder into this matter. A statutory authority is different from a Government department, because it has to have some autonomy and flexibility. It wants to be free of day-to-day Ministerial direction so that it can operate on its own manpower budget and take what administrative measures are necessary in order to see that it functions efficiently. That is not to say that it cannot be more accountable to the Minister than some currently are.

The State Government Insurance Commission is subject to Ministerial direction, except for section 16 of the Act, I think, and that is appropriate to some of the other statutory authorities. They are supposed to report to Parliament regularly on a three-year basis. It is often the case that they do not report or that, when they do report, the report is completely out of date. I am sure that some of the new members are finding that they are receiving reports this year which are probably two years old, and they must wonder what possible use they could be in trying to make an assessment of the authority's or the department's activities. So, reports to Parliament are not the answer. The Government has to be responsible in the end, because public moneys are being spent and decisions are being made that affect the spending of that money. The Government, in looking at these authorities, does not want to hog-tie them or make them so inflexible that they cannot perform the functions for which they were set up. I was amazed to find that there were about 250 of these statutory authorities.

Mr. Millhouse: You answered a question from me about them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I did and after great complaint from the member about the time it took to reply. When he saw the reply, the honourable member would no doubt agree that there was a tremendous amount of work involved in compiling the answer, which showed that there were 249 statutory authorities.

Mr. Millhouse: It was work well done, though.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and it was not wasted by the Government, either. At the time of leaving office I had had a great deal of work, while Premier, done on this matter. I know that the Government has introduced an investigation on deregulation, and I have no argument about that, incidentally, either.

There are so many useless regulations that we could well sift them out, but the sorting out of statutory authorities is a different matter. My Government was well advanced in doing something about the number of statutory authorities

in existence. I had intended to abolish some of them. The South-East Drainage Appeals Board had completed its task and it could be abolished. The South-Western Suburbs Drainage Authority had completed the scheme and, as the Minister of Water Resources would know, the task of minor clearing up was transferred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, so it could be abolished. The Dog Fence Board could be abolished and its functions integrated with the Lands Department; there was no need for a board. The same comment applies to the Pastoral Board and the Land Board; it could be quite easily dealt with administratively and there would be no need for those boards to continue in existence. The Central Inspection Authority's functions could be transferred without problems to the Department of Transport.

A number of bodies could be amalgamated. The Classification of Publications Board and the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board could be amalgamated to form the Classification of Publications and Theatrical Performances Board; instead of two boards, only one was necessary. The Vertebrate Pests Control Authority, the Pest Plants Commission, the Red Scale Committees, the San Jose Control Committees, and the Oriental Fruit Moth Committees could be amalgamated to form one board, perhaps under the title of the Agricultural Pests and Disease Board, for example. The Libraries Board of South Australia, and the Institutes Association of South Australia Council could be amalgamated to reflect current trends in the amalgamation of public and institute libraries which has been going on for some time.

In addition to the number of existing reviews, I had set up a number of investigations into the possibilities of abolishing, rationalising, or improving the financial position and performance of a number of authorities. The Coast Protection Board was to have been reviewed with a view to abolition and transfer of some functions to the then Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs whilst others remained in the Department of Environment. The longer term financial position of the South Australian Film Corporation was to have been assessed. The then existing financial review of the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority was to have been expanded to examine the feasibility of integrating the provision of teacher housing with functions of other Government housing bodies. The objectives, functions and operations of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the State Theatre Company, the State Opera and the Festival of Arts Board were to be reviewed with a view to the integration of functions and administration. The role of the Kindergarten Union was to have been reviewed and tied in with a wide ranging examination of the provision of childhood services in this State.

The provision of administrative services to the Occupational Therapists Registration Board, the Opticians Registration Board, the Chiropody Board, the South Australian Psychological Board, the Medical Board, the Physiotherapists Registration Board and the Nurses Registration Board by the Health Commission was to have been examined. The functions of the Teacher Registration Board, the Teacher Classification Board, and the Teacher Salaries Board were to have been reviewed with a view to integration. The rationalisation of the Wheat Delivery Quota Contingency Reserve Committee, the Wheat Delivery Quota Review Committee and the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee was to have been investigated.

The amalgamation of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science with the Health Commission was to have been investigated. The objectives, functions and

operations of Amdel were to have been reviewed. The rationalisation of functions in the trades and commercial licensing area such as those carried out by the Board of Examiners for Mine and Quarry Managers, the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Committee, the Sanitary Plumbers Examining Board, the Well Drillers Examination Committee, the Local Government Auditors Examining Committee, the Local Government Engineers Examining Committee, the Local Government Clerks Examining Committee, the Cinematographic Projectionists Board of Examiners, the Builders Licensing Board, the Commercial and Private Agents Board, the Land Valuers Licensing Board, the Land and Business Agents Board, the Land Brokers Licensing Board, and the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board was to have been examined.

I have deliberately mentioned a number of boards to show the enormity of the task of any Government in trying to sort them out. Similarly, a review of bodies dealing with appeals against licensing and charges matters, such as the Business Franchise Appeal Tribunal, the Pay-roll Tax Appeal Tribunal, the Motor Fuel Licensing Appeal Tribunal, the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal, the Air Pollution Appeal Board, the Mines and Works Appeal Board, the Poultry Farmers Licensing Review Tribunal and the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal was to have been undertaken.

That is an example of the stage that my Government had reached in an examination of that aspect of the statutory authorities. I am sure the member for Mitcham will be delighted to know that we had done such a lot of work. What alarms me is that, despite the ranting and raving of the Premier about what he was going to do with statutory authorities and sunset legislation, I have not heard of one board being discharged from its duties. I have not heard any suggestion that boards be amalgamated, nor have I heard any suggestion of legislation being introduced to make provision in enabling Acts for the sort of control that the Parliament may want to have in relation to other statutory authorities. My Government had legislation drafted, and all this information would have been available to the Premier immediately he took office, yet, in more than 12 months, we have heard of nothing being done to carry out any of this.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: There is one piece of legislation before the House and that is in relation to an authority that we closed down.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is right. I referred to Samcor. I was surprised when Mr. Graham Inns, Director-General of the Premier's Department, was made full-time Chairman of Samcor. I think that appointment was absolutely and utterly unnecessary. There is no need for a full-time Chairman of Samcor. Mr. Inns has been a member of the Samcor board for a number of years and has acted on occasion as Deputy Chairman. Most of the recommendations that were made to my Government in May 1975 have not been carried out, and those recommendations were made to me by G. J. Inns, as Director-General of the Premier's Department. I suppose I would have to say that I view that appointment with some suspicion.

When I grinned in this Chamber at the Premier when he made the announcement, I think he thought that it had tickled my fancy. He came over to see me and said, "You were going to do something with him." I said, "I was not. You are just guessing. You do not know what was going to happen, nor do I propose to discuss it with you." I think the Premier thought that I would say that I would have done the same thing. Graham Inns was Director-General of the Premier's Department while I was Premier. I had no

intention, no plans, no thoughts about moving him out of that position, in spite of what some people were saying. A number of people were saying to me, as senior public servants are wont to do from time to time, "What are you going to do with Inns?" They were told in no uncertain terms to mind their own business.

I think it is a pity that the decisions taken in relation to Samcor have not yet been implemented. When I questioned Mr. Inns, through the Minister during the Committee, he said to me, after all this time since May last year, "We may get around to it in the next five or six weeks; I am about to make a report to the Government". This was concerning the very things which the former Government had accepted as recommendations which I believe were properly drawn up and which in fact were designed to see to it that Samcor was put in a position to compete efficiently on the open market. Those things that are vital to that, particularly with regard to its capital structure, have not yet been done, and I am disappointed about that.

The next matter that I want to mention briefly comes under the marine portfolio, if you like. I cannot think of a word that would most adequately describe this—I suppose "fiasco" would be as good a word as any to describe the incident of the ship that sank in the Port River, the *Joseph Verco*.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about shemozzle?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Shemozzle, disgrace, fiasco.

Mr. Millhouse: It must have started in your time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not talking about what the boat was or was not. I am talking about what happened to it in the Port River recently. I can assure you that, if I had been the Minister responsible for this area, that boat would have been out of the water in 10 hours, and I would not have been waiting for legal advice or anything else. I think it is a damn disgrace to think that that thing is waiting for a legal halyard, and then public tenders are called, yet we have a 60-tonne floating crane sitting down there at Port Adelaide. I cannot believe it. How would we have got on at Wallaroo? I can remember arriving back from Canberra at half past five one evening to be told that a Chinese ship the *Wuzhou* had run into the wharf at Wallaroo. I asked the Director what was the amount of damage, and he replied that he thought it was about \$1 000 000. I said, "Where is the ship?", and he said, "It is sailing for Port Lincoln at midnight". I said, "Pig's it is, I will tell you where it is going to stay". He said, "You will need to do something about it, but all the people have gone home." I said, "Get them back". We arrested that ship at 1 o'clock in the morning, and the reason why it was worth while arresting the ship was that we will get the money back from that company for most of the cost of damage to that wharf.

The same sort of action was necessary and could be taken by the Minister. He does not have to take the advice of his Director or anybody else. The responsible decision would have been to get that ship up. They tell me that most of the valuable equipment has been raided by scuba divers, scavengers. In other words, it is like leaving a car in the middle of a desert—there's not much left when you come back to get it.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Submarine pirates.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I think the circumstances surrounding the matter, whether the boat is top heavy or whether it is badly designed, is another question, but the way the ship has lain in that river for the length of time it has been there is a disgrace so far as the administration of the Minister responsible is concerned. I suppose that one could blame it on two of the Ministers—I

am not quite sure who would make the decision. The problem may have been that they got together and could not make a decision.

On behalf of the taxpayers of this State, I protest about the wilful waste that has gone on over some technical hitch. They explained in the House that they did not know how terribly complex this matter was; but the end result is that that ship is still rotting down there and in fact may never sail again. There has been some trouble with the ship, but it cost us \$1 000 000 in the first place. I shall say no more about that matter. I have already said what I think of the Committees. I have said that I would like to go back to the original system of examination by a Committee of the whole House, even to the extent that I would allow the Government, after consultation with the Opposition, to guillotine the debate on the various departments. The Government guillotined the debate this time without any consultation. Every member should have the opportunity to ask questions on any matter.

Mr. O'Neill: How about guillotining a couple of Ministers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: You cannot do that in Committee, but Government members could keep other members here forever if they wanted to. The problem is that, once they know the guillotine is on, neither the Ministers nor the back-benchers will shut up, so perhaps we should not have the guillotine after all.

In summary, I do not approve of the Estimates Committees. I think the Government should have done more about statutory authorities in the time that has been available to it, and I have given the reason why I think this. All the information was there when members opposite went into Government, and they could have acted on that information. Recommendations made in relation to statutory authorities were sound, and I think that they were more than a little devious in appointing Mr. Graham Inns as the full-time Chairman of Samcor, which was totally unnecessary. Finally, I am very disgusted about the *Joseph Verco*.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): In directing my remarks earlier in this session as to Committee A, I said very little about my attitude towards the workings of these Committees, and I do not want to spend too much of my time in debate on Committee B talking about my attitude towards the workings of the Committees. However, I want to make one point: if I compare the effectiveness, for my purposes of the system this year with that of last year, I have to say that last year's procedure seems to have worked the better. I am the Opposition spokesman on education in this place. When the Budget is before us, it is my responsibility in Committee to cross-examine the Minister to get as much information as I can out of him and, if possible, to get him to commit himself to things to which he may not want to commit himself but to which I want him to commit himself. In that respect, I believe I was far more successful 12 months ago than I was a fortnight ago. That may have something to do with the relative performances of the Minister and myself on those two occasions but I rather imagine that it has something to do with the change in the ground rules.

I am not too sure that that is the experience that all of my colleagues have had; all I can say is that that is what I found. There are other minor things also. As the principal spokesman for the Opposition on Committee A on education, I did not even get to ask the first question. That was given to the member for Mawson, as an examination of the record will show. Anyway, that did not matter—I am not too concerned about that. However, if I look at what I personally was able to get out of the whole exercise,

I have to say that last year I found it rather more amenable for my purposes than it was this year. That is not necessarily a judgment on the system, but it is an observation which is pertinent.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you think that was because you were used to the old system?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I was not used to the old system, in the sense that I had never addressed it from an Opposition position. However, my concerns in education were the same. As I say, it is not a demonstrable argument against the system as such, but I contribute it for what it is worth. I was not involved only in education on Committee A, but in the time I have available to me I believe that is as much as I can cover.

I refer to the *Advertiser* of 7 May, where it was reported by the *Advertiser's* education writer, Sheena MacLean, that the Minister of Education had announced the setting up of what was to become known as the Keeves Inquiry. This was against a background of a good deal of fear that there were to be substantial reductions in education expenditure by the Government. The following is the report of part of what the Premier and Minister had to say:

Mr. Tonkin and Mr. Allison said that there had been a great deal of speculation and irresponsible comments about the Government's proposals on education arising from conjecture about a three per cent cut in the Education Budget. Mr. Allison said he was concerned that reaction to the inquiry by some people would be cynical because of this. The decision to hold an inquiry originated after an inquiry into early childhood services in October last year. Mr. Allison said there was no intention to withdraw funds which would have a direct effect on students and the employment of teachers. If any cuts were to be made, they would be achieved through rationalisation of administration.

I am not too sure what that last sentence means. In any event, I do not think it matters whether it means something or not. What is important is that the Minister of Education at that time said that people should not be cynical, that this was not an attempt to hold back progress in education, and that certainly there was no intention to withdraw funds which would have a direct effect on students and the employment of teachers. Let us see whether that is consistent with what the Liberal Party policy in these matters happens to be, and let us see whether it is consistent with its performance in this particular Budget because then we may have some idea whether whatever cynicism is around is well-founded or not.

What I have tried to do is to go back to the Liberal Party's election manifesto in 1979 and to contrast the various parts of it with what its performance is as illustrated in these Budget papers, and a fascinating picture develops. In the 1979 election, the Liberal Party promised to reduce class sizes as a matter of high priority, particularly in the first two or three years of primary education. For that promise, I refer to page 2 of the Premier's policy speech in relation to that particular matter. The performance is on page 211 of the briefing document that was given to us, a very useful document in its way, because of the manpower implications which are spelt out. Throughout 1979-80 primary education manpower was 7 691 full-time equivalent, and in 1980-81 primary education manpower is 7 554 full-time equivalent. On the one hand there is the promise to reduce class sizes as a matter of high priority, particularly in the first two or three years of primary education, and on the other hand there is the performance of a reduction from 7 691 to 7 554.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That is talking about teachers only.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, it refers to teachers employed in the primary area. We have to concede that last year the Government did in its Budget increase the number of primary teachers by 30. If that was regarded as some sort of fulfilment of the policy on that occasion, then I think people have a right to be a little cynical about the about-turn which has now occurred. Last year, the Government did see that there was some responsibility to make a mild increase. I am sure the people who believed this policy document saw that as only the first instalment. The second instalment is all in the other direction and it is a rather more drastic change.

Incidentally, I should explain that I am not referring to the Premier's policy speech, but to the Liberal Party education policy as issued by Mr. Harold Allison, MP, Shadow Minister of Education, in August 1979 under the heading "Liberal Party of Australia, South Australian Division".

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are there any figures for enrolments?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We did a good deal of work on that in Committee and we can talk about that, but I simply make the point that enrolments declined last year, and yet the Minister saw that he had to do rather better in terms of his election promise than simply reduce the number of teachers commensurate with the erosion in enrolments. This year that has gone out of the window. The policy said:

A Liberal Government will give proper emphasis to primary education by appointing specialist teachers in art, music, drama, foreign language and physical fitness.

I am quoting from page 2 of Mr. Allison's policy document. Let us see what is the performance, as revealed in the briefing papers. Physical education man-power in 1979-80 was 73; in 1980-81 it is 69. In educational technology, the figures are: 1979-80, 101; 1980-81, 97. For music, art and what have you, the figures are: 1979-80, 92; 1980-81, 87. For advisory and support services, they are: 1979-80, 291; 1980-81, 275. For language studies, they are: 1979-80, 11; 1980-81, 10. I am quoting from pages 214 and 216. So the story continues. I do not have time to read it all through. There has been a reduction in all the specialist services. I do not think the Minister of Transport can argue that these things are as sensitive to changes in enrolments as perhaps the classroom teaching situation is although, as I have indicated earlier, I do not accept his logic on that, anyway, nor did his colleague in the last financial year.

The policy then went on to say that a Liberal Government would give proper emphasis to primary education by appointing trained staff to diagnose and remedy problems of literacy and numeracy. This is not spelt out in specific terms in the document; it is sort of hidden, although I do not mean anything sinister by that. It is hidden in larger figures. What we see is a halving of the staff at the Reading Development Centre. Here is a Government that made a great deal about literacy and numeracy, trying to imply that there had been a considerable decline in literacy and numeracy in schools and that Mr. Hudson and I were largely responsible for it. A vote for the Liberal Party was supposed to change that. What did the Liberals do? They halved the staff at the Reading Development Centre in the one Budget.

The policy states that Liberal Governments will set realistic targets for the provision of non-contact time for teachers and the appointment of ancillary staff. That is the promise; what is the performance? First of all, I am not aware that any realistic targets have been set for non-contact time for teachers, nor were there any promises. What does a realistic target mean? Does it mean a primary

teacher should continue to get the 10 per cent non-contact time that he or she gets at the moment, which is not really a promise at all, or should it be increased to 15 per cent or closer to the 20 per cent or 25 per cent that secondary teachers currently get? We were not told; it was a meaningless commitment.

