

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 21 October 1981

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

PETITIONS: PRE-SCHOOL OPERATING COSTS

Petitions signed by 1 007 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs were presented by the Hon. H. Allison and Messrs Hemmings, O'Neill and Schmidt.

Petitions received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1980-81.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SAMCOR

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: Members will recall that during the last financial year the Government was approached by the Samcor Board to seek—

Mr Millhouse: Are there copies of this statement? That is part of the arrangement between the sides.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: I acknowledge the interjection from the member for Mitcham, but I have no statement from which to read and therefore not one to distribute. I sought your leave, Sir, and that of the House to make a Ministerial statement and said that it would be a brief one.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member for Mitcham will remain silent. The honourable member, by way of interjection, which is out of order, has drawn attention to the fact that the Ministry has given an undertaking that in receiving leave there will be a document which can be circulated prior to the completion of the Ministerial statement. The honourable Minister has indicated that he has not a document to distribute. Leave having been granted, he may continue to give the statement, but I do make the point that it is essential that the Ministry fulfil the commitment that has been made with the House.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: I apologise to you and to members of the House. I was not aware of the commitment to produce a document, but upon one being produced I was clearly aware of the commitment to distribute a copy of the same. But, if there is an undertaking given in the fashion which you indicate, then I shall not proceed with my attempts to make a statement on a very important issue and one which I thought would have been of great interest to the members of this House and, indeed, of great importance to every South Australian. I shall prepare a statement in tune with what I had in mind to say, and I shall seek your leave and that of the House to proceed with it in the very near future. You have denied yourselves some good information.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: *ADVERTISER* ALLEGATIONS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: It is now some two weeks since the *Advertiser* newspaper ran a story reporting that there was a high-level investigation, established by the Attorney-General, to inquire into a number of allegations made by two *Advertiser* journalists, Messrs English and Ball. That story came some five weeks after those reporters had discussed with the Attorney information which they claimed to have which linked certain police officers to other persons involved in the drug scene. Those reporters had quite properly drawn to his attention material which they believed suggested that police were involved. After discussions they agreed to make this information available to a top-level inquiry team of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Assistant Commissioner Hunt and a senior Crown Law officer. Those reporters made information available to the investigating team.

At the time of establishing the team, a decision was made that as some parallel inquiries may be appropriate at the Federal police level, the Commissioner should also consult with his counterpart in the Federal police with a view to having a high-level Federal police officer nominated for this purpose. This was done.

It was fortunate that, prior to the *Advertiser* newspaper running its story two weeks ago, there had been a period of about five weeks during which the investigating team could undertake its work without undue publicity causing informants and possible informants going to cover. Notwithstanding the publicity, the team has reported that except in two instances it has received good co-operation from its contacts. One must recognise that some of the allegations had been known to the police for some time and had been investigated but no substance could be established. Some of the allegations came from persons with a criminal background. Information also came from persons against whom charges were likely to be laid in any event. Whilst these factors do not necessarily mean that the information is discredited, necessarily the investigating team will have to take into account possible ulterior motives of such informants in determining the appropriate weight to be given to that evidence.

Obviously, a lot of people have a lot to gain by attempting to discredit the Police Force or individual members of it. There are criminals and suspected criminals who may have been apprehended by certain police officers or who may be under investigation by certain police officers who have a lot to gain. Politicians, such as the member for Elizabeth, the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Opposition, appear to think that they have a lot to gain because reflections upon police, the principal law enforcers in our democratic society, serve to break down established authority. But by far the major proportion of the South Australian community has a lot more to lose if our police are wrongly discredited. The wider community, ordinary people who each day owe their safety and that of their property to the vigilance, effectiveness and competence of our Police Force, have a considerable amount to lose.

It is, therefore, appropriate that I put into a proper perspective the investigations which are currently being undertaken by the high-level team established by the Attorney-General, with the concurrence of the Chief Secretary, and endeavour to bring some reason back to the debate. It has been difficult to distinguish between fact and fiction in matters raised in the Parliament and the media over the

past two weeks. Facts have either been distorted or overlooked. That does a grave disservice, not only to the police but to the Parliament and to the wider community. According to the *Advertiser* journalists, only some eight police officers have been named by informants out of a force of nearly 4 000 people.

It is important that that perspective be noted. That is not to say that the matter should not be regarded seriously. It is. The fact that we moved so quickly to appoint a top-level inquiry team is evidence of that concern. The Government has said on many occasions that, if there is any reason to suspect the integrity of any member of the Police Force, then we will do our utmost, as will the police themselves, to get to the bottom of it. If there are grounds for action, then action will be taken either under the criminal law if there is evidence to prove beyond reasonable doubt that there has been a breach of the criminal law, or under the Police Regulation Act if there is sufficient evidence to bring a disciplinary charge.

The Police Force must be beyond reproach and individual members must at all times maintain the high ethical standards which have been established for our Police Force over many years of operation under various Governments. Obviously, there are a number of complaints made against the police each year. In 1979-80, there were 301 complaints, and in 1980-81 there were 282 complaints. Only a small proportion were substantiated.

The present practice in reviewing complaints is to have them referred to a specialist Complaints Investigation Section. In July 1977, that section was established within the Police Force under the command of a Chief Superintendent who is directly responsible to the Deputy Commissioner. The Commissioner's report for that year commented as follows:

There has been an increasing public awareness that there are established procedures within the force for the reporting of investigations of complaints against police. Many have expressed appreciation that senior commissioned officers are available to receive and conduct thorough enquiries into their complaints.

There have been no complaints with that procedure. The public has every reason to have confidence in this procedure. Senior commissioned officers, in conjunction with a senior Crown Law officer, are engaged in the current investigation. Their inquiries are thorough.

There are no limiting terms of reference. All of the allegations which have been made by the newspaper reporters, and others of which the police have been made aware, are covered by the inquiry. Who better to conduct the inquiry than officers who have both an understanding of the Police Force and a skill for detection which is not available in other sections of the community? We want thorough and steady detective work—not a flamboyant, emotional drama played out before a Royal Commission. Everyone who has information has an obligation to make that information known to the Deputy Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner.

There has been some suggestion in today's *Advertiser* that some lawyers do not want to approach the police. The answer to that is that, if they have information, they are at liberty to approach the Attorney-General, and I invite them to do so.

There has been a suggestion in the *Advertiser* that the investigating team has not handled the inquiries appropriately. That is patently false. The suggestion is that the senior police officer knocked on the door of an informant and surprised him. How else is a member of the investigating team to make contact with the informant other than by approaching the informant directly? It is complete nonsense to suggest that that sort of approach prejudices the investigation. There is reference also to the disclosure of

the name of prisoner Easom as a police informant. The fact is that that person's name was given by Mr Duncan to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, who did approach prisoner Easom, but he refused to co-operate. There has been no suggestion at any time that he is a police informant; rather, he appears to be an informant of the member for Elizabeth.

It is important also to note that in today's *Advertiser* there is a suggestion that the Attorney-General had previously stated that a report would be available this week. Again that is false. At the press conference which he gave on the day the *Advertiser* broke this story, he was asked how long the inquiry would take. The Attorney indicated that it could be a matter of weeks but he could give no time frame because he wanted to ensure that the inquiries were thorough and he was not going to put pressure on the investigating officers to rush the inquiry, at the risk of prejudicing that thoroughness.

The Attorney-General did indicate also that with allegations of the sort which were made there was a great deal of complexity. It involved careful detection work which may require months of activity. It is naive to suggest that one can wave a wand and gain all the answers in a matter of weeks when there is such complexity in the material which has been made available.

The Government does not intend to bring any other persons into the inquiry at the present time. (It certainly does not intend to establish a Royal Commission. It is here appropriate to note that the Beach Inquiry into the police in Victoria recommended prosecuting 41 police officers. When those police officers were prosecuted, not one charge was established beyond reasonable doubt in the normal courts in Victoria.)

I think it important also to put into perspective the allegations made against the police in the drug area. Our police have been particularly effective in detecting drug offenders, particularly where mass cultivation is involved. That is obviously a significant reason why the criminal element is now under pressure.

Detection of drug offences, of course, is only one aspect of police activities. The general responsibilities encompass law enforcement, violent crime, such as assaults, murders and rapes, the protection of property, the prevention of robbery, and, where necessary, the detection of offenders, traffic control, rescue operations, crime alert campaigns, and on the even broader public relations side, the Police Band and the Mounted Police Cadre. All of these are activities which our police administer often in the face of criticism and at personal risk to themselves and their families. They do it admirably and have the complete confidence of the Government and the general community. It is a great pity that that confidence is not shared by some members of the Opposition.