In any event, there has been no movement in this area. It is clear in terms of the figures I have already quoted that there will be no increase in non-contact time for teachers as a result of this Budget. In fact, as I speak, the dreadful thought occurs to me that to some people realistic targets for the provision of non-contact time for teachers could mean a reduction. There are people who do regard non-contact time for teachers as being quite unnecessary. I am not trying to suggest that this Budget reduces the opportunities for non-contact time. I make the point (a) that on examination the commitment turns out to be no commitment at all, a meaningless collection of words, and, (b) there has certainly been no move to do anything about non-contact time.

What about realistic targets for the appointment of ancillary staff? Again, the targets were not quantified in any way or set in any time frame. In 1979-80, ancillary staff was 2 537, and in 1980-81 it is 2 477. That is on page 212 of the briefing document. So far in the primary area, we have commitments, which in some cases are reasonably specific and in other cases are awfully vague to the reduction in class sizes particularly in the early years of primary; the appointment of specialist teachers in particular areas; trained staff to diagnose and remedy problems in literacy and numeracy; some sort of targets, which are not spelt out, about non-contact time for teachers; and appointment of ancillary staff. In every one of these areas it can be realistically argued that this Budget represents a repudiation of those commitments, such as they were.

I now turn to secondary education, where there was certainly no promise of any increased staffing as was suggested for the primary schools.

Instead, we got a grand statement of aim:

The purpose of secondary education is to build on the basic skills acquired in primary years and to enlarge the child's intellectual and other personal capacities so that he or she can respond to the challenges and opportunities of adult life.

Of course that is what it is there for, and I do not imagine anybody would disagree with that. If there is any sin there, it is one of omission rather than commission. What does the Budget do, anyway? The then Opposition in making that statement must have had something in mind. It was not just spinning out words to fill out space in the education policy was it? It must have had some sort of thing in mind. Secondary education manpower in 1979-80 was 6 717, and in 1980-81 it is 6 651. So again in this area, to the extent that one can talk about any sort of commitment to make things better, that certainly is not happening in terms of the provision of facilities nor in terms of the most important facility available to secondary schools, namely, teachers.

I wish now to turn for a moment from that to the area of teacher development, because here we see an alarming trend in this Budget. I make the point that this Government has not at any stage committed itself to be at all generous in the area of teacher development; at least I cannot find anything along those lines in any of its documents. What I do know, however, is that its friends in Canberra a year or so ago set up an inquiry to look into teacher training in this country headed by Professor Auchmuty, and the Auchmuty Report was brought down a little while ago. In the *Advertiser* of 26 September on page 3 the education writer, Sheena MacLean, has an article headlined "Study leave urged for all teachers". It

states that the Federal Government inquiry into teaching education recommends that Australia's 180 000 teachers should be allowed one term study leave every seven years. The article goes on to spell it out.

I am not sure that I agree with that recommendation. I am not sure that, without a good deal of investigation, I could commit members on this side to that, but I am prepared to say that I believe a good deal has to be done in terms of teacher development, and there is no doubt that there is capacity in the colleges of advanced education at present for that to happen, and it would partly assist the colleges in the problems that they face. What we see in terms of teacher development is that in 1979-80 release-time scholars numbered 163; in 1980-81, there are 71 release-time scholars. In the area of in-service training there were two entries, Government and non-government. I am not sure why there was a non-government entry because each section recorded nil. But that area goes down from 27 to 22. Therefore, release-time scholars and in-service training have been reduced. Whatever sort of priorities this Government has, it certainly has little in the way of teacher development when one considers the needs around the place and when one considers the capacity that is there in the C.A.E.'s to meet these particular needs.

Dr. Billard: It is still insignificant compared to 15 000 teachers.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think I am inclined to agree with that, but that is simply an argument for going in a direction opposite to that which the Minister is currently taking.

Dr. Billard: It means you can't meet the needs with that sort of system.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: You can go part of the way towards meeting the needs. I would not argue with the member for Newland that perhaps we should be looking for other ways of tackling the problem, but this Government is not doing that. If the member for Newland can show me somewhere in these Budget papers some sort of statement that the Minister has made or some inter-departmental memo that suggests the Minister has other fish to fry, well and good; I am prepared to sit down and listen to it. I am prepared to give it considerable investigation and maybe even support it, but that is not what is happening. We see a need and a capacity to meet this need, and the only mechanism at present available to the Government to meet the need is apparently being scaled down.

One of the unfortunate things about this Budget is the little petty reductions, apart from the large ones I have talked about here, which are occurring all over the place. From time to time, people ring me up with information about the reductions which are occurring, particularly in the support advisory area. Are members of this House aware of the reductions which are occurring in the Wattle Park Teachers Centre, the reductions about which the Biology Teachers Association is complaining at present? Are members aware that there was an advisory teacher position, and still is at this stage, and that that person is responsible for advising the schools on the purchase of scientific equipment? Tenders are referred to that person and in this way a good deal of money is saved schools. They make the purchase eventually with money provided by the department and they decide whether it is going to be a liebig condensor, a florence flask or whatever but, nonetheless, they get technical advice from this person. That position is to be done away with, and consultants in the biological sciences field are also to be reduced in the area which now absorbs the largest number of science enrolments at matriculation level. Whether it should be another thing. I share with the member for Newland a

passion for physics in this matter, and I would much rather see physics leading the field than biological sciences, but nonetheless it seems to be a trend at present and nobody is suggesting that biological sciences are useless. They have a great contribution to make, particularly with the environmental awareness that modern societies have.

There it is. The capacity to assist teachers in this field is being reduced because of a reduction in advisory people at the Wattle Park Teachers Centre. What about the Botanical Park and the Zoological Gardens, where education officers are either to be reduced or done away with altogether? There is to be a reduction of two. I am not sure whether it is to be at each place or one at each place. If it is two at each place, that means no education officers will be left at the Zoological Gardens and none at all at the Botanic Park. How Mr. Lothian will cope with the schools that go through the Botanic Gardens—whether he will divert some of his own staff to that purpose—I am not too sure, but it is one of those little things that gets people's backs up and it all relates to the fact that the provision which has been made in this Budget is clearly inadequate.

It became clear to me when we investigated all of this in the Committee that the only defence that the Minister really had to all of these things was that he was part of a Government that clearly had commitments in other areas and they had to take a higher priority. I invite members of the House to read very carefully pages 138 and 139. We had trotted out again the hoary old myth about the Labor Government not taking action early enough in relation to teaching training, despite the fact that Hugh Hudson from 1972 actively tried to discourage increased enrolments for C.A.E.'s, and given the fact also that the ability of a State Minister to do too much in these areas where there is Commonwealth funding is very limited indeed. We were carted through the Frozen Food Factory, through Monarto, through the Land Commission—we got all of that thrown at us again. However, what it really came down to was that the Minister was saying, "I am sorry gentlemen, but my Government's priorities are in other areas".

The Minister said (*Hansard*, page 138):

This is not an apology but a request that the Committee acknowledge the realities that education is part of an overall budgetary structure, that this Government has in fact allocated a greater amount of money toward education than any Government has previously allocated in South Australia.

That is the oldest trick in the book. Given inflation, if it had not we would be in a sorry mess, would we not? He then said that there was a 1 per cent increase in real terms. I think that he meant a decrease. I am sure that is what he said in the *Advertiser* the next day. One will remember the confusion about the statement—

Dr. Billard: It is a 1 per cent decrease within the State school system, but—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I beg your pardon: I am prepared to take the honourable member's correction on that point. It may well be a 1 per cent increase in real terms, but it certainly is not an increase for Government schools—it is at least a 1 per cent decrease, as it must be in terms of these manpower figures. However can that many salaries be lost except through a decrease in real terms in funding?

Dr. Billard: It's a per capita increase, though.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We have gone into that sufficiently to see that that is not how people see the situation, nor was it made clear before the election that that is the sort of increase the Minister was talking about. He was prepared to say last year that the Government had partly held to its commitment by increasing the number of

teachers in primary schools: that was the logic at that time. It was not simply in terms of per capita but in terms of the absolute number of teachers employed in primary schools. Now, the Government has changed its tack. This is clearly a repudiation of what was put at election time.

Dr. Billard: We talked about standards.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There was certainly no increase in standards, that is clear. Accordingly, I move the following amendment:

Leave out all words after "That" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the House of Assembly expresses its extreme concern at the attrition of resource allocation to education as revealed in the Budget papers. In particular, it regrets the lost opportunity to make real inroads into class sizes and teaching loads which is presented by the decline in enrolments, and the loss of technical expertise which is represented by the dismantling of the advisory teaching structure, for example, at the Reading Development Centre and Wattle Park Teachers Centre; and therefore agrees to the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee B, but reduces the vote "Education, \$371 980 000" by \$100. I commend the amendment to honourable members.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I want to refer to various matters that arose under the lines of the Minister of Fisheries.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought you were going to talk about those concrete tracks again.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: No, not unless the Minister is re-launching the *Joseph Verco* on concrete tracks. First, I indicate my support for the amendment moved by the member for Baudin, because it touches on some very important areas in regard to this Government's policies. The same sort of philosophy appears in many other areas.

I was a member of Estimates Committee B when the lines under the Minister of Fisheries were examined and I also sat in on much of the discussion of the Chief Secretary's lines, and I had hoped to sit in on the lines under the Minister of Marine, but we did not reach that stage. Therefore, I was able to observe the performance of the Minister in question. We know that those three Ministries are held by one and the same person. I found that the Minister's performance on that day was very poor and was not one that in any way could raise the opinions of members of the House as to the capacity that he is exhibiting in regard to those jobs. In particular, I found that, when I was questioning him about aspects of fisheries, I had no confidence whatsoever in the answers that I achieved from him on that day; I plan to refer to that in detail.

I wonder why the present Minister is, indeed, the Minister of Fisheries, or even a Minister at all. I know that, in the previous Liberal Government which existed earlier in this decade and which terminated in 1970, he had some Ministerial experience, and many people felt that he had been appointed to this Ministry in a sense as a bit of a pay-off and that, as he had been a Minister before, the Government had to let him be a Minister again. However, after watching the Minister's performance during the Estimates Committees, I do not think it was a pay-off at all; in fact, I am strongly of the opinion that the Premier has a grudge against that Minister. I believe that the Premier is penalising him and making him undergo inconvenience, suffering and uncomfotableness by making him a Minister in charge of these three portfolios. One only has to look at the events that have blown up in that Minister's face to come to that opinion.

I can almost see what must have happened when the Premier was appointing his Ministry and calling them in, one by one, to his office, first to advise them that they

were to be Ministers and, secondly, to advise them of the portfolios that they would hold. The Premier probably called in the member for Alexandra and the member for Murray together and advised them that they would both be Ministers of Environment, one being the front man and the other being the *de facto* Minister, because, in many ways, environmentalists in the South Australian community are beginning to feel that the member for Alexandra and the member for Murray are the Sidney Greenstreet and the Peter Lorre of conservation. From the evidence that we have seen this week alone, we know how they act. Nevertheless, I will not digress.

Then, the Premier called in the member for Victoria, and the grudge became apparent. The desire to inflict penalty and punishment on the member for Victoria came out when the Premier said, "I sentence you to 20 months as Chief Secretary; I sentence you to 20 months as Minister of Fisheries; and I sentence you to 20 months as Minister of Marine", but the Premier was somewhat generous because he also said that the sentences were to be served concurrently. I believe that that was ungenerous on the Premier's behalf, because the Minister had to undergo what took place in the Estimates Committee in regard to two of those portfolios.

I looked at the *Hansard* proofs of what was said on that day, and I found that the record confirmed the opinions that I held, although some editing had taken place, and that is fair enough because that is what happens in *Hansard*. All of the Minister's references to his Director as "Minister" had been edited out. That is the kind of mistake that one makes, a slip of the tongue—four times—but I accept why that was edited out. What disturbed me more than ever on that day was that the Minister really had no knowledge of his own department; he had no real understanding of what was going on.

The purpose of the Estimates Committees was to analyse and determine what is happening in the various departments, and documentation was given to us to assist with that in the form of the programme performance documents (the yellow book). In fact, as I believe the Minister agreed, the programme performance document was of no assistance whatsoever in regard to the Minister of Fisheries' lines, and the Minister effectively threw that document out the window, because he made the following comment:

... 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.

Coming as it did fairly late in the debate regarding the Ministry of Fisheries, that, in a way, took the wind out of our sails, because we had been relying on that document as having some veracity and connection with reality.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the motion for the adjournment of the House to be moved later than 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I was referring to the programme documents and to how, late in the debate, we were advised that they had little accuracy or relevance to the question of fisheries. That remark undermined the comment made by the Premier yesterday, when he was talking about that document, and he attacked the Opposition for not studying it better. We studied it thoroughly with regard to

fisheries and found many inaccuracies, which I will highlight as time goes on.

One of the things, I suppose, that it is fair to demand of a Minister and his department is at least a cursory knowledge of what has been done by that department as well as a cursory knowledge of what information is readily available. Certainly, the Minister had advisers available on the day, sitting with him in the centre of the Legislative Council, to advise him on certain matters. What tended to be the case very often was a great degree of uncertainty as to whether information could be made available. I do not know whether that was because the Minister could not decide whether he should let us have the information (in other words, make a decision as to whether he should conceal or reveal it), or whether he simply did not know whether it was possible to get it.

One of the rather frustrating experiences I had on that day was an episode of trying to ascertain what the industry liaison section of the vote represented (there has been a substantial increase to \$91 000). In the process of that investigation, the following statements were made by the Minister. First, after I had asked the question, he said, "We will have to find that out for the honourable member and advise him." That happened many times in the Committees, and I did not object to that at the time. I went on to another line and, whilst that was happening, one of the advisers to the Minister said, "That is not necessary. We have it." The Minister then said, "My officer has now indicated that he has that information." Indeed, he turned over to his officer to give that information, and some figures were given. I heard those figures and tried to have a mental picture of them and, much in the same way as I wanted to see whether the Minister's understanding of $2 + 2 = 4$ being the same as $3 + 1 = 4$ (essentially, my next question was of that nature), I put another question of clarification to him. This time, having been told the information was available and, indeed, given, I was told, "We will find out and let the honourable member know."

At that stage, I found that the whole thing was too much verbal tennis. They did not seem to have any idea at that table whether the information was available. They were deciding that one minute it was available, the next minute it was not available, and the next minute it was available. I asked the Minister, I thought reasonably, for a definitive clarification as to what was going on. We adjourned at that moment (it was not for that reason) to go to another place for a reception. On our return, the advisers to the Minister had been busily working out the figures, and the Minister said, with a degree of pride, "The Director advises me that, during the adjournment, his officers have been able to reconcile the totals." We had another attempt at an answer, and the figures were given again. What concerned me more than ever was, indeed, what that answer was. The figure was the industry liaison section of the budget. I was basically asking what the increase was to be spent for. We were told that the increase, among other things, was to pay for, *in toto*, the salary of the Director of the Department of Fisheries and the salary of the Assistant Director of the Department of Fisheries—not in part, but *in toto*.

That, I think, should be of grave concern to every member. What we are having said to us is that the line "Industry Liaison" is paying the total salary of the Director and his assistant and, therefore, we can interpret what the role of that Director and Assistant Director is by virtue of its funding section. When I, indeed, wanted to raise that point with the Minister, the first comment he made, when I asked, "Why was there total funding under this one section?" was, "There are probably reasons for

it." I should hope that there would be reasons for it—bad reasons perhaps. As it turned out, there did not seem to be a clear understanding of any reasons, but I was concerned (and I am concerned) partly because of the information that was contained in the yellow document. That was prior to the time when we were advised, in the Committee, to take it with a pinch of salt. So, I was still reading it with some degree of seriousness. At page 311 the document, referring to "Industry Liaison", says:

Liaison with fishing industry representatives has significant importance in the review and formulation of policies and regulations affecting the industries operation.

The document goes on to say:

The maintenance of effective dialogue with the Commonwealth Government . . . is important.

That is fine. We agree. It is important to have industry liaison and to have liaison with the Commonwealth Government. The word "significant" is the correct word, because it implies correct balance. What is happening by allocating the entire Director's and Assistant Director's salaries under the industry liaison section is that, indeed, that liaison is of predominant importance. It is the most significant, the major, aspect of policy determination within the Department of Fisheries. That cannot be considered in anywise a good decision. I hope that, next year, when the document is presented to us again, the Minister and the Government can see the many philosophical problems of putting those two salaries under that line, and I call on them to move them out and put them into a general area. It should be all these facets—liaison with the Commonwealth Government, liaison with other State Governments, liaison with the fishing industry, liaison with the community, the consumer, and the amateur fisherman, and liaison with other sections of the community, that should determine the policies of the department, not just one section.

That was hedged, I believe, by the Minister, and I hope that it will not be hedged in future. One of the things that highlighted again the inaccuracies of the booklet is that, while we were told that there was this big increase in funding for liaison, the manpower allocation stayed the same for two years. Presumably, the Director and the assistant do not count as people. They are mythical beings that do not appear under the manpower total. I suppose that is one of the inaccuracies to which the Minister referred.

The other area of grave concern to those of us who attended that Committee was the question of the Fishing Licences Tribunal. We remember that last year the Liberal Party promised that there would be a Fishing Licences Tribunal. It was felt that this was necessary for the community, and indeed the following policy was given out by the Liberal Party:

The tribunal will be responsible for the issue of new licences as well as for the transfer of existing licences. The tribunal shall apply the competency criteria laid down by the Government in the appropriate legislation and regulations.

Naturally, we saw the policy. It was clearly stated as a need, so, in Committee, we asked where the money, the provision, the funding for it were. The Minister, to give him his due, acknowledged that the policy had been included in the Liberal Party policy speech, but he said that there was "not a great need for it". When he was challenged on that, he repeated the sentiment and said that there was "no need at this stage". That was an odd saying, and I analysed it and challenged it. I said:

It seems that the Liberal Party perceived a need before the last election and that it now realises that the perceived need did not then exist, does not exist now, and is not likely to exist in future. Therefore, the Liberal Party has acknow-

ledged that that perceived need was inaccurate, wrong and not justified. The Minister has refused to answer the question because he perceives that there is no need now, and I accept that. The Minister is obviously going back on the commitment that was made. It is being left there in the papers so that it can perhaps be raised at some future time.