Certain members of the A.L.P., over the last 20 years at least, have publicly criticised the police on a number of occasions. The member for Elizabeth is the latest to take it upon himself to mount such criticism, apparently with the support of his Leader. Yet he makes wild allegations, finds that they are credibly reputed and then he ducks for cover by making further allegations to divert the flak. Compare that with the responsible approach of the Minister of Transport when in Opposition. He placed information in the hands of the appropriate authorities for proper investigation without seeking wide publicity or personal gain.

In the present case the member for Elizabeth has spoken to the police; his statements are vague and lack the substance necessary for proper investigation. The investigating team is available at any time to hear information and allegations, whether from the member for Elizabeth or any other person, and will thoroughly investigate them.

The Government is confident that its approach is the only proper and responsible one, and that it will ensure that the status of the Police Force which it has and deserves is appropriately maintained.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion forthwith:

That this House takes note of the statement of the Premier relating to the police inquiry; rejects the political assertions contained in it as an attempt to cover up the incompetent administration of the Chief Secretary and the failure of the Premier to take necessary action to correct that situation, and therefore calls on the Government to resign.

We have just seen yet another extraordinary chapter in the complete demoralisation and incompetence that have taken place within the Government over this particular issue. We have been confronted over the last few days with the extraordinary situation of the Government refusing to be held to account by way on a no-confidence motion in this House on this particular matter. It has refused point blank to hold a debate on it. That was sorted out yesterday, and a lame attempt was made later by both the Premier and the Chief Secretary to speak on this matter in debate in another context, with no chance for the cut and thrust of debate and, more important, no chance to vote on the matter.

Now we are confronted with a statement from the Premier—a nine-page statement hastily cobbled together; in fact, the copy that was brought to me by the messenger as the Premier rose to make the statement was completely out of order and unstapled. There had to be some hasty administrative work done to even put the thing in order. It is not a well thought out and reasoned statement: throughout there are crossings out, changes in the text and words written in, and the whole thing has clearly been put together in extreme haste. It represents an attempt by the Government to pre-empt questions and debate on this further matter in the light of the developments yesterday. Let me just put this into context

The Government refused a debate yesterday, and the Chief Secretary has been constantly avoiding the press—television, radio and the newspapers, whose representatives have been attempting to find him to get him to appear, give an interview or make a statement. They have a good reason to ask the Chief Secretary to make a statement because yesterday in this House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: It is well for the Government to recognise the appearance of the member for Elizabeth. I will not comment on the Premier's discomfort over this matter. This statement is all about attempting to pervert the debate that has been going on. The debate has not been about inquiries into the police; it has not been about the Opposition attacking the administration of the police; it has been questions directed precisely at the people responsible, who will not take responsibility. The Chief Secretary, the Minister in charge of the police, and the Premier, who is meant to be in charge of this dismal and wrecked Government in this State—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has sought to suspend Standing Orders. He is required to address himself to the suspension and not to deal with material that he would use in the debate if suspension was granted.

Mr BANNON: I will note that, Mr Speaker. In the normal sequence of events, Ministers beginning with the

Premier are called in order. They rise in their places and they advise you, Mr Speaker, whether they have papers to table or a Ministerial statement to make. The Premier was so called and said that he had none. It was only when you had gone right through the full range of the Ministers that the Premier suddenly rose to his feet, as an afterthought, and produced this statement. The fact is that he did not have the statement at the beginning of Question Time; it was being put together, and the crossings out and the changes in text were being seen to in his office at the very moment that this House was being called together.

Is this a considered statement of Government policy? Clearly it is not, yet we have been given nine pages of this nonsense and we are not going to be given the opportunity to debate it. The purpose of my moving this motion is to allow such debate to take place, the debate that was refused yesterday, which has not been canvassed properly. In the light of this disgraceful document—

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable Leader please resume his seat? I point out to the honourable Leader that it is not competent for him to reflect on a vote taken on a previous day of sitting or, indeed, on any other day of sitting. I ask the Leader to come to the discussion relative to the reason for the suspension of Standing Orders, and no other matters.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have been pointing out that this document has been prepared as an afterthought, at the last moment. It is a pre-emptive action by the Government in this House. Therefore, this House ought to be given the opportunity to debate the contents in it. It contains disgraceful allegations. I will not canvass the precise matters, because I recognise that that would be out of order. It purports to be a document describing the nature and extent of the police investigations. This is the first time, I may add, that we have been given any concrete evidence on this matter, despite a day of the Estimates Committees being spent on it, and despite what happened yesterday.

It is a document which purports to give us detailed information but which, in fact, mostly attempts to blackguard members of the Opposition who are doing their duty in raising these matters of public importance and which attempts to blackguard the media, which also is doing its duty in providing to the public information to which the Government has failed to respond. More important, it is an attempt to cover up the incompetent way in which the Government has handled this whole issue. It is a disgraceful document, but nonetheless it is an important one and it deserves the fullest consideration by this House, here and now. It deserves a debate and a vote being taken as a result of that debate.

There are references throughout this document mis-stating the attitudes of the Opposition concerning the police and the reason for their inquiries. There are constant references particularly to my colleague the member for Elizabeth, who, the Government has decided, is a fit target in this matter and the Government is attempting to throw as much as it can on him in the course of this debate.

These things cannot be allowed to be simply laid to rest by the Premier's getting to his feet under the protection of a Ministerial statement, which, under the forms of the House, cannot be questioned or debated, and then sitting down again. The matter cannot be left to rest there. The Premier is going through exactly the same performance as we have had for 24 hours from his hapless Chief Secretary, who has been seen running out of the backdoor of his office. I understand that one of the television crews has actually pictured him doing so, and I advise honourable members to look at television tonight, when we will see fairly graphically the way in which this Government is fronting up to its responsibilities. In a pre-emptive action, the Premier

sought to make this statement. That is not good enough, and I suggest that the Government ought to have the guts to stand up and defend its attitude, let the matter be voted on, and thereby accept this motion.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and there being present an absolute majority of the whole I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): As the Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well, I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders. There are two reasons. The Leader of the Opposition has really made something of a fool of himself this afternoon. The first reason, of course, is that no procedural notice was given to the Government of this intention to move a motion of no confidence.

Mr Millhouse: I don't suppose you told them that you were going to make a Ministerial statement, either—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Millhouse: —out of which it arose.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is a matter that the Leader knows perfectly well must always be followed, as does the member for Mitcham. I find it quite interesting that the member for Mitcham should be the one who seems to be pushing the Opposition along so hard on this motion.

Mr Millhouse: Come on. Tell us why you haven't left Rodda—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard sufficient from the honourable member for Mitcham. I do not want to hear further.

Mr Millhouse: I hardly opened my mouth.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I make the point again that no notice was given; there were none of the usual courtesies, none of the usual traditions—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: There was no notice of your statement, either.

Mr Lewis: You weren't here.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find it fascinating to hear that, when the member for Elizabeth was not even in the Chamber at the time. I oppose the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, first for the reason that there has been no notice given to the Government. Secondly, it is quite apparent that the Leader of the Opposition is grandstanding yet again at the expense of the Chief Secretary and the Police Force. Apart from the fact that there has been no procedural notice, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that before this House there is already a motion that he himself has moved which is still being debated and in which the Leader set out the Opposition's views on this entire matter yesterday.

He does not want another go; he simply wants another go on a different basis. There is no way that we can agree to the taking over of the business of the House when the House is already considering a matter that he wants to bring up again, to have a second chop at it. Let me make the position quite clear. Apparently the Leader is in some way affronted by corrected statements. I point out to him that it is a recent tradition of this House and a courtesy that copies of statements are made available to the Opposition and it is because it was necessary to conform to that undertaking that I, unlike members of the Opposition, waited until copies were available. I am certain that, if I had not done that, the Leader would have been the first person on his feet to complain—no, he would not have been; it would have been the member for Mitcham.

The statement is being given in another place by the Attorney-General and it seemed to me right and proper that the information it contains should be made available in this Chamber for the benefit of all honourable members.

That is what has happened. For the Leader of the Opposition to complain about a statement setting out all the facts being brought forward, when he says he displays great interest in the matter, is absolutely amazing to me. He is not consistent at all. First, he says it is poorly prepared and badly put together. He is upset because his copy of it is not in order. I should have thought that even he could have put it in its right order; the numbers are on top of the pages. The statement was made purely and simply to put members of this House in possession of the facts and to correct some of the gross distortions which have been promulgated by members of the Opposition recently.