At least this prevents the Government having to say that it had to abandon a policy, which is effectively what it has done.

I believed that that was the correct interpretation, and I think members of the Committee believed that, too. I know the Minister believed it. He said "If that is the construction the honourable member wishes to put on it, it must be correct." So, the Minister acknowledges that the perceived need was not there, does not exist now, and will not exist in future; effectively, the policy is being abandoned as discreetly as possible.

That would be fine, but we cannot leave it there, because there have been changes of the powers of the Director of the Department of Fisheries with regard to licences. If everything had been as it was before, we accept that there might well not have been a need for a tribunal, but following legislation this year that situation has changed. There is now an aggregation of power within the hands of the Director of the department that does leave cause for doubt about the fairness with which licences will be applied. We now feel that there should be a need for a tribunal to help fishermen lodge their claims for help, their claims for appeal. Just at the time when, because of changed legislation, we see a need which had not been there previously, the Minister, who had a mythical need before, has now wiped it out of his mind. So, two criticisms must be made: first, the policy was abandoned; secondly, the policy was abandoned unjustifiably because of changes in circumstances brought about by that Minister.

The whole question of licences opens up another area of the operations of the department, just how efficiently that department operates, and we find that in many areas the Department of Fisheries is not coming up with the goods. It is just not operating with the efficiency we should expect. We find, for example, that scale fish licences due for renewal on 1 July this year had still not been completely issued to all the applicants by October, some months later, putting the fishermen in question in an invidious position.

In another area, the Department of Marine and Harbours, the same situation applies. Market gardeners who are wanting licences for the North Haven market which the department runs, licences which expired some time ago, for which they wanted renewals, have been told that they cannot have them yet because the department does not know what it will do. It has had to issue three-month temporary renewals. Every time I tried to get something definitive out of the department about what was happening in this regard, I got a succession of humming and haaing, and in the meantime the market gardeners are left in the same uncertain position in which many fishermen presently find themselves.

The other area that concerns us greatly is the role of the Director of the department, Mr. Stephens. It was clear that he was running the way in which that debate proceeded, albeit a very rocky way, for much of the time. He was expected to provide whatever information was asked for, and at one stage he was even asked to make a decision or a comment on policy. When I asked whether the increase in expenditure anticipated for the Department of Fisheries would be funded out of Consolidated Revenue or out of further imposts on fishermen, the Minister handed the matter to the Director to tell the Committee. A matter of that type, of how the funding is to

be raised, is not something that should have been left in the hands of the Director of the department. It is something for which the Minister should have taken the responsibility to tell the Committee.

I think we now know why the Minister on four occasions referred to the Director as "the Minister", because indeed that was a correct assessment of the real situation applying in the Fisheries Ministry. Because of that, because we are uncertain as to the real role of the Director in that department, because there is clear evidence that the Director is in fact operating as the Minister of that department and making the real decisions, because there is uncertainty about the real role that he has with regard to even the policy-making area as to who he should be regarding as his prime port of call for assistance and opinion, whether it is the fishing industry, as is implied by the line under which his job is paid for, and because of the matter of the licensing tribunal and the changed aspects of the legislation and the reversal of the Liberal Party policy, I feel that I have no option other than to move an amendment to the vote. Accordingly, I move:

To insert after the words "agreed to" the words "except that the vote Fisheries \$2 067 000 be reduced by \$100".

It is not a happy thing to have to move such an amendment, and it is not something that I do lightly, nor would any member do it lightly, because it is making serious aspersions on the capacity of a Minister in his job, and I do not want to do that lightly. I have a great deal of time for the member for Victoria, but I was not convinced on that day in Estimates Committee B that the Minister of Fisheries knew what was going on in his own department. I was not convinced that in the future he would get to know what was going on, and that next year we would have a much more stable and happy situation. Therefore, regrettably, I have to register my feeling that I do not have confidence in his capacity.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I can see regret all over your face.

Mr. Gunn: You have had such a lot of experience in the administration of the Fisheries Department. It is a pity it is not reflected in what's happened in the last 10 years.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I do regret having to move the amendment, because I do not like having to slight him in his capacity. I do not believe that he has shown that he has the capacity to run the department. The evidence is coming through from the fishing industry itself, and the member for Eyre would know that to be correct.

He would know that the response by the fishing industry over the recent months has not been a happy one concerning the way the Minister is running things. We know, from what happened in the Committee when the Minister was talking to his advisers and using his advisers, that there was a most unsound knowledge of what was going on within the department. It reminds me of a comment that was made by a colleague when the Minister was asked a question without notice by one of his own colleagues earlier this week. The Minister gave an answer (not a particularly good answer), and my colleague made the comment that the Minister could not even answer properly questions that he had in advance.

I think we would all be prepared to acknowledge that it takes a new Minister some time to get hold of his Ministry and to understand what is going on. That time should now have well and truly elapsed. If, 13 months later, a Minister can still not prove himself in charge of his department, I think it should only be fair to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia that he defer to somebody else who is more able to handle the demands of the Ministry. Therefore, I ask this House to support my amendment. I ask all members to support it with concern for the

important role that the Ministry of Fisheries has in the community; not out of any sense of personal vendetta, but for the aims, goals, the targets and the job of the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I rise to support the Chief Secretary and Minister of Fisheries. I am amazed that the member for Salisbury can stand in his place and make comments about the administration of the Fisheries Department such as those that he has made during the last 10 minutes of his speech. Having sat in this House and having been involved in the fisheries industry for over 10 years, I believe the member for Salisbury ought to lift his game; that he should go out and talk with the industry and compare the administration of this Government with what went on under the former Administration.

The facts are these: this Government took a conscious decision to separate the Fisheries Department from the Department of Agriculture, something that the industry requested and wanted. In doing that, the Government appointed a new Director, someone who had experience of the industry and its confidence and support, and it was a very popular decision to appoint Mr. Stevens. He is a person who is direct and approachable, and he knows his subject. On a recent trip that I took with the Minister of Fisheries to Eyre Peninsula he was accepted, and great praise was placed on the Minister for the selection of Mr. Stevens. Further, for years—

Mr. Keneally: He was selected by AFIC.

Mr. GUNN: That comment is a reflection on the member for Stuart. It ill behoves him to make those sorts of comments, because that is not true. I challenge him to make such comments outside the confines of this Chamber. For a long time the fishing industry has wanted some security in relation to the transferability of licences; certain people have wanted to transfer them to their sons or to other members of the family. Such persons may have wanted to leave the industry, but there was no way under the socialist doctrinaire philosophy implemented by Mr. Chatterton and written by Mrs. Chatterton. We all know who was the one making the bullets; one had only to go around the country to fishing meetings to see who was the adviser he took with him: it was his good wife. Unfortunately, she was the one who was making the policy. If the honourable member does not believe what I am saying, I suggest that he should go out and talk to the industry. I was asked by the industry on one occasion to bring that matter to the attention of this House. That is how concerned those people were about what was going on.

This Government has set out to put the fishing industry on a firm basis. There is a backlog of 10 years lack of proper administration from the top. There are some very fine officers within the Fisheries Department, but they have been frustrated by the former Government's philosophies. They have been making decisions based on philosophy and not on common sense or what is good for the industry. Their judgments were blinded, so there has been a lack of assistance to the industry and a lack of supervision. This Government has taken a positive step in that area. The Government is currently in the process of appointing nine new inspectors.

What has happened to the abalone industry? For years, people in that industry have wanted the right to have some security for their wives and families. Never again do we want to see the disgraceful spectacle such as that which occurred when Terry Emanuel was taken by a shark at Streaky Bay and his poor widow did not have the right to transfer the licence with the boat so that she could live with some dignity in this world. That is what the member

for Salisbury and his colleagues allowed to occur. Let not the member for Salisbury stand in this place and criticise this Minister, who has shown a human approach to the problems of the fishing industry.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The socialist member for Napier would not know anything about the matters that I am talking about.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think the member for Eyre should withdraw that reference. The member for Napier is the Australian Labor Party member for Napier; that is his Party identification in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for Napier was called the socialist member for Napier. I ask the member for Eyre to withdraw the phrase.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to withdraw it. I was not aware that the member for Napier was a conservative. It is simply a phrase in the English language. However, I will not allow that to deter me from what I was saying. There have been a number of people within the industry who, to all effect, have been independent fishermen but, because of the conditions that the former Government inflicted on the industry, those people had no chance whatsoever of ever obtaining a licence, even though some of them were the sons of some of the first fishermen who worked in this State. Under the humane and commonsense administration of the present Minister, those people have been allowed to obtain the right to fish under an A class licence. Previously they were fishing as remote employees.

Ever since I have been a member, I have been attending fishing meetings throughout the State, and a number of the matters that this Government has put into effect, and other matters in the pipeline, have been asked for and supported by fishing meetings right across South Australia. The attempt to move what amounts to a motion of no confidence in the Minister of Fisheries is ill conceived, is not based on fact, and is purely an attack designed and organised by the former Minister of Fisheries and his wife, who was the real power behind the throne during the previous Administration. It does the member for Salisbury's credibility little good to come in here and waffle on about a subject that he knows little or nothing about.

I suggest to him that he should go out and explain to the fishing industry why the Government of the Party of which he is a member failed to implement many of the constructive policies that the Chief Secretary and Minister of Fisheries has put into effect, policies which are long overdue. I can say to the honourable member that the chief administrative officer, the current Director of Fisheries, has, during the short time he has been in that position, administered the department with authority and fairness, and has given the sort of direction that the department has wanted for a long time. We are looking forward to a bright future in this State for the fishing industry, because it is getting guidance and the type of direction and assistance that it needs so that South Australia can benefit from it, as will the people of South Australia benefit from the wise judgments of this Liberal Government.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Prior to the dinner adjournment, the member for Eyre called me the "socialist member for Napier". As a result of an objection by the member for

Salisbury, the member for Eyre withdrew that remark and for that I am grateful. However, I would like to place on record that I am in this Parliament as a representative of the Australian Labor Party. I am proud to subscribe to socialist principles, but in no way am I to be seen as what I think the member for Eyre meant by a Socialist Party member as they are seen in this country.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may only give a personal explanation; he may not seek to indicate what he thinks another member may think of him.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am proud to be known as a person who has socialist principles, but I am in no way a member of the Socialist Party of Australia.

Mr. GUNN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was defending the manner in which the Chief Secretary, as Minister of Fisheries, in particular, speedily put into effect those overdue reforms which were part of Liberal Party policy. I suggest that the member for Salisbury give some attention to those policies, and he will be somewhat more enlightened on the subject. If the honourable member had any knowledge of the fishing industry at all, he would reflect on the Administration which preceded this Government and the way it administered that department for 10 years. He ought to be aware of the views, comments and grave concern that was then being experienced and felt by the industry. As one who has been associated with the fishing industry ever since I have been a member, and who has grown up close to a fishing village, I am appalled to think that the honourable member would come into this House and make such ill-informed comments.

It was purely an academic exercise for the member for Salisbury, who proceeded to quote from the *Hansard* record of Committee B. We all know what took place at Estimates Committee B. We had the Hon. Mr. Chatterton sitting at the back and Mrs. Chatterton writing him notes so that the member for Salisbury, and others, could put forward the line that they were adopting. The honourable member wants to lift his game and forget the philosophy from which the member for Napier is now trying to dissociate himself. I thought I was paying the member for Napier a compliment when I referred to him in a certain way, but I am terribly sorry if I have offended him.

Mr. Hemmings: Is your heart bleeding?

Mr. GUNN: I express my sympathy from the bottom of my heart to the honourable gentleman. May I say to him that, if he supports the line adopted by the member for Salisbury, he is equally as guilty of perpetrating a confidence trick on the fishing industry.

Mr. Langley: You're not saying the Minister is a good Minister?

Mr. GUNN: On one occasion, I referred to the member for Unley as a "groper", but I do not want to pursue that line. I say that the policies that this Government is putting into effect relating to the fishing industry were designed and put together after lengthy discussions with the industry. They will prove in the long term to be in the best interests of the industry and the State. I do not want to take the time of the House any further because there are other members who want to speak, but I support the policy of the Government and I believe that the member for Salisbury is ill-informed and has launched himself on this tangent without being aware of the real facts. He has not had lengthy discussions with the people in the field who know the problems associated with this matter.

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

The SPEAKER: I do not accept the request at this moment. The normal practice is that explanations are

made at the commencement of, or end of, a particular section, or at the end of a debate. I will see the honourable member at the end of the debate.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): During my speech when Committee A was being considered, I mentioned the fact that many members of the Opposition were denied the opportunity of asking a number of questions, in particular when the Committee was considering Department for Community Welfare lines. I would like to follow up a few of the areas of concern to myself and other members of that Committee. In relation to emergency relief, the Department for Community Welfare primarily provides three types of assistance through its 40-odd paying offices. There is the special assistance used in crisis situations for payment of emergency food supplies, medical assistance, overdue electricity and gas accounts, etc.; the family assistance which is used in order to maintain a family unit when there is a risk of break-down; and the special assistance used to provide assistance to persons in extreme hardship who are awaiting unemployment benefits and who have been denied a special or hardship benefit by the Department of Social Security.

I am aware that the department continues to argue for the raising of the level of income support available. However, in the 1980-81 Budget the Government has let down the department quite badly. I am alarmed at the proposed allocation for emergency financial assistance. South Australia has the highest level of unemployment in Australia, and the percentage of families affected by unemployment is increasing markedly. In 1978-79, \$556 000 was paid out for emergency assistance; in 1979-80, the amount dropped to \$404 390 in actual payments. In the 1980-81 Budget the amount proposed is only \$420 000, a mere \$15 610 extra. This, in my opinion, represents a huge cut in real terms to this type of welfare assistance. This can mean only one thing—that the poor and the needy do without. This is an unbelievable situation, particularly in times of high unemployment with families suffering severe economic difficulties, when the demands for financial assistance are becoming much greater. Yet we find that an amount of only \$15 610 extra has been provided. As a consequence, this miserable allocation will only mean that the poor get poorer.

If we look at every region listed in the Estimates of Expenditure under "Emergency Financial Assistance", we see that the actual payments in 1979-80 exceeded the amount voted in every region except two and the regions where the payments exceeded the amount voted were the regions where unemployment is greatest. I live in the central-western region, and this is one area that exceeded the allocation because unemployment in my district is very high.

A week or so ago a constituent of mine who works for M.B.P. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited, Manchester Street, Mile End, gave me a copy of a company notice which concerned the employment situation and which had been issued to all employees of that company by its General Manager. Apparently, the employees of this company have been very worried about their future employment because of the loss of a stainless steel contract that I understand has gone to Queensland. The notice is dated 9 October 1980. Headed "A notice to all employees of M.B.P. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited", it states:

Over the past few months, many changes have occurred within the organisation and rumours have run rampant. In order that every employee is made aware exactly of the situation, I detail below some of the changes and reasons for this:

1. Agricultural Division:

New export markets are currently being sought. The water handling equipment market is being promoted and expanded. A concerted effort is being made this year to regain our share of the local market Sprayer business. New products are being added to supplement the existing range, i.e. "Perfect" Mowers and Shredders.

2. Standard Stainless Steel Division:

The loss of the South Australian Housing Trust trough contract has forced a rationalisation exercise which will mean the standard sink and trough production will phase out some time before September next year.

That is the contract that I understand has now gone to Queensland. The notice continues:

The jobs of the people concerned are of utmost concern to management and, for this reason, this matter is under constant review—people are being transferred within the organisation as deemed necessary, and it is the intention of the company to retrain and relocate the employees affected.

3. Special Stainless Steel Division:

This division, due to the down-turn of building activities in South Australia, is running at an extremely low level. It is our intention to expand and revitalise this section and, by taking these steps, additional job opportunities will arise.

4. Expansion Plans:

The introduction of a third division is currently being investigated. Details cannot be released at this stage, but this expansion will mean more jobs.

The past six months have been full of changes and problems. However, these are all for the good of the company which in turn adds to the security of all of our futures. Unless we have changes which keep pace with industry requirements, we will stagnate, but by moving with the times we will secure our future.

The notice is signed by the General Manager of the company. My constituent has informed me that the work situation at M.B.P. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited is not good and the workers are worried sick about their future job security. When contracts are lost to other States, the workers become very nervous and fear for their future job security. They live in fear of having to join the growing band of unemployed and, in those circumstances, everyone loses confidence.

This is a problem that I believe the Premier and his Ministers do not understand. They do not understand the feeling that workers experience in these situations, and it would do the Premier and his Ministers good to sit down and talk with the workers, unemployed people, and people in this kind of situation who fear for their job security. If they did that, they would find out what the feelings of these people really were. I believe that neither the Premier nor any of the Ministers has experienced that situation; they do not understand what it is all about.

One pleasing recommendation in the report of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on the Delivery of Community Welfare Services in South Australia is No. 8, which refers to the department's developing an industrial access system in conjunction with industry and the trade union movement. The report states:

The committee believes that there are large numbers of migrant workers in industry, many of them women, whose problems are hidden by virtue of the fact that they are unable or unwilling to absent themselves from work to visit a district office. There is a major need for an industrial access system which will enable these workers to make contact with departmental services. The system should take the form of an industrial access worker in large factories, and employee who

is designated and approved by D.C.W., industry and the trade union, and is provided with a formal orientation about D.C.W. services. The task of the industrial access worker would be to provide information about departmental services and referral to his/her co-workers.

The recommendation is:

The committee recommends that the department develop an industrial access system in conjunction with industry and trade unions to enable workers to obtain information and gain referral to welfare services through their place of employment.

I believe that that is a step in the right direction and I hope that the department can implement it as soon as possible, because it is quite obvious that those workers whom I have mentioned and who are in fear of their future employment will be looking for these services and for what assistance they can gain through the various departments, particularly the Department for Community Welfare.

I now refer to the question of travel concessions for the unemployed. Under the former Labor Government, the Department for Community Welfare introduced, from 1 November 1978, a travel concession card scheme for unemployed persons. This scheme entitles persons in receipt of unemployment benefits and their spouses to travel at concession rates, and to have free travel between certain hours, on State Transport Authority services. During the Committee stages of this debate, I asked the Minister how many concession cards for the unemployed had been issued during 1979-80, including dependent spouses, and I also asked what were the current figures.

The Minister did not have the figures available, but he promised to provide them, and I am pleased to say that I have now received them. Travel concession cards issued to the unemployed during 1979-80, including dependent spouses, totalled 57 645, and travel concession cards issued to the unemployed, including dependent spouses, for the quarter ended 30 September 1980 totalled 24 373. The average period of unemployment, according to the Bureau of Statistics, is 29 weeks, and, if we were to multiply that quarterly figure of 24 373 by four, we would obtain a total of 97 492, which is almost double the total number of concession cards issued for the whole of 1979-80. With more and more recipients of concession cards, this figure could well grow beyond 100 000 this financial year. There is every possibility that that will occur. The figure will grow to about 97 000 if the current trend is maintained, and indications are that the trend will accelerate and that numbers will increase to over 100 000.

I also asked the Minister whether any review of the scheme was being undertaken by the department, either in relation to the concession or the hours in which the unemployed were permitted to travel free. The Minister admitted that a review was being undertaken, but he was not sure about the hours, and indicated that he would consider the matter. I hope the Government is not thinking of doing away with this scheme and, if the Minister intends to consider the question of hours for free travel for the unemployed, as he said he would, I hope that he gives every consideration to those unemployed people who have to travel in peak hour periods in search of employment.

The welfare policy is traditionally formulated for people whose support needs cannot be met through wages and salaries. Welfare must be directed to people who are temporarily or permanently outside the work force, and, as I stated during the Committee hearings, the cutbacks in certain welfare areas, particularly when the inflation rate is running at around 11 per cent, indicate quite clearly a very real change in the Government's support of welfare and its commitment to this important area.

We saw major omissions in the Federal Government's recent policy speeches, in which there was no recognition that there is serious poverty in this wealthy country. Every social indicator shows that poverty is worse now than it was when the Fraser Government came to power in 1975, and 2 000 000 people are now defined as poor. There were other omissions that are perhaps too numerous to mention, and I hope that the Federal Government's weakness in this area will not rub off too much on the State Government, which should be looking at total programmes for families, the isolated and the homeless, as well as education, health and recreation policies aimed at generating a happier, more equal and more alive society.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I hope that what I have to say will bring some interest into this debate, and I am sure that my remarks will be met with a great deal of intelligence. First, I refer to some of the remarks made by the member for Hartley, who pointed out that he opposed the new concept of dealing with these financial Bills. I could not agree more with the member for Hartley. There is no doubt that the new order (for want of another phrase) limits the opportunities for questioning by members of the House who are not members of the Committee, and a good example of that situation developed in Committee A. Admittedly, we are now dealing with Committee B, but that situation was a classic example of my allegation.

The new system successfully brought into operation the guillotine, and it also brought into question the matter of who was running the whole show—the Minister or officers of the department—and this occurred on numerous occasions. This was brought into focus by the member for Salisbury when he discussed the fisheries lines that were examined in Committee B. The member for Eyre challenged the Opposition on the basis that the industry had been involved in decision making. With very great respect to the honourable member (and I say that quite seriously), I challenge that remark tonight. I have challenged it by question to the Minister and by letter to the Minister, because I do not believe that, basically, the hard core roots of the industry have been involved in decision making.

The member for Eyre also challenged the Opposition on the basis that the member for Stuart, the member for Salisbury and I are not in contact with the industry. For his benefit, I point out that I am in constant contact with the industry, as are the member for Stuart and, I suggest, the member for Salisbury. However, I agree that the section with which I am in contact consists of the professional net fishermen in the industry, because they are in abundance in Whyalla, but those people are important.

He also talked about the role of the present Government in allowing sons and employees of fishermen to have licences. I suggest that one of the major problems in the fishing industry is that there are too many taking out and too few putting in. I would respectfully suggest that the licensed people about whom we are talking are, in many instances, owners of delicatessens, fish shops, and so on. With great respect to the member for Eyre or any other member, I question whether, as an initial step, we should not be looking into whether these sorts of people ought to have licences at all—whether they be A class or B class.

As far as the Fisheries line is concerned, I have become increasingly involved, so much so that I feel competent enough to speak on this subject at some length in the debate. I have said before, and I say again (maybe for the hundredth time), that it may be obvious to all and sundry that this industry is very fragmented. That is the very grave

difficulty that anybody in Government, including my own Party and the present Party, has in respect of this industry and the problems that must be grappled with to try to overcome the difficulties that exist within the industry. I recognise the enormous task before the current Minister to assist the industry. Each political Party has had its headaches in its various endeavours to give some easement to the problems that exist in the industry as a whole, and each Party invariably has come upon the various pitfalls that exist in the industry.

I have said that the fragmentation within the industry is probably the biggest hurdle. I have also pointed out that the fragmentation to which I refer, being as big a hurdle as it obviously is, has within its concept just as many big hurdles. The hurdle to which I refer is the make-up and the earning power of that make-up. The make-up broadly consists of professional net fishermen or scale fishermen, tuna fishermen, prawn fishermen, lobster and crayfish fishermen, and abalone divers. There may be others. Mentioning that phase of the fragmentation, I have in no way taken into consideration the amateurs, the recreational or the infamous B class fishermen. I contend that within that make-up to which I referred is a very wide income scale. I would suggest that the income ratio of a professional net fisherman is far different from that of an abalone diver or a prawn fisherman. I further suggest that both the abalone diver and the prawn fisherman have a closed shop agreement in which to work.

Having said that, I point out that in each area there are problems—probably more in the scale fishing area than in any other. Nevertheless, it appears that the announced Government policy to be initiated into the industry has a far greater impact on scale fishermen operating within the industry and depending on it for a living than it has, for example, on the prawn fishermen or the abalone diver. The fact that the abalone diver and the prawn fisherman operate in a closed shop existence is in itself a tool of less impact than that placed on the scale fisherman.

I refer to a press statement made by the then recently appointed Director of Fisheries, Mr. Stevens. The article appeared in the *Advertiser* on 28 May 1980 and was headed "Fish Industry Needs tough decision". I agree with the headline. The article states:

Some tough decisions would have to be made in the near future to ensure the continuation of the scale fishing industry.

This is the view of the State's new Director of Fisheries, Mr. Richard Stevens.

The article then goes on to say:

However, he saw the scale fish industry as the number one problem. "If we are to ensure scale fishing for future generations of recreational and commercial fishermen we are going to have to make some tough decisions, possibly within the next 12 months," he said.

At present there was insufficient information available to make proper judgments, and one of his first tasks would be to obtain as much detail as possible. Future control could involve restrictions on the type of gear used by both the amateur and the professional.

I think that that is very important, because we bring into the arena the amateur. After reading that article, I can say that I agree with the Director's attitude to the scale fishing industry. The member for Eyre does not want to get into all sorts of tantrums over the whole issue. There are areas that we can all agree upon. I have pointed out on numerous occasions that there is a variance of problems within the scale fishing arena. Within that arena exist professional net fishermen, professional anglers, B-class fishermen (both net and anglers), amateur and recreational fishermen, all with their out-take but with very little intake.

I can understand the Government's decision to tighten the existing fishing laws; laws that I would have some doubt as to their previous existence. In an article in the *Advertiser* on 27 June 1980 the Government came out with its announced policy of fishing laws in an article headed "Government tightens fishing laws". The article stated:

Tough new controls over all fishing in South Australia are planned by the State Government. Fishing areas will be zoned—

that is important as far as I am concerned, and I may have something to say about that later on—

all netting will be banned in nursery areas, and fishermen will be restricted to catching certain species. For the first time seasonal fishing may be introduced for scale fish, and the number of fishing boats operating in South Australian waters may be reduced.

I can agree with parts of that statement, but I question how we put it into operation. That is the difficulty which faced the Labor Party, when it was in Government, and now faces the Liberal Party, when it is in Government. The article went on to say:

"Responsible fishermen recognise the need for new restrictions", Mr. Stevens said. "There has been close consultation with the industry. We won't do things arbitrarily."

I have to stop at that paragraph because that is where we all fall down. I have always questioned very strongly, as I do so again tonight, whether the industry has been consulted in real terms and whether in the final analysis the Government will not do something arbitrarily. The article continued:

But in scale fishing particularly, the industry agrees that tough action will have to be taken.

I believe that that is correct. The professional fishermen to whom I have spoken all agreed that that is a fact of life, whether or not we like it. The article continued:

He warned, however, that fishermen who resisted new controls would risk losing their licenses. "We will move to suspend the licence of any fisherman who persistently abuses the law—in some cases, we will act on a second offence," Mr. Stevens said, "and we are reviewing the present level of penalties, which are not an effective deterrent. Until we get both professional and recreational fishermen to observe the law, we are wasting our time trying to protect the resource."

I could not agree more. The Minister has said to me numerous times that his department is having close consultation with the industry. As I have said previously, I am getting the message loud and clear, particularly from professional net fishermen, that no such consultation exists. I put to the Minister that the fishing council is not representative of the ordinary fishermen in the industry, and I say that with no disrespect to the people in the department or on the council. That is where the whole matter is breaking down. Rather, I suggest that the council is representing the big interests of the industry.

It is for this reason that I have pursued the possibility of, first, having the Minister accompany me on a professional net fisherman's boat to see at first hand the real problems being experienced in the industry—a possibility that appears, considering the Minister's mood, to be remote. I refer to the question I asked the Minister yesterday, when I requested him again to accompany me on a professional net fisherman's boat. I find that we are really back to square one, as regards part of the answer he gave me, namely:

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.

The Minister went on to thank me for my kind invitation. Following that offer, whilst in Committee B, I raised with the Minister the question of proposed fines within the industry. I maintain that, if a penal system is to be set up, let justice at least appear to be done within that system. I said in Committee B:

It seems to me that an anomaly exists in relation to the law enforcement system. I am not asking too much of the Minister, who could investigate the form of penalty system. I cited the example of a penalty for the one offence, and the Director pointed out later that the offence could be the taking of under-size fish. Surely, if the penalty exists so that a licence can be revoked, if a professional A class fisherman was caught catching under-size fish and his licence was revoked, obviously his whole livelihood would be taken away, whereas if a B class operator was caught taking under-size fish and had his licence revoked he would simply go back to his full-time job, and that would be the end of the matter.

Before any penal system operates, there ought to be a serious look at the anomalies that probably will exist. I was pleased at the time to hear the Director of Fisheries point out that this matter could be examined (despite what the Minister said) and he pointed out something which, in my opinion, merited consideration. He said I was suggesting that the penalty for taking under-size fish should be, say, \$200 for a class A licence holder, whereas a class B licence holder would be out. That could possibly be the solution to the problem, as far as I am concerned.

The Minister said that that would be about the limit to which one could go. I was intrigued by the statement of the member for Stuart that that would be all one would need to do. That is exactly correct. I do not believe that a class A professional fisherman would want to be caught taking under-size fish if he knew he were in danger of being fined even \$200. That would be a sufficient deterrent for him to consider this problem. On the other hand, I do not think that a class B fisherman would want his licence taken from him, and that, too, would be a deterrent. If the law was worked out on the basis of a reasonable compromise on penalty between those who depend on the industry for a living and those who do not depend on it for a living, I would see nothing wrong with the penal system.

Mr. Evans: Would you do the same with drivers' licences, the professional driver as against the casual driver?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member opens up a topic that is fairly broad, to say the least. I think he would agree that, if a professional driver (for example, a long haulier, who depended wholly and solely on driving for his living) were to lose his licence, it would be a more severe penalty on him than it would be in the case of a recreational driver who might drive up to the Hills.

Mr. Evans: Then, he ought to be more cautious in how he operates?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course. I turn now to the proposed closure of certain parts of Spencer Gulf to net fishermen, and return to the article in the *Advertiser* of 27 June, as follows:

If we don't take some corrective action now, we might as well kiss the industry goodbye. We have to take very tough measures. New laws, which give the Director wider powers to control fishing in South Australia were proclaimed yesterday. Mr. Stevens said the additional powers were vital to preserve fish stocks and prevent decline in the \$25 000 000 industry.

We are going to have to specify where people can fish,

what gear they can use, and what species they can catch. Scale fish may have to become seasonal and zoned.

I doubt very much whether there has been any real consultation between the Director and the professional net fishermen in relation to the proposed zoning laws. Mr. Stevens continues:

Certainly, there will have to be more closed areas. A heavy reduction in netting was necessary.

There is pretty heavy netting in both Spencer and St. Vincent gulfs, and it does untold damage. We need to move quickly to stop it, and we will try to protect Spencer Gulf first.

Perhaps I might get into the fisticuffs arena when I talk about untold damage. No-one has said whether the prawn fishing industry is doing untold damage to the gulf. I want simply to say that I have no objections to the conservation of fish. I do not believe that the people who depend for their living on fishing have any objection, either, to the conservation of fish. I simply point out that, with each closure that the Government makes, a cycle of events usually occurs. These cycles are based on the issue of where professional net fishermen are forced to obtain their livelihood.

In this respect, I point out, for example, that recently a problem reared its head in the Franklin Harbor area. The local council has obviously decided that, for the sake of the tourist trade, a closed netting area should be available close to Cowell. Therefore, if people wanted to go to Cowell on a holiday, an area would be set aside to enable them to fish in a recreational manner.

The area about which we are speaking is one of the biggest areas for professional net fishing in the gulf. If we are to close it simply on that basis (and this is why I have invited the Minister to come out on a professional fisherman's boat with me to have a look at the area), we will merely intensify the cycle. We will force these people out of the area that is used heavily by professional net fishermen into another area.

It seems to me that that sort of exercise is not doing the industry any good at all. We should initially look at the people who are taking from the industry and not depending on it in any shape or form. I believe now (and I believed it when the Labor Government was in office) that there should be a stronger and more penalised system in relation to the number of class B fishing licences. Despite the merry-go-round that we have been on for some years, that seems to be the point to which we should return.

Also, I believe that some professional class A licence-holders should not have their licences. I do not, and never will, believe that a professional class A licence-holder should never be on a boat or go out to fish but own a shop or delicatessen from which he controls the boat. I believe that we should be strong enough to say to that sort of person, "You will not get a professional class A fishing licence, for that reason." I hope that we get down to grappling with the real problems facing the fishing industry because, to be candid, we have not done so up until now.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I place on record my congratulations to the member for Whyalla, as he made a very important speech tonight in relation to the fishing industry. I concur wholeheartedly in everything that the honourable member said.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What did he say?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The most important thing, for the benefit of the daisy picker from Alice Springs who has returned, is that the honourable member did not believe that class A licences should be given to shop

owners and distributors. Rather, such licences should be provided to fishermen who earn their living from the sea. That was the most important thing that I heard the member for Whyalla say.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I told them about your remarks regarding my going up to Alice Springs to pick daisies.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: And I sincerely hope that they believed what I said about you.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Frankly, they had some rather unkind remarks to make.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will sit down if the Minister wants to have a chat.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader resumes his seat, he concludes his remarks.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not want to do that, Sir. However, I do at least want some respect from the daisy picker Minister who has been away for a couple of days camel riding up in the North, getting his ugly puss in the paper.

The SPEAKER: Can the Deputy Leader say to which line that comment relates?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If I knew that the Minister was going to be here annoying me tonight, I would have found a line. I can assure you of that, Sir. Nevertheless, I suppose that we can be a little frivolous tonight, as we are now getting towards the end of this long session of examining the Budget. It has certainly been long in time, but not long in essence.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You're coming to the end of the filibuster.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will have to give the honourable member for daisy picking a serve in a moment if he keeps interrupting me. It is obvious that he will get a serve before the evening is out. At least the Minister can realise tonight that I am not talking about his portfolio. So, he ought to be able to sit there and, for once in his life, behave himself. Of course, that is pretty difficult for the Minister to do. At least we should see from him some semblance of his being able to control himself and not carry on as he did on the last night that he was in this House.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Just because I set your argument back.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I heard some comments about that from members on both sides of the House. They did not think that the Minister did very well. In fact, they thought that he carried on like a child: getting wild and carrying on. There was no decorum about the Minister. I have heard all these things said about his speech, and I am prepared to accept them.

Nonetheless, I will return to the matter about which I wish to speak tonight. I know that this involves flogging a dead horse, but it relates to the guided bus-way O'Bahn system *versus* l.r.t. I do not want to enter into a technical debate about the matter, because I am not sufficiently engineering minded to concern myself with the engineering feats or the technology of the matter.

In the past few days, the member for Salisbury has easily won the debate on the technicalities of this situation, when he has debated the matter with the member for Todd. The honours have simply, without any fear of contradiction, gone to the member for Salisbury, who has made an intense study of the matter and, because of that, has a very good knowledge of the technological and mechanical aspects of both the guided bus-way O'Bahn and l.r.t. schemes.

Mr. Mathwin: He only had one ride in Cologne.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I suppose that that one ride would be 100 per cent more rides than the member for Todd has enjoyed. I had not realised that until I was

reminded of it by the member for Glenelg. That is probably why the member for Salisbury was able to win that debate hands down.