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion before the Chair relates to the suspension of Standing Orders. I ask the Premier to come back to that motion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, I am, with great respect. The motion for suspension is to move a motion of no confidence apparently based on the statement that I have just made to the House. That is the Leader's story, anyway, and I think he is sticking to it. The whole point is that the Opposition has said it is interested in the truth. It now seeks the suspension of Standing Orders to question the truth; that is what it amounts to. The truth is as it is set out in that Ministerial statement and the support for the Police Force of this State, which the Government has, is also clearly set out in that statement.

There is no basis whatsoever for any criticism of having a Ministerial statement on this issue and, if it has mucked up the Leader's planned Question Time, I am sorry, I cannot help that. I repeat, it is essential that the people of South Australia and the members of this House be put in possession of the facts in a balanced and reasoned way and that we get rid of some of the hysterical attacks on members of the Police Force in this State.

Although members of the Opposition say they want to get at the so-called truth of the matter, in their style they do not want to hear the real truth. That is the only conclusion that can be drawn from this ridiculous attitude put forward today by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion before the Chair is the motion for suspension of Standing Orders moved by the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', those against say 'No'. There being a dissentient voice, it is necessary to have a division.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (24)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the House to the fact that during various exchanges in the past 20 minutes or so, the word 'coward' has quite often been bandied from one side of the House to the other. It is an offensive term. I rule it to be unparliamentary, and I ask all members to realise that it will not be tolerated by the Chair.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE FORCE

Mr BANNON: Does the Premier agree with and endorse the action yesterday of his Chief Secretary in naming a person who provided information on a confidential basis about police corruption? If so, why, and, if not, is this yet another example of gross incompetence on the part of the Chief Secretary? Will the Premier now act responsibly and decisively by sacking him?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not too sure how many questions there are in that one.

Mr Millhouse: Try to answer at least one of them directly. Go on. Do it now. Give a direct answer to any of them.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not mind the member for Mitcham at all. I am quite delighted to answer the question, even when he requests me to do so. The short answer is 'No, I will not sack the Chief Secretary.' As for naming a person who had indicated that he would provide information, it is quite clear that the member for Elizabeth was the person who indicated that that person might have information. He was interviewed by a member of the investigating team and refused to say anything.

No suggestion that he is a police informant has been made by anyone other than the member for Elizabeth. That is the long and short of it. The only time that term was used in this House was, I believe, when it was used by the member for Elizabeth. It is quite clear that even the suggestion that has been made is ridiculous: 'Endangering his life,' the Leader of the Opposition says. How ridiculous!

Publicity given states clearly that the member for Elizabeth suggested that he might have some information, that the police approached him, he would not talk, and he did not give any information. How on earth can he possibly be accused of being in danger because of giving information? That seems to be an utterly ridiculous and pointless thing to say. I refer the Leader of the Opposition, for the rest of his answer, to the statement that has already been made.

EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr GLAZBROOK: Has the Minister of Education found the \$8 600 000 that the member for Salisbury claimed, during a recent rally, that the Minister had lost from his Budget lines? Last Wednesday, on Parliament House steps, the member for Salisbury, who had left a Budget Estimates Committee, addressed a number of people at a rally on pre-school education. An article written by one Derek Ward, which, I might add, had certain journalistic licence, and which appeared in the 21 October issue of the *Teachers Journal*, stated:

Labor shadow Minister of Education, Lynn Arnold, received loud applause when he said, 'The fact is that money has been directed away from education by this Government.'

He went on to say later, as reported in the article:

The member had suggested that Education Minister Allison should leave the Estimates debate to address the meeting. He said that in the debate he questioned the Minister on his figures, and it was clear that \$8 600 000 had been lost to South Australian education.

It has been pointed out to me that what was really said by the member for Salisbury was that the Minister could not add up, nor could he do his sums, that despite cross-examination by that member, the Minister failed to supply an answer, and that the \$8 600 000 had been lost from his lines. He also indicated that perhaps the money had gone

to pay for the O'Bahn system. It has been further suggested that the member for Salisbury was inciting those present at the rally, and was condemning the Minister for not being honest. The member for Salisbury even suggested to people at the rally—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting and I ask him to desist.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I accept that, Mr Speaker. I have been told by those present that the member for Salisbury suggested that people come to the gallery to be recognised and to make their presence felt. I therefore seek the Minister's clarification as to the whereabouts of the so-called lost \$8 600 000.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Members of Estimates Committee A will be aware that during the session I did in fact promise to come back to the House with the specific information and members who were present yesterday evening will recall that the detail as supplied by Treasury was read at some length into *Hansard*. It does disconcert me somewhat to find that untruths can be peddled so readily by one who is ostensibly in a position of responsibility. I can understand the basic error having been made because it is quite a common one in so far as frequently members of the Opposition will compare the actual sum spent in a preceding year to the amount voted in the succeeding year.

In this case, Treasury pointed out that the question asked by the member for Salisbury did show some ineptitude in regard to the understanding of accounts. Apart from that, he repeated his allegations outside this House, on the Parliament House steps, and he took great pains to repeat exactly the same argument in a debate in the House yesterday. I find that his errors are perpetuated on the front page of the *Teachers Journal*. The actual fact is precisely as I stated during the Estimates Committee A session, when I said that the only apparent discrepancy between the alleged statements by the member for Salisbury and my claimed statistics was that there was an additional pay period in the preceding year, and that is precisely what happened.

A sum of \$11 400 000 was set aside, including in the 1980-81 figures an additional pay period, which is a cyclical thing, and the actual amount was not \$13 000 000 as I speculated during the Budget session but \$13 250 000. When the member says that the Minister's maths are inaccurate, I would suggest that for a speculative figure an error of \$250 000 in \$13 000 000 is not too bad when his own error of \$8 800 000 is based on a personal lack of knowledge of how the Parliamentary accounts are compiled.

A couple of other errors were built into his misconception and they do not bear much consideration. One is that he had included a figure at the top of the page which he was looking at and which should not have been included in the grand total, and the second is that he had taken the wrong total in any case. He made three errors, but the main one was that he simply did not accept the Ministerial explanation given in a responsible session of Parliament during the Budget debate and preferred to go outside. He did not accept the Ministerial explanation which was given, which was quite correct, which had been confirmed by Treasury, and the precise details of which are now inserted in *Hansard* for all members to see.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That's exactly how the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order!

POLICE FORCE

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Chief Secretary state his reason for deliberately releasing in Parliament yesterday

the name of a prisoner in Yatala whose name had been given on a confidential basis to the police team investigating allegations of corruption in the force, and has he now arranged to provide protection for that prisoner in order to prevent any retribution against him?

Yesterday, the Chief Secretary revealed the name of a prisoner whose name had been given to the police investigating team on a strictly confidential basis as a potential source of information about allegations of police and drug dealing. That name was subsequently reported by the media. The Chief Secretary has previously refused to reveal the terms of reference of the inquiry.

However, I am told that most members of the legal fraternity believe that information could be given to the police investigating team on a confidential basis. They are therefore shocked that the name of a potential source, whether he revealed any information or not, would be made public deliberately, and they are asking whether confidentiality will apply to any other information that is given to the police investigating team and to the Minister.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Mr Speaker, I am getting just about fed up to the neck with this approach of the Opposition about what is going on in this police investigation. As to the matter that the honourable member raises concerning protection for a prisoner, I am sure that this gentleman is in no danger.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Why did you release his name?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The question of confidentiality came from the member for Elizabeth. He said, 'So much for confidentiality.'

The Hon. Peter Duncan: After you named this—

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is his story. The honourable member has been shouting from the rooftops, and this was picked up yesterday by the tom-tit Leader of the Opposition, who has picked up the filth that has come from the honourable member about my stewardship of my Ministerial role. The Deputy Leader, also, is under threat from the member for Elizabeth, and if he keeps on performing with the tenacity he is showing he will sweep both of these gentlemen off the bench they are sitting on. To get up here and say that I have breached confidentiality is a load of hogwash. The member for Elizabeth has kept going for the whole of the last two years on issues that are obviously dear to his heart.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Why did you name him?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Chief Secretary please resume his seat. I have had enough of interjections, and I warn all members on both sides of the House that further interjections during Question Time will not be tolerated.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The question of confidentiality comes out of the mouths of members opposite, and I have no comment to make about that—that is their story. I made a statement in this House yesterday about something that the Assistant Commissioner had done, and I stand by it.