Mr. Mathwin: It proves he has had some rides.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He has had some experience in this connection and he had had experience in talking to people and making comparisons. It is clear from reading *Hansard* that the technology and the technical arguments used by the member for Salisbury have completely demolished everything that the member for Todd had to say in his speech. I think the member for Salisbury should be congratulated on assessing so much knowledge on this matter.

Whether we believe in the technology of the O'Bahn or not, I must say this about the O'Bahn system: what is planned is not really an O'Bahn system anyway, and to that extent the Government has backed away from its promises prior to the election. There can be little doubt about that question, because the small and meagre distance in the whole system that will be covered by the O'Bahn system is almost infinitesimal. In fact, there has been a back-down on the part of the Government.

The whole of the decision made regarding the O'Bahn guided busway system was a political decision and was not a decision based on factual research. There was no research done by the Government prior to the last election, although it said that there had been research undertaken. In the Estimates Committee, I think from memory that the member for Glenelg was present when the Minister freely admitted when questioned by me in relation to whether or not there was any money allocated for research (because I could not see any allocation under any line for research in this area) that of \$10 000 000 allowed under a line some of that allocation was for research.

A political decision was made to commit the State to \$48 000 000 in expenditure—that is the amount at this stage, but obviously it will increase, if for no other reason than as a result of inflation. There should have been research, especially as for other reasons the amount will probably go beyond \$60 000 000 or \$70 000 000 before the project is finally concluded. The point is that research on the O'Bahn guided busway system has not been completed. The Government has gone in with its head in the sand without knowing the full details and without knowing where it will finally come out.

As I said when I commenced my speech, this is probably flogging a dead horse—the Government is probably going to proceed whether this system is successful or not, whether or not it satisfies the citizens of the northern areas, the Government has politically persuaded itself that it cannot accept the l.r.t. system and that it needs to move into this area. From everything I have read (I have already said that I am not a technical expert in this area) in relation to the two systems from any of the experts in Adelaide, no-one has written that the guided busway O'Bahn system is the superior system. Invariably, almost every expert has stated clearly that the l.r.t. (the tramway system) is the superior system. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. One can turn to the element of cost, but at this stage I am talking about the quality of both systems.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What about the extra \$60 000 000?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There seems to be no argument about that fact. The fact is that the l.r.t. rates as No. 1 and the O'Bahn guided busway system rates as No. 2.

Mr. Mathwin: Trams are not flexible.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the Government wants to adopt the second choice and make that decision it will get

what it pays for. It will not get much for this system, because it will get \$40 000 000, \$50 000 000, or \$60 000 000 worth of system which will not work for long. Certainly, it will not be able to adequately cover the needs of the people of South Australia into the 1990's and beyond.

Also, having reached that decision, having made up its mind that the l.r.t. is the best system (and I know that the Government believes that), the Government has chosen to ignore the requirements of the people in the northern areas in the districts of Tea Tree Gully and Todd and adjacent areas and has given them a second-class service and, as a result, it is treating those people as second-class citizens. This is the point—having been able to arrive at a decision that the l.r.t. is the best system, then it should be the system provided for those first-class citizens in those districts. No, this Government wants to treat those people as second-class citizens and give them a second-class transport system that will not work.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am pleased that I have stirred members in the House. I am getting interjections from here and there.

Mr. Lewis: Not from me.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You and I are good friends, Peter. I was the only one who did not laugh at you when you asked your question this afternoon. All your own back-benchers laughed behind your back and clapped their hands and thought, "What is Peter up to now?" The member for Fisher said he did not laugh at you—he must have been upset. Nevertheless, most people laughed. Another major interesting factor that come out of the questioning in the Committee arose when I asked the Minister whether or not departmental officers were as confident as he was about the success of the O'Bahn guided busway system. The Minister's answer can be found at page 216 of *Hansard* of 2 October, and I advise members to read it if they have not already bothered to read the transcript of those Committees. The Minister told me and the Committee in no uncertain terms that there was a disagreement between the officers in the Department of Transport. He made that clear. I was going to read out his reply, but I suppose that members can find their own way to check that reference.

Mr. Mathwin: What page is it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is page 216 of *Hansard* of 2 October. The Minister said there was disagreement between departmental officers. It is evident that the Government not only in this area but in other areas of government (and I am informed about this from high places) will not take advice: this Government goes in blindly to a situation having made a political assessment for its own purposes and is unwilling to be guided by departmental officers who, after all, have the experience necessary to run a transport department.

The other thing I want to say in relation to this system is that, from the evidence that I have been able to ascertain, within the next five to eight years we will get into a serious situation in regard to petroleum products. I do not think that the Government gave this matter sufficient consideration and investigation to establish whether or not this system could carry on when the petrol shortage occurs. I do not believe that any member can dispute that there will be such a shortage of petrol products in five to eight years. One can say that these buses are convertible, and maybe they are, but conversion will cost a tremendous amount unless it is done initially. I have one last important point to make in regard to the guided bus system.

The member for Todd has had quite a lot to say about this. I was making the point before the member for Todd

came in that he lost very badly in the technical arguments and debates that have been going on with the member for Salisbury over the last few weeks. I would say that, of the 15-round bout that has been fought, the member for Todd has not yet won a round. The member for Salisbury has adequately covered every technical argument in relation to this matter. The thing that concerns me is this: what place in the world market will the O'Bahn technology take? At this stage no-one can ascertain with any certainty how much this system will be accepted in the market place. I have not heard the member for Todd say that he knows that, either.

Mr. Mathwin: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What I mean is that we do not know how popular it will be, whether it will be accepted in the world sphere or not. It is a new concept, untried, and no-one can guarantee its future at this stage, as it has not yet reached the marketplace.

Mr. Mathwin: In other words, you would still be flying around without a plane.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, that might not be true. I am not saying that it will not take its place in the marketplace, but I am saying that no-one knows whether it will make any headway in the marketplace or whether it will fall by the wayside because the technology may not be acceptable and may not work. I place the matter no higher than that, except to say that, if it does not take its place in the world market, as the Government expects it to, the Government could find itself in a very awkward situation regarding spare parts, accessories, replacements and all sorts of things that will be required to maintain these buses.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Only time will tell, and as I said earlier, this is now a *fait accompli*. The Government is proceeding with it on a political decision, not on a technical basis or in an informative way at all. The Government is proceeding with it because it was caught in a situation where it had to put some little meagre distance of O'Bahn into the thing, so that in some mild way the Government could honour the obligation that it forecast before the last election. However, no-one can say with any certainty that this system has any future in the world market or any future in South Australia. It may be that the low-cost system that the Government has opted for will in the long term be a very costly one, because there is no evidence that this particular system will stand up, and no evidence that it will serve, as it should, up to the 1990's and beyond, whereas (from the evidence I have been able to assess) the l.r.t. system would. From time to time the member for Todd has been critical of the BART system in San Francisco. He had made comparisons—

Mr. Ashenden: That is not true.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, I understand that is the situation.

Mr. Ashenden: All I said was that they had trouble, that they could not get passengers on at off peak times, and that they had to close it down because of the expense.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, that is being critical of the system. I am not attacking the member for Todd for saying it; all I am saying is that you said it. My understanding is that the BART system has had all sorts of technical difficulties and so forth and, as I understand it, at the moment they are overcoming those particular problems. They have some basis on which to overcome those problems because at least they have some back-up knowledge, whereas I do not believe the O'Bahn system has that sort of back-up knowledge that can make it a successful combination within the transport system.

I received a letter from a Mr. R. I. Jamieson (I do not

know whether other members received a similar letter or not) wherein he made some 15 or 16 points. I have no intention of reading the letter into *Hansard* because it is too long, but I compliment Mr. Jamieson for his very thoughtful letter. It seemed to me that the points that he raised have some merit. He was critical not only of the l.r.t. system but he was also critical of the guided busway O'Bahn system as well. So, he was not out to score political points from either Party in this particular arena, but he was making what I thought was a fairly well examined criticism of both systems. The interesting thing that Mr. Jamieson had to say (and this is something that I must admit I had not thought of in the past) is that he suggested that in an area where there is to be a lot of money spent on capital works projects (and at the moment I am unable to say what he means by a lot of money, but if we are talking about some millions of dollars of the public purse I guess that is a lot of money) there ought to be a public referendum on these projects as to how much money should be spent and so forth. Mr. Jamieson cited the Swedish system and mentioned Switzerland and said that public referendums were held on most matters in those places. It may be that, if the Government gave more consideration to the effect on people of the spending of the public purse, it would find by a referendum that the people in the community may be thinking completely differently from what we are thinking here or from what the specialists who recommend to the Government are thinking. I mention this for the present Government and future Governments to give some consideration to.

I turn now to the Committee that dealt with agriculture. I thought that was an extremely interesting Committee. As I have not had very much experience in the agricultural area, I was prepared to be guided by my good friend, the member for Salisbury. I think that all members on that Committee applied themselves fairly well in trying to find out from the Minister exactly what was happening within his portfolio. However, I, and Opposition members of the Committee found that it was a very difficult situation. In an attempt to find out from the Minister just what was happening in relation to overseas visits in connection with that department, the member for Salisbury found that he was unable to break the Minister in providing any information in relation to what was happening in regard to relationships with China. I want to place on record the actual questioning by the member for Salisbury. He asked the Minister the following question:

Can the Minister say "Yes" or "No" as to whether his department, the Overseas Projects Division, his Ministerial staff, or he has done any work on the possibility of a project between this Government and the Chinese Government?

The Minister (the Hon. W. E. Chapman) replied:

The answer is "No".

The member for Salisbury asked:

Does the Minister, therefore, say that he has made no submission to Cabinet on this matter?

The Minister replied as follows:

In relation to Cabinet, "No".

They are pretty clear and specific answers to a member who is entitled to receive truthful information from a Minister who was there for the purpose of answering questions, to provide information to a member, who, in this instance, wanted to know what the relationship was in regard to any sort of projects between this country and China. The Minister also said that the member for Salisbury never mentioned at any stage a sister relationship. That was the excuse the Minister finally used to try and vindicate his previous answers.

Over the lunch period the Minister changed his mind. We persisted with the questioning after the lunch break, as

the *Hansard* record shows. To my question relating to what was happening with the project in China, the Minister of Agriculture replied:

I understand that the Deputy Leader seeks further information from me, and that he wants me to tell him what I put to Cabinet relating to agricultural co-operation with China.

I said:

That is right.

The Minister then said:

As I have indicated to the Committee, I have raised that subject in the form of a proposal to Cabinet.

That information from the Minister of Agriculture took at least 40 minutes to extract with direct questioning from the member for Salisbury before lunch. Now, whether the Minister had a lapse of memory during that period before lunch, or whether he had decided it was about time he came clean, or whether his officers got to him at lunchtime and said, "You are telling lies to the Committee"—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the honourable member should impute that the Minister was telling lies.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was not using that word in the context that I said it but in the context that the Minister's officers were telling the Minister he was telling lies. If you, Sir, want me to withdraw my remark, I will.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that it would be better if he used a different phrase.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Perhaps the departmental officers suggested to the Minister that members of the Opposition knew more than he thought they knew and that he had better unravel the untruths he had told, because, clearly, the Minister had a change of face following the lunch break. I do not care who the Minister is, whether he be Liberal or Labor, he ought to have sufficient knowledge of his department to know what proposals he puts to Cabinet, at least. I do not expect any Minister, or any man, to remember everything he does, but a submission to Cabinet is one of the most important things that a Minister does; in my view it is the most important, because he has to be sure of his ground in the first place and has to have something to say, or Cabinet will carve him up when he tries to induce Cabinet to accept his recommendation.

It does not ring true to me that the Minister was not trying to evade the questions from the member for Salisbury. But for what reason was he trying to evade those questions? Was he ashamed of the fact that Cabinet had rejected his proposals? Was he ashamed of the fact that he had not been able to pull it off? Was he ashamed of the fact that he had not done his homework on this particular matter and Cabinet had sent it back, because in the afternoon we were able to establish that the decision had not finally been made? That is what we were told, but we are not sure whether the Minister has now told us all we want to know about the China project.

In normal circumstances, I would commend the Minister for putting up a proposition to co-operate in this area with any country, but more particularly with Asian countries, because I believe that that is where the future lies. There is no greater country at the moment than China that we could be doing business with and trying to teach our dry-land farming techniques to. In my view, in the next five or 10 years China will be one of the great purchasing countries of the world. It has a modernisation programme which has been underway for some four or five years, and already there is tremendous progress in that area. That country has lots of arid land, as we have in this country, and our expertise can be sold to China,

without any doubt. I cannot understand, if the Minister has put this proposition in a proper way, why Cabinet has not decided to accept that proposition. I want to go on record as saying that, whatever the situation is, I hope that Cabinet accepts the proposal in future.

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

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. O'NEILL: Estimates Committee B was a rather frustrating experience. One of the things that confused me, with due respect to the Minister concerned, was the consideration of Estimates relating to the Department for the Environment. It was rather difficult to elicit concrete answers during that debate. For instance, in his opening remarks the Minister referred to the Department for the Environment as a "diverse organisation". He said that it is a wide portfolio. He then called on one of his officers to answer a question put to him by a member of the Government, and that officer said that the department was a small department and did not have a computer or the high level resources normally associated with large departments. That was symptomatic of the whole exercise—there were conflicting responses to questions.

It was difficult to get any tangible evidence of what was happening in respect of expenditure from the Minister. My observations of the other Committee led me to a similar conclusion. Having waited patiently for some considerable time in the light of the Chairman's decision about asking questions, when I finally got up, and in an effort to expedite the proceedings of the Committee, I decided to forgo a number of my prepared questions because I considered that, in part, responses had been given. I concluded that the rejoinder from the Chairman would be that the Minister had answered the question and I could check the *Hansard* record. In the course of the questions and answers a number of other questions arose. One matter which concerned me related to remarks the Minister's officer made about Landsat, the use to which that facility would be put, the information that could be elicited, and the co-operation that was going on between the Commonwealth and State Governments.

However, I could not get a question in, and to me it was important, because it relates very much to the environment and has to do with the land in the metropolitan area which has been committed to paved surfaces and which is acting as a giant heat collector. I would have liked to ask the Minister whether it was possible, in view of the money being spent on this co-operative exercise, to elicit information on the effect of these huge areas, in the main shopping centre car parks that are bituminised, on the ambient temperature in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and the consequent cost that might accrue to the State in respect of providing air-conditioning and cooling to cope with the increased temperatures being generated in the metropolitan area.

I also would have liked to ask whether it would be a much wiser proposition to look at another system of providing car parking on grassed areas, using some kind of paving, of which a number of types are available and which would allow for a system of providing open space for parking without turning Adelaide into a giant solar heater. However, I did not get an opportunity to ask that question. I did ask a question in respect of coast protection and was rather surprised at the answer, because I think that one of the things we should be aware of is that, especially as the Redcliff project may now not proceed,

whether Redcliff goes ahead or not, hydrocarbon solids will be brought down—

Mr. Lewis: Not coal: liquids, you mean.

Mr. O'NEILL: The hydrocarbon solids in liquid form will come down from the interior. I will not take the point on the member for Mallee. He is very upset because, during the dinner adjournment, I beat him at snooker and he took it badly. There will be a pipeline from the gas and oil fields in the interior to the Stanvac refinery, and one of the alternative routes is a pipeline under the sea. Members on the Government side may think that this is a rather jocular matter but I do not, because I have done some reading on the impact of oil leakages on the coastal environment.

Therefore, with due seriousness, I asked a question of the Minister in respect of any funds that may have been committed to carry out an environmental impact study on the coastal environment of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. We have often been told how the Liberal Party, through its representation in Parliament, now controls the coastline of the metropolitan area, with the exception of that area of Semaphore that is represented by an Independent who belongs to no Party. Nevertheless, the Liberal Party is proud of the claim that it controls the whole coastline.

I should have thought members of the Liberal Party would be showing more concern for the possible dangers inherent in a pipeline under the sea running down the full length of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I asked the question, and the Minister told me he would refer it to the Director of his department. Here we can see the value of having these peak public servants along with their Ministers to give direct and succinct answers to questions. The Director stated:

The department has not devoted any specific funds to that assessment but it is well aware of that proposal.

I assume that, being interested in the environment, the department must also be aware of the hazards inherent. The Director went on to say:

It would normally carry out that assessment within the funds voted to the Projects and Assessments Division. The second part of the question related, I think, to the dangers foreseen and that would be the possibility of rupture and leakage of the contents of the pipeline and the necessary contingencies arrangement that would have to be made to contain such a spill.

That is correct: it did relate to that. However, that was the end of the answer in respect of that. Then I asked:

Can the Minister say what amount would be necessary to carry out a study of sufficient magnitude to alert the Government to the dangers?

Again, the Minister referred the question to the Director, who said:

Without giving the amount in money terms, it would be about two or three man-weeks of work.

I got an answer from the Minister and I thank him for it. The answer was:

It is estimated that the study would involve three man-weeks of work, costing \$2 500, allowing for overheads, operating expenses, supervision, etc.

We have heard a lot about the VISA promotion and the importance of attracting tourism to South Australia. One of the most attractive assets in our metropolitan area is our broad beaches and the long stretches of sand and, to a lesser extent, some geological features farther down the coast. With the possibility of an under-sea pipeline carrying hydrocarbon fluids from the hinterland right past these places, the Government is going to invest \$2 500 in an ecological study or an environmental impact study.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: An environmental impact assessment.

Mr. O'NEILL: Yes, an environmental impact assessment. It is interesting to note some of the effects that occur from ruptures of pipelines, spillages from tankers, or whatever any introduction of oil into the marine environment has deleterious effects on that environment and on the communities of plants and animals living there. Oil is a conspicuous pollutant, and in particular, it has a dramatic effect on sea birds. Although long-term effects of sub-lethal concentrations of oil are not as dramatic as massive mortalities, the results may affect the survival of an important species, or alter the balance in the food chain.

That is one of the problems. The dangers to marine life are also a problem that we have to consider, in view of all the trouble that the fishing industry is having in this State since the present Government has come to office. We have this problem that has accrued, and earlier today the attention of the House was drawn to the fact that we do not even have a survey vessel in that department now, because this Government has sunk the thing and could not lift it off the bottom. There are dangers to the physical environment, in as much as the sandy beaches of which we are so proud and which we promote to attract tourists stand in danger, as has been the case in the United Kingdom and in other areas, of being ruined.

Mr. Randall: Where?

Mr. O'NEILL: The member for Henley Beach has suddenly woken up and realised that, if the Government allows a pipeline to go under the sea past his district, he may be in big trouble if that pipeline ruptures in future. He is already in trouble, as evidenced by the vote last Saturday, and, by the time the pipeline is completed, it is not likely that he will be around to have to worry about it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: They are all coming in now, because they have suddenly realised that there is a threat on the horizon to the seaboard districts. The beaches could be covered in oil pollutants if the pipeline ruptures, and if members opposite know anything about pipelines, they will know that under-sea pipelines involve high technology, and there is no guarantee, even as a result of high technology, that there will be no accidents. In fact, the situation was so serious that, some time ago, the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation carried out an investigation that will do nothing to cheer up the members who live on the seaboard. There is a lack of knowledge of the dangers inherent in the introduction of mineral oils into a coastal environment.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: Members should not shout across the House at me: they should thank me for having drawn their attention to this matter, but, in the main, they are preoccupied with denigrating members on this side. They rely on the fact that they seem to have been successful in adopting a totally negative approach to gaining Government. It is time they started to look constructively at the real dangers that confront the seaboard districts. Members of the Labor Party may be lucky to have a slight recess from representing those areas, because, if the oil companies are successful in inducing the Government to allow the line to go under the sea, it may be of marginal benefit to us that the electors of these seaside districts will find out that their members knew nothing about the prospect until tonight; those members have now become alive to the facts, but they are being critical instead of thankful. If they are quiet, I will explain that not only is there a hazard to their districts as a result of the projected

under-sea pipeline that will carry oil along the coast but another danger is involved, which was ignored by the Department for the Environment.

Mr. Lewis: There's not going to be one. It's like the 3 per cent education cuts that you were bleating about early this year. They didn't happen; they were never planned. You read this garbage to your constituents and expect them to believe it as gospel.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We will have one speech at a time.

Mr. O'NEILL: I appreciate that interjections are not allowed and that it is inadvisable for members to respond to them. I have already explained why the member for Mallee is being so vitriolic in his attacks on me. This matter is serious, yet members opposite are trying to turn it into a farce. There is a real danger that the seaside environment in metropolitan Adelaide will be polluted. There have been great upheavals in other countries and, indeed, in other States, when under-sea pipelines have been projected and, despite the fact that the industry claims that there are few spillages, it takes only really large spillages to create havoc at the seaside, and it takes a long time for the coastal environment to recover.

The problem is that the Ministers, during the Committee proceedings, pretended that they knew a lot about everything, but they would not tell us too much about what they intimated that they knew. There are three options, to the best of my knowledge, for transporting the hydrocarbon fluids from the field to the Stanvac oil refinery. The cheapest option for the companies (provided the Liberal Government lets them get away with it and does not put too many restrictions on them) is an under-sea pipeline. If the pipeline comes down through the metropolitan area, land resumption will be involved, and this will be very costly; if a route is taken behind the Mount Lofty Range, it will be more costly, because there will be more distance to traverse and land resumptions will also be involved. The latter concept would be slightly less costly, but the cost of laying the pipeline over that distance would be greater.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: I know a little bit about it, and the Minister can shout that it is not on. I will be happy if the pipeline is not constructed, and I will bet that those members who represent seaside districts will also be happy, because, when their constituents find out that there is a possibility that a pipeline will run alongside the coast, a few yards off shore, and when they become aware of the dangers inherent in this type of transportation of oil, they will become very worried. Those members representing seaside districts will probably draw great comfort from the Minister's denial that such a project will take a place.

I also asked the Minister a question about the sum set aside by the Department for the Environment to investigate the dangers that may accrue from the establishment of a uranium treatment plant in any coastal area of South Australia, and I asked what studies had been undertaken. Again, the Minister referred the matter to the Director, who stated:

The investigations into the environmental impact of the uranium enrichment plant are being carried out in two stages. As the proposal is only in the feasibility consideration stage, no specific assessment of any site has been carried out, although an assessment of the technology has been carried out by the department in the last year. No money or time has, therefore, been allocated to complete that study, since it is over. However, there is an allocation, again, within the general manpower planning of the Projects and Assessments Division for updating that study during the following year. That work is being carried out by two officers and, again,

would probably involve three to four man weeks, amounting to about \$5 000 or \$6 000 expenditure for this year.

This Government intends to take us into the very dangerous area of uranium treatment and it proposes to spend \$5 000 or \$6 000 on an environmental impact study to assess the dangers of the uranium mining and treatment plant. That sum would probably not pay for the cost for the visit of the Minister of Industrial Affairs to Alice Springs in the past couple of days. In the *Advertiser* of 15 November 1979, in respect to uranium mining and development, the Deputy Premier stated:

It cannot proceed until the Government is completely satisfied it is absolutely safe to do so.

The Government will spend \$5 000 or \$6 000 to make that assessment. It is absolutely amazing what these people will try to put over.

The other matter that I should draw to the attention of the House in the light of that statement by the Minister is that the Deputy Premier said that the matter would not proceed until it was absolutely safe. I now have a letter to which I referred last night. It was addressed by the Premier to the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council on 5 May 1980. The last paragraph stated:

However, it is unknown whether an absolutely safe level of radiation exposure exists. For practical purposes and philosophy [of the Liberal Party] is to maintain all exposures at levels which are as low as is reasonably achievable, economic and social factors being taken into account.

The social factors, of course, are as the Liberal Party sees them, and there we have it. On the one hand the Deputy Premier says that we will not proceed until the situation is shown to be absolutely safe. The Premier says that it can never be shown to be safe, and the Government has allocated \$5 000 or \$6 000 to assess the impact on the South Australian environment. It is an absolute disgrace: it is a farce that we have people here who are supposed to be representing the interests of the people of this State but who are racing headlong into an industry which, as is well known, is fraught with danger.

I have a document which sets out the accidents that have occurred since the early 1950's up until the late 1970's and more material in relation to the dangers in 1980. We know that the Deputy Premier, the man who has said that we will not proceed with this operation until it is absolutely safe, is currently in Britain. He says that the industry in Britain has the best safety record in the world over a long period. I would not argue about that. It may have the best safety record in the world but, if it does, the worst must be pretty terrible.

I will not bore the House by reading the list, but in October 1957 there was a fire in Windscale No. 1 plant which released radio-activity over the area of Westmoreland and Cumberland; in 1963 there was a failure at the Calder Hill reactor; and in 1964 there was a leak of radioactive waste at the Windscale plant. This is only in Britain, which I will accept as having the best safety record. I suggest that we put the word "best" in inverted commas, because there is a catalogue of potential disasters in respect of the uranium and nuclear industry.

I also have material in relation to the dangers to which I referred last night in another matter, of low yield radio-activity which has been shown in the United States to have precipitated carcinogenic effects on people who have worked in the industry, whether they be miners, process workers, white collar workers or whatever. If they have been in the industry, they are at risk. As I said yesterday, it is more frightening than the circumstances that relate to the asbestos industry, which we now know was disastrous in terms of human life. We are in a situation where the lives of South Australians are at stake, and the

Department for the Environment has allocated \$5 000 or \$6 000 to carry out a study that will last for two or three man-weeks. It is disgraceful, and it is a public scandal that should be looked into. The Deputy Premier is overseas at the moment trying to bring industries of that nature into South Australia. The Premier is always bragging about the Roxby Downs development and what it is going to do for South Australia—

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

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Some members will be pleased to hear that I am the last in a long line of distinguished Opposition speakers. I must congratulate my next-door neighbour and colleague from Florey on his excellent contribution. When I put a Question on Notice to the Premier last year asking for an unreserved assurance that there would be no nuclear development plant of any kind in the District of Playford, he was unable to give me that assurance. That worried me greatly, because anybody representing areas in the north or north-eastern suburbs, as do members like the member for Florey, Todd, Newland and Playford, are very conscious of the fact that there are large areas of land adjacent to the abattoirs and to the Parafield airport in which developers might well have a keen interest. I was very worried when I was unable to get a simple assurance like that. However, it is not on that topic that I propose to talk at any length tonight.

First, I want to say one or two things about the observations of the Premier last night as to the fundamental workings of the Estimates Committees, and then to go on to the question of the Correctional Services line, as I do not believe that there has been much said so far in this debate concerning the law and order issue, which was the second major point of the Liberal Party's policy at the last election.

Last night the Premier took issue with what the Leader of the Opposition had to say concerning the working of the Committees. I do not want to repeat either what I said or what the Leader said about the matter. The Premier stated what he saw to be the real benefit of the Estimates Committees as follows:

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.

In order to put that matter into perspective, we have to go back to the policy as outlined by the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, on 26 September 1978, on page 1161 of *Hansard*. That was a speech which time and time again I have referred to as the best speech I have heard the now Premier make and in which he quite literally took the bull by the horns and, instead of being negative about the whole matter, proposed a whole new system of looking at the Budget. I want to highlight his observations and, when I have done so, members who read my remarks will be able to see why there were problems in some Committees (and it was only in some Committees and with some Ministers, as I stated in my observations previously). The Premier stated:

In more detail, the proposals are as follows:

Budget and Estimates Committees: The Committee consideration of the Budget and Loan Estimates should be extended for a period of three weeks, or longer, and be divided between three Budget and Estimates Committees each of, say, nine members and set up for that specific purpose. Each Committee would examine a specified area of

Ministerial responsibility, following the same procedure as that adopted by Select Committees, and would report back to the Parliament when its inquiries were complete, so that its findings could be debated. Not only Ministers [and I stress this] but also departmental heads and officers should be required to attend and answer queries directed by members, as is done, for example, in the Senate Committees on the Federal Budget.

Let us analyse that statement, because that was a crucial part of the then Opposition's platform that it put to the community and, because it has a mandate, I am bound to say that, quite apart from the basically favourable view which I take of that suggestion, anyway, the community must have adopted the same attitude. There have been some changes of thinking, and that was the argument I put when I dealt in my address with Estimates Committee A. I point out what the changes are: so far as time is concerned, I do not carp about that. Frankly, I think that one of the problems has been that we have tackled it the wrong way; one only learns by experience.

You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my view of these Committees and their works has been very favourable. I found that it was only because certain Ministers had not adjusted, were not prepared to adjust, or were frightened to adjust to the new circumstances (and members were in the same circumstances) that difficulties arose. My only other complaint related to one or two rulings given in the course of those Committees. I was not reflecting on the Chair in so doing. The Deputy Speaker was not the person to whom I was referring. What really has happened is that we have tended to put the cart before the horse. As I always understood what the now Premier was saying was that you could not have an informed debate on the Budget until you knew what the Budget was all about. It seems silly to spend two weeks discussing in general philosophical terms, as we did, what the Budget is all about, before knowing what it really is. It seems to me that there should be a much more abbreviated hearing, and I am speaking now purely as an individual and certainly not expressing a majority view.

My personal view is that the first part of the debate should be limited to, say, one week, in which there are restricted times, when one would tackle the broad philosophies of Government, and then proceed to the Estimates Committees. I do not carp at the fact that there are not three Estimates Committees, because obviously you have to proceed slowly, and we have had enough teething difficulties with two Estimates Committees, let alone three. There are staff problems and other problems as well. However, the programme, as we understood it, was based on what we recall, and I could recall it vividly, as being the best speech which the present Leader of the Government ever made in the House, when he said that not only Ministers but also departmental heads and officers should be required to attend and answer queries directed by members. I fully appreciate that those queries should be matters going only to fact.

It would be wrong (and I would not tolerate it myself, should I be a Minister) that departmental officers should be subjected to controversies over policy. Regarding matters of fact, I do not think that any departmental head worth his salt, or any senior officer, would be in the least worried about questioning as to matters of fact because, obviously, he is dealing with these matters of fact day by day. He has people to help him and, before he comes along to the Committee, he will bone up on his material, just as any other witness would before any other committee. I think it was that which in certain circumstances produced a real break-down, a situation of mistrust that must be remedied. I do not know who was

the Minister or group of Ministers (obviously, I can only guess about this) who reversed the line of thinking. Clearly, up to a point that was close to the opening of the Estimates Committees, the Premier was still pursuing his general line of thought as he had expounded it on 26 September 1978; the famous guidelines had been espoused. There was no need for those guidelines unless the Premier's basic theory and philosophy as espoused on that day in this House (indeed, one seat in front of me, and I can vividly recall it) were going to be implemented.

Suddenly, we had a *volte face*. I am prepared to take a calculated and shrewd guess and say that the Minister who I think was most likely involved in this change of direction was the Attorney-General. I say that, because of his display when appearing before Estimates Committee A in this House. I link that remark to Committee B purely in broad conceptual terms. I do not intend to refer to what he said, or what we discussed. It was his attitude; not once throughout the entire day (and we spent a day with him) did one departmental officer say a word. Time and again, the Attorney said, "I will answer the questions." He continued to repeat that prerogative, yet it does not square up with what the Premier said such a short time ago, and with what the Premier, I think on all indicators, intended to do until a short time before these Committees.

I think that the Attorney-General and perhaps other Ministers who adopted a similar approach got cold feet at the last moment. Why they should have, is totally beyond me. The Attorney-General, of all people, probably had the most able group of advisers surrounding him. I recall that, at the opening of the proceedings, we have the Master of the Supreme Court and a galaxy of talent from the Crown Law Office, the Solicitor-General's Department, the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, etc., all highly qualified and highly paid people. It was a real day of the stars, if you like.

Other Ministers did not experience the same difficulties. They came out of it much better. I think that the Attorney-General created his own problems. As I pointed out the other day, I think that the Minister of Water Resources was the Minister who probably impressed most, simply because he adopted a straightforward approach. He demonstrated that his officers trusted him and that he trusted his officers. There was no difficulty. His officers dealt with matters of fact, and he with matters of policy. I was physically present in the Chamber for a while, and later spent most of the afternoon listening to the proceedings down in this Chamber from my room, and it seemed to me that everything went as well as one could hope for.

Yet, the Opposition's problems were caused in almost every circumstance, apart from the rulings from the Chair and the disputes and debates about that (which, again, were teething problems), by this collision, where the Opposition wanted simply to do what the Premier had offered. So, in reply to what the Premier said last night, I refer him back to his original philosophy. I also urge the Premier to make sure that he is not overridden by his junior Ministers (or any of his Ministers for that matter), that he calls upon their loyalty, and that next year he faces up with the same confidence that he displayed two years ago and makes sure that we get into that situation.

I have had some small experience in the Chair and know from the Chairman's point of view that it would make it much easier, too. If we are clear that members have a right to ask officers about matters of fact and to ask Ministers about matters of policy, there is no difficulty, and we do not have to go through the foolishness that was displayed on some occasions. However, that is enough about that topic. I have already said more than I first intended to say,

and I hope that some account is taken of it.

The Premier did say one thing that alarmed me, namely, that, while he had not made a final decision, he certainly had been impressed by the suggestion that the proceedings of the Estimates Committees be removed from the two Chambers of the House. I am not impressed by that suggestion one little bit. I believe that, if the system is going to work (and I think that it can work), it should be in the principal Chambers of the House, if we are to have two Committees, where people know they can go to see and hear what is happening. On that note, I will finish my general remarks about the Estimates Committees, which I thought I had already done. However, I was triggered off again by what the Premier said last night.

I turn now, on the arrival of the Chief Secretary, to Estimates Committee B. I did not want to speak in the absence of the Chief Secretary regarding matters of policy. However, now that the Chief Secretary has arrived in the Chamber I should like to say one or two things. First, I hope that the Chief Secretary has since 7 October been checking as to the elevation of crime in this State in the past 12 months, because he will well recall, as his colleagues do, that law and order was the second principal plank after the provision of employment in the general programme of the South Australian Liberal Party in September 1979.

We know that the promise of employment has failed, and we now have a right to know what has happened as to the promise regarding law and order. On the occasion that the Chief Secretary was giving evidence before Committee B, he adopted the practice (and all credit to him) of asking his senior officer in this area, namely, the Police Commissioner, to deal with it. I must confess that I was very surprised (and I refer to page 262 of *Hansard*) when the Police Commissioner, Mr. Draper, in reply to a question that I had asked regarding the percentage escalation of crime in this State, and about comparisons with other States, said:

I cannot answer that question at this stage. I certainly cannot give any information on the difference in increase, if there is an increase, between South Australia and other States. Concerning whether the crime rate has increased in South Australia in the past 12 months, the answer is in the affirmative, yes. As to the exact per cent of increase, I cannot say, without reference to criminal statistics which are available at headquarters.

I asked whether the information could be obtained, in reply to which the Minister said that it could. I know that the Minister will be collecting that material for me, and I will be interested to see what it discloses. I say again now that the Minister is present (I have already said it a couple of times in debate on various matters) that I cannot understand why the Government of which he is a member continues to push away the genuine offer by the Opposition to depoliticise the whole area of law and order.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: But you're not doing that. It sticks out like a pikestaff that you have tongue in cheek when you say that.

Mr. McRAE: I have not got any tongue in any cheek. I assure the Chief Secretary that, by a majority decision of Caucus, I was authorised to move the motion that stands again in my name on the Notice Paper. I have no doubt whatsoever that a majority Caucus decision would permit the depoliticisation of the law and order situation in this State.