BEER BOTTLES

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning write to all seaside councils supporting the advertisement which was placed in yesterday's *News* by the Adelaide Bottle Company Pty Ltd? This advertisement, which appeared on half a page of the *News*, quite clearly spelt out the company's concern to see beer bottles recycled and returned to the company. This is in line with concern expressed to me in correspondence from local councils that, as we enter the summer season, seaside councils will again have to tolerate a significant number of beer bottles on

their beaches. I believe that the Minister, if he supports this form of advertisement and the concept of recycling, should write to all seaside councils.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am very much aware of the concern of the member for Henley Beach about the number of beer bottles along our coast. I would be very happy to write to seaside councils, as requested by the honourable member. I believe that the half-page advertisement that appeared in the *News* yesterday was indeed a very positive move on the part of the Adelaide Bottle Company.

South Australia has a very efficient (it is regarded by many as the most efficient in Australia) beer bottle recovery system. The Adelaide Bottle Company is to be congratulated for acting in a responsible and positive manner by inserting an advertisement, such as the one we saw in the *News* last night, to encourage the recycling of beer bottles. The refund system that we know in South Australia is voluntary; it was established nearly 100 years ago by the Adelaide Bottle Company, which has achieved a great deal in that time.

I informed the House some time ago that a survey was to be carried out by my department in regard to injuries caused by broken bottles on our beaches. That survey has now been carried out to ascertain problems associated with broken glass on our beaches. It has been revealed that as few as 13 people cut themselves on beer bottle glass or on other bottles on Adelaide beaches during the last summer season. I realise that this might understate the degree of trauma caused by broken bottles, as many people may not have gone to the hospitals that were surveyed, but perhaps preferred to go to their own local doctor. It is our intention to conduct a similar survey again this summer with the assistance of the St John Ambulance, the Surf Life Saving Association, and the five major hospitals in the Adelaide metropolitan area. In answer to the honourable member, yes, I will write to the seaside councils.

Finally, I would like to say that I believe that the current action being taken by the Adelaide Bottle Company greatly assists in saving energy and raw materials used in the manufacture of bottles. Further, I believe that it helps to reduce the litter problem in South Australia arising from discarded bottles, which is something I am sure we would all like to see happening. So, the matter should be seen as a very positive move on the part of that company.

IN-SERVICE CONFERENCE

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education advise the House whether, in relation to the matter of in-service conferences, he misled the Parliamentary Estimates Committee, or whether officers of his department had issued instructions for 1982 on this matter without adequate authority? Last week I asked the Minister of Education during the Parliamentary Estimates Committee whether a decision had been made concerning a recommendation that, in 1982, 50 per cent of the time allocated for teacher and parent initiated in-service conferences be in teachers' own time. In response, the Minister acknowledged that such a recommendation had been put to the Education Department by national and State inquiries into education and also by the razor gang, but that 'no decision has been arrived at'. In response to further questioning by myself, the Minister acknowledged that before any decision was reached the Teacher Service and Development Committee would be further consulted on this matter.

While those answers were reassuring, I have since been advised by some teachers that telexes giving an instruction about this matter were sent some time ago to regional

offices of the Education Department and, furthermore, that a circular was distributed to advisory staff employed at the Wattle Park Teachers Centre, again some time ago. Both the telexes and circular indicated that, in 1982, 50 per cent of the time of in-service conferences would have to be spent out of school hours. Either these instructions were incorrectly issued without the appropriate authority, or the Minister misled the Committee.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Salisbury would realise that during the Budget debate the Director-General of Education and the Deputy Director were present and concurred with the information that I gave to the Committee, namely, that no advice had been sent out to schools, and that no decision had been arrived at. The matter was investigated upon their return, as was promised, I believe, to the Committee. We found that, at a lower administration level, information had been sent to regional offices, but certainly not to schools. I advise members of the House that this matter has not been discussed yet at senior administration level by the committee which would normally send out the information, that is, the Central Services and Development Committee. In fact, the matter is scheduled for a meeting of the committee on 2 November and in fact it had been scheduled for that day prior to the session in the House. That is an official meeting.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Is this recommendation in the telex?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The telex that was sent out was sent out by a departmental officer at a lower level, without the approval of that senior executive committee. Nonetheless, contained in that telex is some relevant and sound advice in so far as teachers and organisers are assured that conferences that have already been arranged and approved prior to the end of this year will in effect continue. I suggest that in those circumstances, with the matter still to be reviewed and the commitment I made to members of the House, I will be in a position to bring more information back to the House after 2 November. Meanwhile, the departmental officer acted in good faith in that the recommendation was one which emanated from a review committee. It was a suggestion which was taken as a firm direction. That was not so, and the officer has been advised of that.

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr SCHMIDT: Has the Premier examined the supplement which appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday highlighting various aspects of South Australia? Can he report as to the accuracy of that supplement in yesterday's paper?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to bring the question to the Chair for consideration to be given as to whether it is admissible and whether it should be admitted at a later stage.

MEDIA INTERVIEWS

Mr KENEALLY: Why is the Chief Secretary persistently refusing to give interviews to radio and television journalists on important matters of public interest concerning his portfolio? I have been informed that the Chief Secretary has refused to appear on *Nationwide* and has refused other media requests for interviews. I understand that this morning, while his Press Secretary was explaining to a television journalist that his Minister was not available, that the Minister was quietly slipping out the back way. Does this demonstrate a lack of confidence by the Minister in himself?

An honourable member: You're getting lower and lower.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: If the altar boy—the member for Stuart—wants to know, I will be pleased to tell him. After the situation that arose on Friday night, the two scoundrels (if I can refer to them under that term), the member for Elizabeth and the member for Mitcham, could walk under a rattlesnake, with high-heeled boots on.

Mr Lewis: In a top hat.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes, wearing a sombrero. If the honourable member thinks I am going to appear on *Nationwide* after the callous things they have said about me, he and everyone else has another think coming. What do we hear about the Prime Minister? He will appear on a direct broadcast, but will not appear on an edited segment. I was surprised to see the little gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, joining forces with them and echoing these callous things. I noticed that he was No. 3; I thought that they were showing great perspicacity in that area. Individually, people involved in the electronic media are good people, but collectively, when one has something to say, the real truth does not get over. I am not interested in talking until this matter is resolved. It is a sensitive matter and I am not going to talk on *Nationwide* until this matter has been resolved. It is in competent hands and it will be resolved.

I have to make a decision about whom I am going to talk to. If I do not want to talk to you, too bad, you miss out. That goes for nice people like Mike Drewer and others, for whom I have a lot of regard, but even Mike can become athwartship sometimes and get his rhumb line bent. Mr Speaker, if you want to have a most harrowing experience, have your rhumb line bent. I hope that the honourable member gets the message.

SCHOOL CROSSING LIGHTS

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport consider installing the activated pedestrian crossing lights adjacent to the Warradale Primary School and pre-school entrance on Morphett Road, Warradale? The Minister will be aware that for some years now the upgrading of the southern end of Morphett Road has been delayed time and time again. Indeed, the Minister will also be aware that my colleague, friend and neighbour, the member for Morphett, and I have approached both his predecessor and himself many times over this problem. The Minister has now brought forward the programme date from the 1982-83 year to the 1981-82 financial year, and the member for Morphett and I appreciate that. Now I understand from a recent communication with the Minister that this work is to commence in January or February of next year. I would also inform the Minister that there has been some concern with many parents of children at that school, especially about safety problems, because of increased traffic on Morphett Road following the opening of the sad mistake, the Lonsdale link, by the previous Minister. Will the Minister consider installing activated lights at this school?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am well aware of the representations made to me by the member for Glenelg and the member for Morphett on this matter. They were extremely persistent, and I am glad that we have been able to help in that important section of Morphett Road, because this was a very high priority installation. I will certainly investigate the honourable member's request, but I must point out (and probably not all members of the House are aware) that pedestrian activated traffic lights are four times the cost of the normal flashing school crossing lights. I just

make that comment by way of explanation. I will certainly investigate the matter for the honourable member.