I do not believe that the Liberal Party or the Labor Party wants to arise in South Australia the situation that has arisen in the Eastern States, where Governments and Oppositions of each political persuasion continually beat each other over the head in relation to crime statistics,

uproar in the gaols and prisons, and other areas. That is disgraceful.

I do not speak insincerely, as I have told the honourable gentleman time and time again that I am not suggesting that the troubles that he is encountering are of his own making. I am saying that they have been there for generations. Indeed, they have been there under the Corcoran, Dunstan, Hall, Walsh, and Playford Administrations, and probably before that, too, and that covers a pretty long stretch of time. If I have never made myself clear before, let me do so now.

I believe that all the problems about which we have been speaking have been present during all the Administrations to which I have referred. I do not for the life of me see why all these problems should be loaded on the shoulders of any one man or any one political Party. Nothing will be gained by doing that.

I refer to the ordinary rank-and-file members of my sub-branch in the north-eastern suburbs. As the honourable gentleman knows from cases that I have referred to him, these people live in suburbs where, regrettably, horrible offences are committed, and those offences have occurred under both Liberal and Labor Governments. The honourable gentleman will understand that the members of my sub-branch got very upset indeed by suggestions made in certain advertisements that were obviously inserted by supporters of the Liberal Party. I am not saying that the honourable gentleman authorised the insertion of those advertisements or that he believed that this was a good thing. The Minister shakes his head, and I accept that, out of hand. I would not doubt his word for a moment.

Nonetheless, let the Minister see my point of view. The members of my sub-branch were upset indeed at such a thing, and they now call on me to do something positive about it. What I have been putting for the past 15 months I again assert tonight. Let the political Parties grab the bull by the horns, like the Premier did with the Estimates Committees.

Before the honourable gentleman arrived I had been speaking about the Estimates Committees and what the present Premier had done about them two years ago. The political Parties ought to be sufficiently grown up to grapple with this problem by depoliticising it, although I may be wrong. No one person or group has the repository of wisdom. However, it seems to me that the only way that we can depoliticise the situation is to appoint a Select Committee of this Parliament. That is why in the motion standing in my name (under the authority of the Labor Caucus) I requested a Select Committee.

I cannot understand why that has not been acceded to because, if it was, there is one area of law and order where the Minister could truly say that the result, whatever it might be, coming from the Select Committee was a non-political result. If it was for good, let the credit fall on all sides, and if it was for ill, let the blame fall on all sides. Equally, it can be so with a whole range of other areas. I know at times in this area I become somewhat irate and perhaps even savage because of the explanation that I have given tonight, but it is an understandable one, I think, in view of what the Minister has learnt since he has taken office in this area as to what goes on in some suburbs.

Because of the attitude of my sub-branch and those people who support me in the electorate, and because of the advertisements that appeared prior to the last election, I believe that my anger on this matter was justifiable, but I would drop it immediately if the Government would make a *bona fide* offer to appoint a Select Committee of this Parliament because, surely, of all things, law and order in

the street is the one prerogative that the decent citizen is entitled to. To me, that is the most obvious political fact of all. If one cannot agree on that, then only anarchy is left, and there is no-one in this Parliament who is an anarchist.

In the very little time left I should like to again ask the Minister to please think again on this matter, especially in the light of what I have said tonight and put it to Cabinet because I am not speaking insincerely or with tongue in cheek. The last comment that I want to make is not a challenge in connection with a ruling of the member for Goyder, who was Chairman of Estimates Committee B (of course, I must not challenge a ruling): it is simply a comment. It is a somewhat historic ruling, and one that has certainly evoked much discussion in the community. I believe that one of his senior colleagues in another place (the Hon. R. C. DeGaris) who circulates a well known broadsheet which I see from time to time and of which I am a recipient from time to time, commented recently on it. It appears that there will be an interesting situation when conceivably this matter is discussed in another place and the President of the Council has to consider the very matter that the member for Goyder in his then role of Chairman of Estimates Committee B had to consider.

I wonder whether the same conclusion will be reached. I am not saying that the honourable member was wrong or that the President was wrong, but I do foresee that it will be interesting if the President reaches a different conclusion, because then we would have a kind of jurisprudential deadlock unprecedented in the history of the State, when the presiding officer of one Chamber for a particular occasion reached a conclusion exactly the opposite of the decision reached by the presiding officer in another Chamber. I do not think I can pursue that much further without reflecting on the decision (and I do not want to do that), but it is a very interesting topic and one that will be discussed inevitably as time goes on, because views on these things change.

My final comment in the short time that I now have left is about the Royal Commission, although I hasten to add that my comment is not as to the content of the Commission but simply as to its terms of reference. I simply say this: no doubt that the Royal Commission has to go on, but I agree with the observations made in this morning's *Advertiser*, that if the Royal Commission is going to proceed, then in order to get something of lasting value into the community as distinct from solving a few isolated instances, the terms of reference have to be greatly broadened. With the reservations expressed by my colleagues this afternoon, I support the motion.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I was not in the House but I understand a little earlier this evening an amendment to the motion was moved which I certainly cannot support and, indeed, I feel that the amendment must have been moved tongue in cheek by the member for Baudin, who was a former Minister of Education in this House and who in fact was sorely criticised by members of the public previously for what he and his Government had done to educational funding. This was in spite of the fact that he pats the former Government on the back for what it did for education, and he continued in that vein this afternoon.

To substantiate the complaint that I have against him personally for moving this rather tongue-in-cheek motion, I have received a letter from a group of school principals of 3 April 1979 that includes copies of correspondence received from the member for Mawson, as he then was, dated 1 November 1978. The letter, which was addressed to the former Minister, asked him to inform the group whether schools would receive an equipment grant at the

beginning of 1979. The Minister had told them at that time that that possibility was just not there, and that statement caused great concern within the schools of the association with which the writer was concerned, particularly, he said, with regard to how they should present that to parent committees with regard to the difficulties and uncertainties that would be posed when drawing up forthcoming school-based budgets.

Among the series of questions addressed to the former Minister was the question of whether there would be any payments made later in 1979 retrospective to the beginning of 1979. The answer to that question, of course, was "No", because the previous Government had completely slashed the school purposes grants. The Minister was asked whether there would be any cuts in 1979 to continue to 1980 and 1981. They did not receive a reply to that. They asked whether cuts in equipment grants in 1979 would be increasing cuts in 1980-81, and would there be any increases or decreases in ground maintenance grants. That letter was left unanswered and was left not to the former Government but to the present Government, first, to restore those grants by 50 per cent last year and, secondly, to restore them to 100 per cent in this current financial year, a point which the member for Baudin chose to omit completely from his criticism earlier today, in spite of the fact that the point was clearly made during the Estimates Committee B sittings last week.

The complainant was also concerned that the secondary book allowance would be increased by only \$2, and that in fact the sacrifice of secondary book allowances would be done at the apparent expense of half of this year's equipment grant to primary schools. The group asked the Minister to clarify the matter. Subsequently, the letter addressed to me in April pointed out that, as I would see from enclosed copies of the letters that they had sent, the association was having difficulty in securing appropriate and satisfactory replies to its questions about cutbacks in 1979 equipment grants for primary schools. They said that to date they had not received a reply from the Minister following his acknowledgement of their letter of 14 November 1978.

The Minister's acknowledgement broadly stated that for a variety of reasons they would not be receiving any increase in equipment grants because the then Government was experiencing much financial constraint and, indeed, its priorities were elsewhere. That is clearly expressed in the letter from the former Minister to that group of principals.

So, the House will not express any wonder when I say that the motion moved tonight to reduce education expenditure by \$100 is no more than a tongue-in-cheek action. Indeed, the former Government was \$1 000 000 down on the expenditure committed by this Government in 1979; that is, last year's Budget. So, in fact, this Government had improved expenditure in education for two years running over the achievements of the former Government.

This year, in spite of the alleged 3 per cent cuts in education which caused a furore earlier this year and which led to the stacked meeting at Thebarton Town Hall, what has happened that the member for Baudin chooses to ignore, is that this Government has increased expenditure from last year's vote of \$324 500 000 to a new all-time high in South Australia of \$371 000 000—an increase of approximately \$48 000 000 over last year's vote (an increase of almost 15 per cent in cash terms on what was voted last year). Not only is that increase of 15 per cent a reality, but since the Budget was brought down this Cabinet has also allocated another \$1 500 000 approximately to education for a variety of initiatives, and I shall

outline those during the course of the debate. In fact, the 15 per cent increase in cash terms represents approximately a 2 per cent increase in real terms, and in that 2 per cent increase in real terms there has been some redirection of spending from some parts of education to others, but certainly, no cuts either in cash terms or in real terms in education spending during the current financial year, and that is quite indisputable.

There have been alterations in thrust, and one of the parts of the motion moved to amend tonight's motion before the House refers specifically to staff reductions. Let me point out to the House that over the last two years alone there have been reductions of 10 000 or more students; that is, a 5 per cent reduction in the student population. In spite of that 5 per cent reduction over two years, what did the present Government do? Last financial year it pegged school staffing, so that there was no reduction. This year, in spite of 5 per cent fewer students, we have just a little over a 2 per cent reduction in staffing, so that, in effect, we will have continued to improve the teacher/student ratios both in primary and in secondary schools. The former Minister would have to acknowledge that the major component in education spending (in fact, 90 per cent; that is, 90c in every dollar) goes toward staffing, so that any decisions in maintaining staffing in schools in South Australia or elsewhere in Australia are of vital importance in considering financial expenditures. This Government has maintained teacher/student ratios over the past two years.

Regarding the references to staff cuts, when one looks at the two areas that the member for Baudin has singled out in the amendment before the House, it can be seen that he has referred specifically to the Teacher Reading Development Centre and the Wattle Park Teachers Centre, where in fact just a handful of staff are involved (two at the teacher reading centre and just a few more at the Wattle Park Teachers Centre). In fact, we are looking at an overall reduction on budgetary figures of 306. However, already since the Budget was brought down we have given an additional 22 staff to migrant education at a cost of \$200 000; we have given an initial \$400 000 to the education line to help ease the employment situation in term 1 of next year, when we know that we will have to transfer staff from one school to another.

What other initiatives has this Government taken? It has given \$2 500 000, which does not appear in the Budget, in round sum allowances for contract staff to replace departmental staff in Education Department General who are taking long service leave. That has also been extended this year into the Department of Further Education, and since the Budget another \$130 000 has been provided for Further Education Department staff to take, and to be replaced while they take, long service leave. These are initiatives which will lead to more employment in South Australia in the education system.

Another initiative announced only this afternoon in response to a question by the member for Henley Beach was the much-awaited decision to make some money available, \$90 000, again additional to the Budget amount, for ancillary staff to be encouraged to take long service leave and for people to be brought in to replace them. The 306 teachers we were looking at as a reduction for next year has been drastically reduced by initiatives which have been taken since the Budget was brought down and which were taken at a time when the Government was under far less pressure than it was at the beginning of the year when the alleged 3 per cent cuts furor was being whipped into flame by members of the Opposition.

There is no doubt that the whole 3 per cent cuts antagonism being whipped up by members of the

Opposition was designed specifically to undermine the present Government and the Liberal Party in general before the Federal election which members opposite knew had to take place by the end of this year. What was the end result of that in South Australia?

Mr. O'Neill interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The end result in South Australia, as the honourable member who just interjected will realise, is that the public opinion polls (and this Party did not attach much credence to them so far as predicting the result of the election was concerned), which were telling people how important various aspects of Government policy were to the nation, said that across Australia education was running between 8 per cent at the low average and 12 per cent at the high average. That was three days before the Federal election poll. But, wonder of wonders, in South Australia where great activity had been taken to undermine the present Government, and particularly the Education Department, interest (or should I say concern, worry) by the public was running at 4 per cent, which must surely be an all-time low for educational concern.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: What was the size of the sample?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Does it matter what the size of the sample was? The public opinion pollsters say that if the random sample is across a broad enough section of the community it will reflect community opinions. It is no good saying that the sample was useless when members on the other side of the House were attaching great importance to those polls. Indeed, they were in a state of euphoria over the predictions of the polls. They were attaching so much importance to those polls that moves had already been undertaken to transfer furniture to certain houses in Canberra. How far out they were!

So much for the attack on the Minister of Education which has been perpetuated here today in a rather useless fashion, one completely lacking in statistical backing. The initiatives that this Government has undertaken far outweigh the paucity of information brought out in half an hour by the member for Baudin. Let us look at a few of the things this Government has done. The building programme, capital works, was the subject of major criticism. The Federal Government has reduced input to South Australia by a little less than \$5 000 000 in 1980. In spite of that, the present Government has maintained its expenditure at close to last year's expenditure—\$34 000 000 last year and a little over \$33 000 000 this year.

However, look at the significant point that that was completely omitted from the debate when this motion was moved. Four years ago the Government in power had to spend vast sums on new schools. It was committed, because we have to provide education: it is compulsory. New schools to the tune of 70 per cent of the total capital expenditure had to be provided in 1976-77. In 1977-78, 33 per cent of capital expenditure went on new schools, increasing in 1978-79 to 41 per cent, and that was compulsory.

The area that was being constantly criticised by the Institute of Teachers and parents was in the renovation, refurbishing and replacement of older dilapidated premises that had been neglected for decades, not only by the former Labor Governments but possibly by Liberal Governments, too. This Government last year had to spend only 15 per cent of that \$35 000 000 on new schools. In other words, the compulsory component was only 15 per cent, or \$4 700 000, but the Government did not reduce expenditure vastly. It swung the initiative into that urgently needed area of replacement, renovation, refurbishing and addition, looking at the problem that has

existed literally for two or three decades. This year again, we are only up for about 12 per cent to 15 per cent of our \$33 000 000 on new schools, but we continue to plow \$25 000 000 to \$30 000 000 into the older school programmes. Under the small schools refurbishing programme, some 38 schools are being lifted and given a new heart.

Mr. O'Neill: Blame the Premier. He supported the Federal Government's attitude to education and the cut-backs in Federal money.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is irrelevant. Despite the Federal Government's cut-back, the Premier you are trying to denigrate, the Treasurer of this State, has made additional funds available to pick up the tab. In other words, \$5 000 000 short-fall from Schools Commission funding, capital works, has been picked up by the Treasurer, for the Childhood Services Council, where there is again a cut-back at Federal level (it reached a plateau two or three years ago), this Government has picked up the tab and increased expenditure to \$17 200 000, which is what the Childhood Services Council asked the Government for.

Mr. O'Neill: Your Government said it would get a better deal from Canberra, and you haven't.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Whether we did or did not, we are still meeting our commitments and picking up the tab, and that is due to the Treasurer.

Mr. O'Neill: Don't complain to us. The Premier endorses the Prime Minister's attitude.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member expects this Government to knock the Government that is in power in Canberra immediately before an election, I suspect that he thinks we are quite witless, and we are not. We have won three elections in succession at Federal level, and have polished off an inept Government at State level. The Opposition cannot accuse us of being witless or inadequate. The results are on the board. This Government has increased educational expenditure and it rankles no end with the Opposition, because we have exceeded by far the Opposition's worst fears and everything that it did to whip up a frenzy in the public has come to nought. Concern about education is at an all-time low.

I have enough material to go for hours, as we had in the Estimates debate, but that information was largely ignored, as this motion reveals. A gentleman who is vitally concerned with an industrial union in which teachers are widely involved was so alarmed at the ineptitude of the questioning in the Estimates Committee that he left early, saying that he had more answers than the Opposition had questions for. That is how a reflection on how under-informed the Opposition is, despite the fact one would think that it had all the questions, having been in office for 10 years. The Opposition was very inept.

Another issue on which that we were tackled was the present Government's tardiness in taking up the Federal Government's allocation of \$2 200 000 last year for school-to-work transition.

What did we do? South Australia was the first State to have our programmes ready to go, but we had reservations last year. We asked the Prime Minister to revise his policy to the extent that young people in Australia would be given assistance in moving from unemployment into education so that they would not sacrifice unemployment benefits. We said that we could not really move into initiatives that may draw young people from school and add to the pool of unemployed rather than take young people from the unemployment lists back into education, something that they will resist because they will lose unemployment funds. This Government stood out against

the Federal Government, yet members opposite say that we support that Government all the way. We refused to accept the money until February-March-April of last year. We were accused of being slow, but the point is—

Mr. O'Neill: You are hypocrites, because last week—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, you are wrong again, because, before last week's election, the Federal Government saw the wisdom of this Government's request and gave the young people who come from unemployment to education unemployment benefits plus \$6 a week, so these young people are now better off. It was a South Australian Liberal Government incentive that triggered off that response. Members opposite are not only ill-informed but they have a deliberate mental block; they choose not to hear favourable initiatives emanating from either the State or Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Also, the Federal Government asked this Government and, indeed, all Governments, to put in their own commitment towards school-to-work transition. Last year, this Government committed \$475 000, which we can identify within the Education Department, for school-to-work transition, and \$550 000 in Further Education towards school-to-work transition programmes. The State Government put in over \$1 000 000 of its own money that is clearly identifiable, in addition to the money that was received from the Federal Government.

Next year we will accept with great alacrity the \$2 300 000 offered by the Federal Government, and we will change the initiatives to a large extent in order to provide training for young people so that they can move rapidly from unemployment to work situations. If the sceptics on the other side say, once again, "What work?", let me remind them that a South Australian industry is looking overseas for young people in the metal trades industry, the very area that we, across Australia, have been aware of for a long time as being in short supply of people for boilermaking, welding, the metal trades generally, the electrical trades, accounting and so on. This Government intends to place that \$2 300 000 directly into initiatives that will channel young people to work. It is solidly based, not crystal-ball stuff waiting for something to happen five years down the track. This is strongly motivating the young people to enter education, and then to have something waiting. Employers in South Australia have already indicated that the work is available.