POLICE OPERATIONS CENTRE

Mr PETERSON: Will the Chief Secretary say what provision has been made for the relocation of the police operations centre currently sited in the old Adelaide Ship Construction premises at Glanville? A.N. Rail has notified the State that it will be proceeding with the standard gauge railway link; the Outer Harbor connection should be completed late next year. Part of that plan is to go along the Semaphore Road extension. To do this, I believe that, according to the plan, some 20ft or so of the building occupied by the police headquarters in that area will have to be removed to create an easement. In the Minister's Marine portfolio, provision was made for that work to be carried out, but there was no notification of the work necessary on the Adelaide Ship Construction building or whether the police centre will be relocated. Where and when will the operations centre be relocated?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am almost too scared to say this but, for the benefit of the House and the honourable members opposite, including the member for Semaphore, the matter is being pursued, but, of course, it is in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. As members opposite will not be unaware, from some of the tricks they have got up to, they have had some unkind things to say to the Minister of Public Works about some of the sites he selects for public buildings. I hope that the people of Port Adelaide will not be subject to these constraints, but the district of Port Adelaide is a region and the police certainly need an adequate central headquarters for the region. The matter is being actively canvassed by my colleague and his department.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr BLACKER: When a referendum on daylight saving is held at the next State election, will the Premier and the Government consider having alternative questions included in the referendum to provide for a reduction in the period of daylight saving? I have received correspondence from the Pinkawillie branch of the Women's Agricultural Bureau, who are principally opposed to daylight saving, but who have requested that an alternative question be included, calling for a reduction of the number of days per year when daylight saving operates. A suggestion has been made that it should commence on the first Sunday in December, concluding on the first Sunday in February, so as to principally coincide with the school year, which would considerably reduce the inconvenience forced upon school children, particularly those children in the western part of the State, where the impact of daylight saving is accentuated.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government will be very pleased indeed to examine the entire question of daylight saving following the referendum. It is certainly important that we get a proper expression of the community's views on the matter. The actual questions to be asked have not yet been considered, but certainly I undertake to the honourable member that we will examine the possibilities. There is, I think, a very well developed recognition of the difficulties that some residents of South Australia experience as a result of daylight saving. There is no question that people on the West Coast, in particular, have specific difficulties with time and with their farming activities. Be that as it may, it will not be possible at any time to bring

in a separate daylight saving zone to affect one part of the State and not another. It will be necessary, of course, for the entire State to be affected. Nevertheless, the question that the honourable member has put forward will be kept in mind when the time comes to formulate the questions to be submitted to the people at the referendum.

TRAIN SAFETY

Mr HAMILTON: Following Monday's rail accident involving 50 passengers in a new supertrain at Dry Creek, will the Minister of Transport now request the consultants, the John Connell consulting group, which is engaged in the Adelaide signalling study, to reassess one of their recommendations, which is that train stops and speed proving be not included in the present upgrading proposals? Yesterday, information was supplied to me that suggests very strongly that, should these train stop devices and speed proving have been installed on the Gawler line, that accident would not have occurred. Further, the information supplied to me from the John Connell consulting group was that one of their recommendations was as follows:

The train stop is a device which causes the emergency brakes of the train to be applied if the train passes a signal at stop, and is thus a valuable safety device.

Also, the report states, referring to signalling equipment:

... there is evidence of substantial increase in the signal fault rate and consequent disturbance to operation. Also, the system lacks a number of fundamental safeguards considered vital in a modern rail system and which, if not corrected, is likely—as traffic density increases—to lead to a serious accident. These aspects are: lack of approach locking; lack of positive switch detection in the Adelaide Yard area; lack of overlaps. Lack of positive switch detection has already resulted in some derailment, and with further ageing of the system, such incidents will inevitably become more frequent and train running control deteriorate.

Will the Minister therefore request the team of consultants, the John Connell consulting group, to reinvestigate the question of train stops and speed proving?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member is quoting from documents which, I understand, are in draft form only, and have not yet been presented to the board of the authority. That does not matter; his question is quite relevant. I will not give an undertaking at this stage; I will wait until I have in hand the results of the inquiry into the accident. I will certainly consider what the honourable member has put forward. He seems to imply by his question that he believes that the accident was caused by a signalling defect.

Mr Hamilton: I am not saying that; I do not reflect on that at all.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am glad that the honourable member has explained himself. The results of the inquiry should be with me first thing Monday morning. I will certainly consider that and also the honourable member's suggestion.

STATE DEVELOPMENT

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Premier say whether the Government will take every opportunity to advance prospects of future development in South Australia, as summarised in a supplement to yesterday's *Advertiser*?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was greatly impressed by the supplement published in the *Advertiser* yesterday, and I congratulate that journal for taking such a responsible step. The series of articles was well balanced, well reasoned, realistically and quietly optimistic, and very positive indeed. It reflected a general air of quiet optimism which pervaded

the entire supplement, as it now pervades the entire State of South Australia, with one rather glaring and blatant exception. I was particularly disappointed to find that the small island of gloom and doom that we see in this House, represented on the other side—

Mr Bannon: Realism!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is now on record as saying that his doom and gloom is realism. That is what he thinks of South Australia's future prospects. I am glad that that is on record. That marked exception attracted enormous comment from people who are not only Liberal Party and Government supporters but also normally Labor Party supporters, ordinary people concerned for South Australia's future, for their children's future, people who want jobs, who want to see development, and who want to know that their children will have the security of employment and the prosperity that our resources development will inevitably bring.

In that article, written, I presume by the Leader of the Opposition (he has not denied authorship), whenever he acknowledged that there were any future prospects for South Australia, for instance with the Cooper Basin, he made them very grudgingly and reluctantly. He dismissed Roxby Downs almost as a complete write-off. That was not particularly satisfactory as a reflection of the policies of the alternative Government.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order. Is it appropriate for the Premier to hold in his hand a copy of the *Advertiser*?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It has been suggested to me that a picture of Jonah appears very prominently under 'On guard against threats', by the Leader of the Opposition. In an article in the *Australian* last Monday, South Australia was described as 'the most underrated State'. I believe that is quite correct. It is probably due in no small measure to that perception of South Australia promulgated beyond our boundaries by the sort of downgrading, derogatory and defeatist attitudes about South Australia prompted by the Opposition.

We, in Government, do not share the Opposition's doom and gloom. We will do everything possible to advance the development of our primary and secondary industries, and our resources. We will get on with the job, despite the pessimistic, absolute doom and gloom attitude of the Opposition. The bringing into this House of indentures for the Cooper Basin and Roxby Downs projects will be clear evidence of our earnest attempts to make this State great again.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EDUCATION RALLY

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

Leave granted.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In a question this afternoon the member for Brighton stated that I had invited people at a rally on Parliament House steps to come into the gallery of Parliament House to 'make their presence felt', the implication being that I had incited them to undertake a breach of Standing Orders. That statement is entirely untrue, and I refute it. From the steps of Parliament House I did invite members of the public there present to come in and watch Estimates Committee proceedings on education. That is entirely different, and at no time did I incite or desire a

breach of Standing Orders of this place by members of the gallery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POLICE FORCE

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: During the Ministerial statement made today by the Premier, prepared by the Attorney-General, I notice that the Premier made the following statement:

Obviously, a lot of people have a lot to gain by attempting to discredit the Police Force or individual members of it. There are criminals and suspected criminals who may have been apprehended by certain police officers or who may be under investigation by certain police officers who have a lot to gain. Politicians, such as Mr Duncan, Mr Bannon and his Opposition colleagues appear to think that they have a lot to gain because reflections upon police, the principal law enforcers in our democratic society, serve to break down established authority.

Further, on the ABC television news last night, the Premier made certain comments about me, which included the following—

An honourable member: You will be the next Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted for a personal explanation.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The interviewer said:

Does that mean that Mr Rodda will stay in the position until the next election?

The Premier said:

Is there any reason at all to ask a question like that—

well, one might speculate—

when we are dealing with a motion of no confidence in the Chief Secretary, but which I interpret as a motion of no confidence in the Police Force? Quite frankly, I think they are getting at the Police Force. The member for Elizabeth has done this sort of thing before. We understand that he has made comments to the effect that he is going to get the Police Force, and I think this is all a complete fabrication. I think the allegations which have been made are not substantiated. It has been led by the member for Elizabeth...

I want to place on public record that I am not now, nor have I ever been, out to get the Police Force, as has been alleged by the Premier. In relation to the libel that he has done me outside this House last night, I will be taking the appropriate action. In relation to the comment he made today, I simply want to say that for my part I believe that a Police Force is a fundamental arm of any democratic society. I would have thought that was patently obvious to any member of this House. I support the police, the same as does every other member of this House, in the important work that they do.