Mr. O'Neill: You can retrain a lot of the out-of-work teachers.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are very few out-of-work teachers. The honourable member will recognise that, although there are a large number of teachers who are qualified to teach and who want to enter the education profession, the vast majority of people who enter teacher training are more easily placed in industry and commerce than those low down on the employment scale who are less adequately trained. Teacher training is not to be denigrated whether the trainees become teachers or seek other employment. The fact is that teacher employment is very attractive; it is one of the more attractive fields of employment, and I am quite sure that members as well as the public recognise this. What else has this Government done? I have hardly touched the surface, and my time has almost expired. I will mention some aspects briefly.

Literacy and numeracy was another subject attacked by the member for Baudin. It is accepted amongst the public that there may be a transition from Government schools to non-Government schools simply because of the emphasis that the latter have placed on literacy and numeracy and

which this Government places on those two subjects. The previous Government may have placed emphasis on them, but it did not speak out loudly and strongly and say what its initiatives would be. This Government has, and it was supported at the last election strongly for them.

Non-contact time within the primary education system is up to 0.8. In fact, the target stipulated by the Australian Teachers Federation (and that was a target queried by the honourable member who moved the motion) has largely been met in South Australia. As to migrant education, we have increased the staffing by 22. There are literally several dozen new classes in South Australia introduced during the 1979-80 school year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation.

The Hon. H. ALLISON:—to help youngsters who are seeking to improve in their native tongue. We gave students who cannot get migrant education language education at school additional incentives from \$14 to \$28 increase per student so that they can take instruction out of school at weekends or after school with their own teachers. We have also absorbed completely the speech therapists who qualified from the Sturt-Bedford College of Advanced Education, in spite of predictions that we would be reducing speech therapists. They are all employed, and we are over-complement. We are over the Public Service complement with speech therapists, as we have several in addition.

We have also given \$500 per student to isolated children—an area that was neglected by the previous Government. About \$250 000 was granted in a new initiative. We have given \$28 per student to the foreign language class instead of \$14. We have given minor grants applicants additional funds. The Minor Grants line is probably bigger than a lot of Ministers handle for their entire Ministry—some \$38 000 000. They are people like the Bushwalkers Association, which received a grant of \$5 000. The Specific Learning Difficulties Association qualified; it had been asking the previous Government for assistance for several years. Book allowances have been increased not once but twice and will be increased again, as has the free book allowance scheme, by the present Government.

We have brought up to 100 per cent of the existing quota, the School Purposes Grants. The multi-cultural education system in South Australia benefited by a \$380 000 grant from this Government to reconstruct the Grote Street centre. This Government has acknowledged its responsibilities. We had a list, put out rather cynically by the Institute of Teachers, of promises made by this Government and, had I had another 10 minutes, I would have been pleased to go through them line by line to show that over 90 per cent have been not only honoured but honoured well. The remainder of the promises will be met in the term of this Government's office over the next 2½ years. This Government has done more in a year in office for education than the previous Government did in its last year of office when it was apologising for reducing expenditure in education because, as the former Minister said, its priorities were unfortunately with other Government portfolios. That apologia was widespread.

I would be pleased to table that report for honourable members if they ask me to do so. The D.F.E. at Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Millicent, and the Adelaide College of Further Education, are all currently being considered by the TAFE Commission for expenditure over the next triennium. We are not neglecting those country areas but we are completely reappraising the priorities allocated to Further Education by the former Government, as indeed

the former Premier was doing in July and August last year just before he called an election which was untimely in the words of the Opposition, and it was tipped out of office.

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

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): With great pleasure I come back to the House tonight to have a word.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The member does not understand what is going on. On the other side there are some old dogs on hard roads. It is particularly the old dogs that I wish to speak to tonight. If we are going to get out amongst the people, the ones to look at are the old dogs. We have heard the old dogs having a bit to say about the Government and Ministers, and I have not been left out of consideration. I take objection to the old dogs pushing this literate eloquent, upstanding young man, skilled in the art of communication, into the deep hole to move a vote of no confidence in the Fisheries line. He did it quite well.

Mr. Keneally: We gave him the easy job.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: You and your Leader got it all. The words that the honourable member uttered will live with him long, and he will be distinguished for it in the Parliament. It was most ungenerous of some of the old dogs to intimidate the brightest young man in the Opposition, putting him in the invidious position of having to move, as one of the nicest people in the Parliament, a vote of no confidence.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is referring to us over here as old dogs. I think that that is unparliamentary. I, for one, consider myself to be young.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Stuart wish the Chair to answer the point of order with or without the facetious statement that concluded it?

Mr. Keneally: I am prepared to accept your judgment, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister and other honourable members taking part in the debate to recognise that Opposition members are honourable members.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am speaking generally, but, if the cap fits, wear it; if it does not, pull it down over your ears. The honourable member still has to rise to make his point in Parliament. Obviously, he is not wearing a cap, so that excludes him. The member for Salisbury had some unkind things to say about me today. The irony of it is that I had a deputation. One of my officers faithfully turned up the loudspeaker, and I heard the member for Salisbury say generously that he was very fond of the member for Victoria; although that does not ring too true, likewise, I am fond of the member for Salisbury.

Mr. Slater: You're being patronising.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am not being patronising, nor do I think that he was being patronising to me. The ironic part of this matter is that I was receiving a deputation from some unhappy fishermen.

Mr. Slater: Are there any happy ones?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes, there are. These people thought they had been hard done by as a result of some of my decisions and were producing promises that had been made to them by the Party to which the honourable member belongs. We had to turn down the loud speaker, as the honourable member's voice was upsetting the discussions that I was having with these people.

However, this all points to the fact that promises live long. When the present Government must say "No", it gets into a lot of trouble. So, blessings come in strange ways. The honourable member was probably chastising

me. However, it was helpful in the circumstances, bearing in mind the stage at which he made those untimely statements.

In recent days the Government has been castigated by the Opposition. The member for Salisbury seemed to be offended because I asked experts to reply to questions more than he thought I should do. However, the great thing with these Estimates Committees is that the departmental officers can come along and give their expert opinion on matters. That is certainly the good thing about the Committees. I was being chided by the member for Salisbury for making too much use of my officers.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: On policy matters.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I argue the point with the honourable member about this matter. I answered questions relating to matters of policy. I was careful to watch things in relation to specific questions that came out of the discussion on policy matters. This applied to the member for Playford in relation to the Police Commissioner. Selective quotations have been made during the course of the past week. Indeed, they have been used quite expertly to rubbish Government Ministers in various ways.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: I said "policy matters in the Committee".

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I used the officer to answer specific questions, but I dealt with matters of policy. I know that Opposition members are not too dense to take that on board; they are doing this for political purposes. When I arrived in the Chamber and made a rough interjection when the member for Playford was speaking, he was rather indignant about it. I concede that I was perhaps a little quick on the draw.

Last evening, we heard that catalyst, the member for Stuart, upbraiding my colleague the Deputy Premier in that honourable gentleman's absence. The member for Stuart said that the Deputy Premier was lazy, and then went on to say that he was stupid.

Mr. Keneally: I said that if he was not lazy he must be stupid.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: If anyone has worked hard for this State since he has been in office, it is the Deputy Premier. Indeed, the honourable gentleman is at present overseas working hard for this State, and his deliberations overseas will, I am sure, be beneficial to South Australia. I am also sure that Opposition members will be sufficiently generous as to acknowledge that.

Last evening the member for Napier spoke. He has blossomed. Indeed, he is in bloom, and he is not a tulip, either. We have seen the myxomatosis scourge occur in the rabbit population and it kills off everything. For some reason, those weak, measly bucks never attract myxomatosis and, after the scourge clears up, these fellows reassert themselves. Although it is a terrible description, the measly miserable buck has suddenly asserted himself and, after the election, survived; here he is. I feel annoyed, as the Minister of Health always seems to draw the umbrage of the member for Napier. The honourable lady is, however, always equal to the task of putting down the person whom I would describe as the measly, miserable buck.

Last evening he decided to give me a broadside about the Fire Brigade. The actions that I have taken in regarding to the Fire Brigade, and that matter was raised in the Budget Committees was based on the recommendations of a valuable report that came from the former Government, the Inns Report.

I have not yet checked with the Clerk, but I understand that someone was asking that our Bill be withdrawn. That is the sort of ungracious faith that this Opposition has in the Government. I detect, notwithstanding what the

member for Salisbury had to say about me this afternoon in moving that my line be reduced, that what is coming from the Opposition side is the sequel to what happened last Saturday. The Minister of Education raised this issue in his speech a moment ago. The Minister said that there was great euphoria, but I detect a great deal of disappointment from Opposition benches. The euphoria extended into Sunday but whipped down quite a bit on Monday when it was found that the Federal Government was returned; that was certainly disappointing to members opposite.

Mr. O'Neill: What about the swing against the Government in Barker?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The encouraging thing is what happened in those areas that put this Government into office. Members opposite should look at the illustrious young men who have joined this Party. While I am incurring the ire of the member for Salisbury, members opposite need not be worried about my being here forever, because we have some illustrious young people—not one, but a dozen—who are ready to step into the Ministry on this side of the House.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: We know that.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: You do not know that. The honourable member was mouthing eloquently on his upstanding feet with his swelled head and everything else that goes with him that has been pushed in by the old dogs on the hard road from his side which the member will live to regret—that is what the member for Salisbury is doing. He is a young man in politics.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I was grateful that the member for Eyre gave the payouts where they were deserved. There is great depression in the Opposition. I refer to the unkind things that the member for Salisbury said about the Premier and about how he selected this Cabinet and had people coming to his office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The programme performance budget that the Premier has introduced is a first in Australia. It will be a good thing for Australia, and it will be a good thing for South Australia. I take exception to some of the things that have been said about me, not by the member for Salisbury, but I have read about what has been said in another place. That I was casting aspersions on Treasury officers.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes, there are.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member did not say that, but someone else did. It was put to three senior Ministers that we would work on line budgeting, and we found ourselves being asked questions (I think in my case, dealing with the Department of Fisheries, the Director's salary was being worked over). That was never the intention.

Some of the things that were said this afternoon by the member for Salisbury were quite unkind. I do not hold it against the honourable member, but they would have been better left unsaid, and those comments cast aspersions on the Treasury. I take on board some of the things the member for Playford was saying. I made an unkind interjection to him when I came in, but I am not apologising for it.

I think that even honourable members opposite will look back over this year of 1980 and they will find that this innovation in the accounts of this State will be a very good thing for the State, and I commend them to the House.

The SPEAKER: The situation this evening is somewhat different from that last evening in relation to the

amendments which are before the House. For the clarification for all members, before the votes are taken, I want to make the following statement. Of the two amendments, both are different in style, and the procedure for putting them is not the same as that used when dealing with Estimates Committee A. Therefore, I will put first that part of the amendment moved by the member for Baudin which was to leave out all words after "that". If this is agreed to, I shall put the remainder of the honourable member's amendment but, if it is not, the remainder of his amendment may not be proceeded with. I will then put the amendment moved by the member for Salisbury. The reason for this procedure is to protect the rights of the member for Salisbury to have his amendment considered.

With the indulgence of members I would suggest that when members have voted they remain in the position that they are sitting in at the conclusion of the vote on the assumption that there may well be a further division. If members do not leave the Chamber before the second division and the second vote is taken it may be possible to conclude the voting pattern a little earlier than would otherwise have been the case. If any member wishes a different course of action to be taken I would take that indication from him.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Do I take it, then, Mr. Speaker, that you are, in effect, inferring that members will perhaps be voting on this motion in one way, and on a subsequent motion in the same way? Some of us may be inclined to vote one way this time and possibly change our mind on the second motion.

The SPEAKER: I prefaced my remarks by saying "with the indulgence of members" and then indicated I was presuming that a certain course of action would be taken. It is conceivable that members would want to change their positions. I simply indicated that, if we could avoid the need for members to change their positions in the House, thus involving a further ringing of the bells and closing of the doors, time could be saved.

The Committee divided on the Hon. D. J. Hopgood's amendment:

Ayes (12)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, M. J. Brown, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), O'Neill, Plunkett, Slater, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), Ashenden, Billard, D. C. Brown, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Bannon, Crafter, Duncan, Hopgood, Payne, Trainer, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Goldsworthy, Olsen, and Tonkin.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The SPEAKER: With the indulgence of the House, unless any member wishes the bells to be rung, I will now put the amendment of the member for Salisbury.

The House divided on Mr. Lynn Arnold's amendment:

Ayes (12)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), M. J. Brown, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Plunkett, Slater, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Ashenden, Billard, D. C. Brown, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Randall, Rodda (teller), Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Bannon, Crafter, Duncan, Hopgood, Payne, Trainer, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Goldsworthy, Olsen, and Tonkin.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That the remainder of the Bills be agreed to.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): So that we can get the situation clarified, is the effect of what the Minister has now done what would normally be the third reading of the Bills?

The SPEAKER: No. I point out to the honourable member, having regard to the resolution creating the Sessional Orders, that there is to be a motion that the remainder of the Bills be agreed to and it relates to the discussion which would normally be on the clauses of the two Bills. The final vote will be on the motion that the Bills be read a third time, and the first of the two actions may not be debated.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That these Bills be now read a third time.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I will speak briefly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS:—and I can wait until members cease interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not accept any implication that the Chair is not giving the honourable member due protection. I had given the honourable member for Napier the call, and I would indicate to him or any other honourable member that a member may speak to the Bills as they have left what otherwise would have been the Committee stages.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. I would like to speak briefly about the resolution coming from Committee A.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for consideration of the resolution coming from the two Committees has passed with the passage of the previous motion. The honourable member or any other member may now speak only as in the third reading stage, as to the passage of the two Bills as they left the Committee stage.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It seems that I cannot speak about the one resolution that was passed by this House dealing with the health lines.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may not, and I ask him to desist.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I may speak to you later, Sir, in private about ways of overcoming this problem, which is of vital importance to the House when dealing with the Estimates Committees.

The SPEAKER: I assure the honourable member that the result of the private discussion will be the same as the public discussion. He may not proceed in that vein.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on the first full Budget that he presented to this House. That Budget truly reflects the policy of the new Liberal Government that was elected just over 12 months ago in this State. What the Treasurer has achieved in the past 12 months, in rearranging and tightening up the financial arrangements of the State and the way in which he has managed the finances so that he could present a Budget that truly reflected the policies of the new Liberal Government, is a credit to him and his officials. I also draw to the attention of the House that, during the debate on the Budget and during the passage of the Budget, a number of new techniques were used.

Mr. Keneally: Filibustering by Ministers.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will come to that shortly. Some of the Budget papers, although they were not

official papers before the House, were presented in a very unique form. I see the Estimates Committee system as a significant major step forward in the South Australian Parliamentary procedure. The Estimates Committees, as conceived by the Premier, are a major attribute to the manner in which the Budget and the Budgetary papers can be debated in this House, and I take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier on being innovative in introducing the whole concept of those Estimates Committees. I point out that it was the Premier's own idea, and he talked of it often when in Opposition. I also refer to programme budgeting, which was presented to Parliament in the form of the yellow book. This is the first time that such a procedure has been used not only in Australia but under the Westminster system of Parliament. It is unique for one very important reason.

For the first time, it presents the Parliamentary Budget papers to the Parliament in a form which will improve the management and financial control of the State's resources. The extent to which I think in the future we will look back and accept programme budgeting, not only as the best form of budget procedure but also as the best way of making sure in our very complex form of Parliament that it is the best way of keeping control over the entire Public Service. I believe that that has been highlighted, if one thinks back over the various Committee hearings. During those Committee hearings it was obvious how often a number of members referred to the programme Budget rather than to the Budget papers, as formerly laid before the House.

It was interesting to see how often a question was asked or a comment made because, for the first time, Parliament had the opportunity to look at a specific programme and to see what manpower and financial resources were being directed towards that programme. It goes beyond judging that one programme. For the first time it allows us to place in order of precedent and priority the various programmes and to see within our entire allocation of resources whether we are allocating the appropriate resources for the appropriate tasks.

In commenting on the programme budgeting in the Estimates Committees I will raise one or two points that are rather disappointing. First, I refer to the extent to which the Estimates Committees were used as a political forum rather than as an inquiry.

The SPEAKER: I draw to the Minister's attention the purpose of the third reading debate, which is to refer to the Bills as they come from the Committee stages. I ask the Minister to tie any remarks to that position.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much and certainly I shall direct my comments to the Bills as they have come out of Committee and as we now

have them before this House before they are finally passed. I believe this will be the last time we see the Budget formally presented as in the Bills before us. In future I would imagine, especially following the excellent experience that we have had this time in the formation of the programme Budget—

Mr. Hemmings: You're joking.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am not joking at all. In future, we will see this Budget presented as a programme Budget rather than as a series of expenditures or estimated expenditures. I would expect for the last time to have one large line bulking together salaries and another line bulking together administration costs, and hopefully for the last time we will have passed through the phase of standing up and asking a large number of questions on individual lines, simply because the form in which they are presented to Parliament is rather meaningless. So, it is a unique occasion, and I again congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on the innovation and the work he put in to devising the scheme and making sure that at least the concept works successfully, even though certain members of the House have unfortunately let the full advantages of the new procedure slip past them. I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the Bills before us.

Bills read a third time and passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S ALLEGATIONS

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

Leave granted.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Earlier this evening in debate it was implied by the member for Eyre that, during consideration of the fisheries line by Estimates Committee B, my actions had been motivated and activated by the receipt of messages during that particular session from the shadow spokesman for agriculture. I refute that allegation. My activities on that day were determined by the responses I was receiving on that day from the Minister in question. I obviously had had consultations with the shadow spokesman and the agriculture committee on previous occasions, but the imputation of the member for Eyre is totally inaccurate and totally wrong.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 28 October at 2 p.m.