That does not mean, of course, that when one sees things that are wrong within the Police Force involving particular officers one should simply be silenced and not comment on them. That is what I have endeavoured to do, in the interests not only of the Government in the long term but also of all the citizens of this State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

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

Leave granted.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In answer to a question from the member for Brighton, the Minister of Education made a number of allegations concerning comments that I had made in this place and outside of this place. The Minister

alleged that I failed to compare vote with vote in figures for this financial year and last financial year. He indicated that I had stated that the apparently saved money in education had gone on the O'Bahn system. He indicated that I had not taken the trouble to find out what answers had been given in the Estimates Committee while I was out of the Chamber attending a rally on the Parliament House steps. He further indicated that I had failed to note his earlier comments to the Estimates Committee. I reject those allegations. On page 332 of *Hansard* I am quoted as saying:

If we take the voted figures last year to see how that comes out, we find that \$371 980 000 as a ratio of \$1 423 700 000 comes out at 26.1 per cent. That gives, against this year's total recurrent figure, \$425 000 000, a difference of \$13 600 000.

As to the O'Bahn statement, I did not say that was where the money had gone. I said that perhaps it had gone in that direction, and it was in a spirit of whimsy, given a light-hearted moment at the rally, and I was not attempting to pre-empt the Minister's findings from Treasury officials as to where that money may have gone. I am still awaiting that answer.

As to the allegation that I had not taken the trouble to find out what was said while I was out of the Chamber at the rally, a reading of *Hansard* proves that at the time I was out of the Chamber at the rally no answer was given by the Minister on the particular questions I had raised. As to the Minister's allegation that I failed to note his earlier comments concerning the 26 versus 27 weeks difference between the two budgets, I did in fact note those comments. I considered them and rejected them because my basis of contention was talking about relativities rather than absolutes. The Minister has still not answered the question I raised by my calculations and he should give answers to the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked to make a personal explanation. He is now starting to debate the issue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POLICE FORCE

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On another but related matter, yesterday in his speech to the Parliament the Premier made the following comments:

The area of greatest concern about the accusations made by the member for Elizabeth, an Attorney-General in a previous Labor Administration, is that they have been completely unsubstantiated. There is no suggestion, and there has been no suggestion since the accusations were made, of the member coming forward with names and specific evidence.

I do not think I need add anything further to that but simply point out that two hours later the Chief Secretary, much to my regret, named in Parliament one of the sources that had come to me and thereby indicated the untruthfulness of that statement.

At 3.24 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS BILL

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of dental technicians and dental prosthetists and to regulate the prac-

tice of technical dentistry and clinical technical dentistry; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The most important feature of this Bill has had to be deleted because of Standing Order 286, which provides:

Every Bill which imposes a charge upon the people or authorises the borrowing or expenditure of money (including expenditure out of money to be provided subsequently by Parliament) shall be introduced by a Minister.

I understand that some members of the Government believe that a Bill of this type is necessary at this time. Whilst I realise and recognise that the deletion of any clause that imposes a charge upon the people in a money form fails to give a Bill any teeth, I urge members to pass this Bill and, on the passing of it, I ask the responsible Minister to insert the clause to provide for the borrowing of money.

Dental technicians in South Australia have been dealing directly with the public for over 35 years. There has been a widespread demand for and acceptance by the public of this practice and to my knowledge there have been very few complaints made by the public about ill-fitting dentures made by dental technicians. Since the Consumer Affairs Branch was set up, I understand that only one complaint has been investigated by that department. Dental technicians have been making and supplying dentures direct to patients entirely to their satisfaction, and, more importantly, at a vastly reduced cost. However, it is still illegal under the Dentists Act in this State for dental technicians to act in this way.

Dental technicians, or prosthetists, as they are known in other States, have legally provided dentures directly to the public since 1957 in Tasmania, the mid-1970s in Victoria, and 1978 in New South Wales. In those States the registration of dental technicians has proved to be remarkably successful. As a result of experience in those States I have mentioned, I understand that the Australian Capital Territory is now considering enacting legislation to register dental technicians.

Why, then, does this Government insist on deferring the matter of registration of dental technicians? Its official attitude is that it is following the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services. That committee was set up in December 1979, yet in May 1979 the Review of Dental Services in South Australia had already carried out a similar exercise, but that committee's report did not suit the political philosophy of the Health Minister.

The terms of reference given to the Minister's committee were such that they could only lead to one conclusion, which was that the registration of dental technicians should be deferred. A request by the Australasian Dental Technicians Society of South Australia to have representation on the committee of inquiry was denied. One would have thought that, if one was dealing with the question of the registration of dental technicians, at least the Minister would have put a representative of that society on the board. I have been given information that figures given to the committee of inquiry regarding the fees in other States were incorrect. In fact, the evidence given by some parties was directed with one view in mind, and that was to sabotage any case that the dental technicians had for achieving chairside status.

I would like to read part of a letter sent by the Minister of Health to a member of the community who had expressed concern at this Government's reluctance to register dental technicians. Part of the letter states:

The committee duly reported and recommended as follows:

The Government defer the proposal to register certain dental technicians to deal directly with the public until there is more convincing evidence of need;

The Government defer the proposal to register dental technicians to work in a laboratory.

That was a recommendation of the committee. The letter went on to say:

As you know the Government has now considered the committee's advice and has adopted the abovementioned recommendations. In giving its reasons for making these two recommendations, the committee expressed concern over the cost of training technicians to bring them to a level of competence that would enable them to deal directly with the public. The committee believed this could not be justified on the basis of the advantages to the public as a result of that expenditure. In other words, there would have been a significant cost to the taxpayer that could not be justified on the grounds of benefit to the consumer.

I believe thought needs to be given to the standards of professional expertise which are required to make a clinical judgment about the condition of a person's teeth and gums. It is not realistic to expect that someone without the professional training of a dentist is fully equipped to make those judgments. Another one of the reasons put forward by the committee of inquiry was a reluctance to introduce and train yet another category of dental personnel when there is already an impending over-supply of dental personnel in South Australia.

Furthermore, the committee took into account evidence from other States which suggests that the difference between the cost of dentures provided by dental technicians and those of dentists reduces to the level of perhaps 15 per cent or so once chairside status is granted. In other words, once technicians are able to operate legally their charges rise as do their overheads.

That was what the Minister said in that letter. I will deal first with the statement that once chairside status is granted there will be a reduction of only 15 per cent in the charges of registered dental prosthetists; that is a distortion of the true facts. Let me quote the situation regarding fees in New South Wales, the last State which introduced legislation to register dental technicians. I understand that the situation there is similar to that in all other States where the dental prosthetists have chairside status.

I would like to quote an article in the *Australian Women's Weekly* of 3 June 1981, under the heading 'How to take the bite out of dental bills', dealing with the prices charged by members of the A.D.A. and members of the New South Wales Dental Prosthetists Association. For a complete maxillary (upper denture), the A.D.A. price is \$227, as opposed to \$135 charged by the Dental Prosthetists Association, a reduction of 40.5 per cent. For a complete maxillary and mandibular denture (both upper and lower), the price charged by the A.D.A. is \$396, whereas the price charged by the dental technicians is \$250 (a reduction of 36.7 per cent); acrylic partial, one or two teeth, \$117 as opposed to \$70 (a reduction of 40.2 per cent); metal partial, one or two teeth, \$358 compared with \$210 (a reduction of 41.3 per cent). They are the figures for New South Wales which are based similarly to those in other States that have registered dental technicians. Where does the Minister have the evidence that there will be a reduction of only 15 per cent? That was the distortion that was fed to the committee of inquiry.

Members of the general public, as I stated earlier, have been dealing for years with dental technicians, and that is because, despite knowing that what they and the dental technicians have been doing is illegal, they have been getting good treatment at a vastly reduced cost. The New South Wales figures quoted prove that. So much for the Minister's statement that there will be only a 15 per cent reduction. Other statements made by the Minister in her letter are completely refuted when one reads a letter to the Minister from a Mr James A. Jeffrey, who is President of the Dental Technicians Association of Victoria. That letter states in part:

The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention several facts which, after reading the substance of your letter of 20 July 1981 addressed to Mr Howard Harris, President of our South Australian branch, appear to have been overlooked by your com-

mittee of inquiry when investigating this extremely important industrial and public issue.

At the outset I must assert that any further delay with the proposed legislation is to permit the dental technician industry to fall further into disarray, opening the way to greater difficulties for any controlling authority in future and to deny the people of South Australia an improved standard of dental treatment due to an overall improvement of technological services within the profession. The registration permitting certain dental technicians limited clinical involvement is only a part of the answer to the whole problem within the industry, though an integral part. It will answer a very real interprofessional disorder which at this point in the development of dentistry in your State represents the natural product of an area of neglect on the part of the profession in its administration over the conduct and training of dental technicians.

That dental technicians seek limited clinical involvement in the process of general technological development is neither unnatural nor undesirable, and it is only the conservatism of thought on the part of the dental profession, typical of most professions, that has in refusing to come to terms with the problem a number of years ago allowed illegal practice to develop rather than to introduce a properly controlled high standard ancillary denture service . . .

The costs involved in establishing a course of training for clinical dental technicians can be justified by—

- (a) Each candidate subsidising the scheme by way of a fee—Victoria \$500 per year.
- (b) During the course a great number of dentures would be completed for necessitous persons saving the Government many thousands of dollars and would result in greatly reducing the backlog of patients awaiting urgent denture attention at the Dental Hospital.
- (c) The general public would benefit by an improved denture service because it is now increasingly acknowledged in those parts of the world having clinical dental technicians that the personal contact between the patient and the person providing both the clinical and technical aspects of denture treatment inevitably produces a better denture than is provided where the clinical and technical aspects are provided by separate individuals . . . where neither has sufficient understanding of or control over those factors that are essentially interrelated in the fitting and construction of the dentures, this of course being the present legally accepted procedure in your State.

The main objects of this Bill are twofold. First, it proposes the introduction of a system of registration for dental technicians. Secondly, it provides for registered dental technicians who have undergone additional training to become registered as dental prosthetists. Dental prosthetists will be permitted to deal directly with the public in the making, fitting, supplying and repairing of full dentures. As members would be aware, dental technicians have been seeking registration and the right to deal directly with the public—or 'chairside status' as it is often called—for some time. The Opposition believes it is time that the dental technician and his work were recognised in this State. Following an extensive review of the interstate situation, the then Labor Administration in the latter part of 1978 established a working party, including dentists and dental technicians, whose task was to prepare a brief upon which legislation could be based. This Bill reflects the work of that group. The Bill provides for the establishment of a Dental Technicians Board whose functions will include the registration of persons as dental technicians subject to certain criteria being met. This will prevent entry into the field by untrained people in the future. It will ensure that standards are set and upheld. Registered dental technicians will be required to work to prescription or under supervision. I would mention at this point that the basic training for dental technicians has recently been subjected to a comprehensive review. Suggestions have been made as to how the course might be upgraded.

The other major object of the Bill is to provide for the registration of clinical dental technicians. Persons registered under this part of the Bill will be permitted to deal directly with the public in the making, fitting and supplying of full dentures, and in the repair thereof. They will not be allowed to work on any jaw in which there are any natural teeth,

open tissue, disease or abnormality. I think that is an important part of the Bill; it refutes the allegations made by the A.D.A. and by the Minister that only professional dentists would be required in this particular instance.

A significant feature of this part of the Bill is that all persons wishing to become registered clinical prosthetists will be required to complete successfully one of two courses proposed to be conducted by the Department of Further Education. For the longer-established practitioners, as defined in the body of the legislation, there will be a shorter 'conversion' course available for a limited period. Other persons will be required to complete successfully a course of clinical training which will be longer in duration, possibly up to one year's full-time training, or the equivalent in part-time training. The people will not be permitted to deal directly with the public until they have successfully completed this course.

The conduct of clinical dental technicians and registered dental technicians will be subject to review by the board. Standards will be set, regulations will be made, and registered practitioners will be required to comply. The board will be empowered to take action against defaulting practitioners. The Opposition believes that the proposed legislation will meet a demand which has existed in the community for a long time. The public will be able to make a choice. In introducing the legislation, the Opposition is mindful of the fears that were expressed as to what would eventuate when similar legislation was introduced in other states. Those fears were not realised; indeed, a respected member of the dental profession in Tasmania was prepared to go on record and make a statement to that effect. The Opposition has every confidence that, with the support of members of this House, the system will work in South Australia. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 are formal. Clause 4 defines certain terms required for the purposes of the Act. Clause 5 provides that the Dentists Act, 1931-1974, does not have effect in respect to a person's practice or employment as a registered person under the Act or in respect of a business conducted in accordance with the Act. Clauses 6 to 16 provide for the establishment of the Dental Technicians Board, its membership, procedures and machinery provisions necessary for its effective operation.

Clause 7 prescribes the constitution of the board. The dental profession and the public will be represented by one member each. There will be two dental technicians on the board and a legal practitioner will be the Chairman. The Opposition believes that this will give a fair representation to all interested groups. Three members will form a quorum of the board.

Clause 16 provides for the appointment of a registrar. Clauses 17 and 18 provide for the registration of dental technicians. It is intended that those who practise as dental technicians prior to the commencement of the Act will be entitled to register under the new Act. Clauses 19 and 20 provide for the registration of dental prosthetists. Paragraph (c) (ii) enables a person who has experience as a dental technician prior to the commencement of the Act to be exempted from the requirement of paragraph (c) (i) to pass a full course of study. If he has had the experience stipulated in paragraph (c) (ii) or if the Minister considers he has had sufficient experience he can be exempted on passing a prescribed course of study. This is the conversion course that I mentioned earlier.

Clause 21 provides for the renewal of registration. Clause 22 provides for the keeping of the register. Clause 23 provides for the issuing of certificates of registration. Clause 24 restricts the practice of technical dentistry by imposing substantial fines. It is not contemplated that clinical dental prosthetists will have the necessary qualifications to deal with a patient who retains natural teeth in the jaw concerned or who is suffering from an abnormality, disease or wound. Subclause (2) prohibits a clinical dental prosthetist from attending a patient in these circumstances. Subclause (4) provides that a dental technician can only make, alter or repair dentures or appliances on the prescription or under the supervision of a doctor, dentist or clinical dental technician. Subclause (5) is a saving provision for work done by students and apprentices in the course of study or training.

Clause 25 prohibits a person from representing that he is a clinical dental prosthetist or dental technician. Clauses 26 to 31 make provision for the regulation of the practice of technical dentistry. Clause 26 allows the board to make investigations. Clause 27 allows the board to inquire into the conduct of a registered person and gives it disciplinary powers including power to suspend or cancel registration. Clause 28 provides for notice of an inquiry to be given to the subject of the enquiry. Clause 29 empowers the board to require the attendance of witnesses and production of documents for the purposes of the inquiry.

Clause 30 provides for an appeal to the Supreme Court, and clause 31 enables a technician who has appealed against a decision of the board to cancel or suspend his registration to continue to practise until the determination of the appeal. Clause 32 gives power to the board to provide for the continuing education of registered persons. Clause 33 enables the business of a clinical dental prosthetist to be carried on 12 months after his death if it is supervised by a dentist or a registered clinical dental prosthetist.

Clause 34 enables an unqualified person to carry on the business of a dental technician if the business is supervised by a dentist or registered person. Clause 35 requires surrender of certificates where they are cancelled or expired. Clause 36 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 37 is a regulation-making power.

Mr HEMMINGS: I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: It is a course that is a little unusual. Leave was granted for the insertion of the explanation of the clauses of the Bill. In the circumstances, if the honourable member has additional material that he wishes to continue with, on this occasion I will give him that permission.

Mr HEMMINGS: I have additional material to place before the House. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: To clarify the situation for the honourable member; by seeking leave to continue his remarks, does the honourable member seek leave to do that on an occasion other than today?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FRESH-WATER STUDIES

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I move:

That this House strongly supports the establishment of an Australian Institute of Fresh-water Studies and calls upon all South Australian Federal Parliamentary members to support the private member's Bill introduced into Federal Parliament by the member for Hawker, Mr Jacobi.

This Bill, which has been supported by the New South Wales Government, the Save the Murray Committee, and the Murray Valley League, has yet to receive the support of any Liberal or Country Party member of Parliament, State or Federal, in this nation. I am unable to understand why this should be so, particularly in the case of South Australian Liberal and Country Party members. Such an institute would provide tremendous advantages for this State. I would be disappointed to find that lack of support is motivated merely by the fact that Mr Jacobi is a member of the Liberal Party. With due acknowledgment to Mr Jacobi's second reading explanation, I will place before the House the reasons why this Bill was presented to the House of Representatives and why this Assembly should support my motion.

The frequent calls for a national approach to solve the problems of the Murray River and the steadfast refusal of the national Government to become involved in interstate arguments about the river management, exemplify the fact that water resources management in Australia to achieve national objectives at the highest and broadest levels is virtually non-existent. This is undeniable and has been noted by every commentator on water resources management in Australia. It is not surprising that such deficiencies should exist when the Australian Constitution omits water management as a specific responsibility of the national Government. But national Governments have almost invariably attempted to adopt the narrowest interpretation of their residual responsibilities and powers with respect to water management.

The Bill provides for the establishment of an Australian Institute of Fresh-water Studies to upgrade and extend the research and planning of fresh-water resources; in short, to provide the framework for better management of the most basic of resources in a dry continent—water. The establishment of such a national institute will not, of itself, solve the problems of the Murray River or similar national problems. It would, however, greatly assist by providing impartial information whereby the claims and requirements of the various managing State authorities could be investigated and evaluated, whereby the problems could be better defined and whereby optimal solutions are most likely to be derived in the national interest. The manner in which the institute can play its envisaged role can be assessed from the wording of the Bill itself. [Copies of the Bill are available to members who wish to obtain a copy.] It should be noted, however, that the charter of the institute itself would not be settled until an interim council had been established by the Government to examine the situation more closely.

The establishment of an Institute of Fresh-water Studies is by no means a unique proposal. Similar institutes exist in many developed countries, including, for example, Canada, the United Kingdom, South Africa, New Zealand and Israel. Indeed, it is quite anomalous that the driest continent, Australia, presently lacks such an institute. The charters of these overseas institutes indicate the importance placed on water research by the countries in which they are located. The high priority given such institutes by Israel and South Africa, where, like Australia, water is a basic resource in short supply, is, of course, no coincidence.

These countries have recognised the vital role of water research, investigation and management to their national well-being. These countries have recognised that the problems of water management are extricably tied to the nature and complexity of their localised geography; that is, their soils, topography, industries, agriculture and water demands. These countries have clearly seen that the problems of one country are inevitably individual to that country and cannot necessarily be solved by taking results from elsewhere. That

feature, above all, applies in Australia. For example, the irrigation problems along the Murray River, which has mainly sodium salinity, require a quite different solution to those of irrigation areas of the United States of America or Israel, where salinity is mainly of the calcium type. We require a solution which can be found only in Australia, by using our own brains and resources.

In comparison with other countries we can ask what organisations does Australia have and what level of effort Australia applies to the solution of its problems. First, the level of funding of fresh-water research in Australia is totally inadequate. The allocation to the Australian Water Resources Council for research purposes in the last Budget was a mere \$450 000. Let us compare this figure with that received by just one fresh-water research laboratory in the United Kingdom in 1980—\$2 500 000. With this limited level of funding for the A.W.R.C., even the best organisation in the world would be hard pressed to make any impression on the growing water problems of this vast and largely arid nation. But worse than that, the organisations we do have are woefully fragmented or inappropriate to the tasks.

First, the Department of National Development and Energy, of which the Australian Water Resources Council is part, is involved only in administrative and policy areas. Neither organisation directly undertakes investigation or research, although they do have some limited control or influence on these activities by their funding powers. Nor do they make decisions or recommendations on specific or contentious management issues. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I move:

That this House believes pre-school educational opportunities are an important part of a child's total education, rejects the trend towards having parents bear an ever-increasing burden of the costs of providing for those opportunities, and calls on the Federal Government to cease its erosion of funding for pre-school education and to acknowledge its responsibilities towards the children of this State and their right to pre-school education.

This is an important motion, and I hope that the House will be able to deal with it speedily in the next couple of weeks. I appreciate the constraints of other business and I do not propose to speak on this at great length because of those constraints. There are some basic points I feel ought to be made.

First, the motion, as can be seen, implies three courses of action by this House. The first course of action is that it requires the House to affirm or deny its belief in the value of pre-school education as education. Secondly, it calls on the House to accept or reject the trend towards expecting parents in the community to pay an ever-increasing share of the costs of their children's pre-school education in this instance. Thirdly, it asks this House to either support or oppose the erosion in funding from the Federal Government towards pre-school education. These three areas are all vital, important, and inter-related.

We need to determine what we feel the educational value of pre-school education is in order to determine its funding priorities from both the State and Federal levels. Tied in with that, we need to know whether it is essential educationally and whether it should be the responsibility primarily of the Government to meet the actual costs of running the kindergartens and child-parent centres. This issue has come to a head in recent times. It is by no manner of means new that we have had criticism of the Federal Government and its inadequate level of funding in this

regard. A press release issued by a former Minister of Education of this State, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, then member for Brighton, way back in 1974 said:

Full coverage of the State [that is in regard to kindergarten and child-parent centres] will require support from the Federal Government many times in excess of that provided this financial year.

The former Minister was making a criticism of the then Federal Government. This criticism was listened to by that Government and resulted in a substantial increase in funding to child-parent centres and kindergartens. This increased level has since been significantly and disastrously eroded. My motion also tackles the three questions because in this House we need to establish where we feel our responsibility lays to pre-school education.

It is true that the Federal Government has not lived up to its obligations and responsibilities and has allowed the erosion of funding for some years and this has been the subject of considerable criticism. It is also true that we have a responsibility to say where we stand on those first two questions of parent funding and educational value of child-parent centres. If we accept the educational value and reject the ever-increasing trend towards the user pays philosophy, we also have to look closely at the funding allocations we give towards pre-school education and determine whether they are adequate.

I will cover each of those as quickly as I can. The first is pre-school education. Initially, I draw the attention of members to a quote from the report of the Kindergarten Union for the year ended 31 December 1979, in which comment is made on the role of pre-schools. The article states:

Under its Act the Kindergarten Union is charged, amongst other things, with promoting 'proper education, development, guidance, and care', of pre-school children.

It is important to note that this statement juxtaposes the four aspects, namely, education, development, guidance, and care. This statement in the annual report of the Kindergarten Union, the body that provides about 78 per cent of all pre-school education places in this State, is highly significant. That organisation has affirmed that pre-schools are not just a case of baby-sitting, occupational therapy, or providing time out from the home so the children can get out of the hair of the parents. The union acknowledges that the matter goes much further than that, so there is the educational component.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Who does say that?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister asks, 'Who does say that?' If we interpret the actions we are now seeing it is implied that we doubt just how valuable educationally pre-school is. I wish to indicate one way in which we can understand the analysis of how serious we are about the educational value of pre-school education. I put it to you this way, Sir: in this State at the moment we would not be as appalled if a four-year-old child was unable to find a place in a child-parent centre or a kindergarten for four sessions a week as we would be if a seven or eight-year-old child was not able to find a place in a primary school. In that latter case I fully accept that everybody in society would be rightly and justly appalled. Yet, when four-year-old children are involved—and there are many four-year-old children who do not have full access to what is considered a reasonable exposure to pre-school education—the response is, 'That is rather a pity. We are sorry about that. We would like to give you the pre-school education you should be entitled to but, unfortunately, you will just have to wait.' That is a commentary on the value that we in society at large and in Governmental positions place on pre-school education. I am calling for a change of attitude in that regard. I am calling for this affirmation so that we can regard it as essential, and so that we can regard it as

likewise appalling when a four-year-old is unable to get four sessions a week in a pre-school or a kindergarten.

Education authorities have proven by studies for some time that the early years of childhood are vital learning years, that much of the important learning takes place then, and, even more importantly, the skills to go on and enhance that learning in the years ahead are determined by those early years. Certainly, it is true that much of that education does not take place in a school building, nor indeed should it. There is a very valuable role to be played, and always has been played, by the educating capacity of the home. That should be endorsed and reinforced, but there does come a stage at about the age of four years—or 3½ years in some situations—when there is considerable value in having children join together in a learning situation, namely, a child-parent centre or a kindergarten, and undertake their education there, because there are also the educational benefits of the social inter-relationships of the students in that situation. So, it is very important for that reason.

It is also very important for another reason, that is, that we can identify in the pre-school years many educational problems amongst children that can more readily be solved then, and if not solved then may become irreparable in years to come. Having a child in a pre-school situation therefore helps us to identify such problems. Indeed, the Kindergarten Union applied for two speech therapists back in 1979, and this year one of those two positions has been filled. It is a pity that the two have not been filled, but we will just have to keep on trying for the second one. What will result from that is that those speech therapists will identify speech problems in young children, be able to diagnose and propose remedies for those problems, and perhaps quickly alleviate them, quickly provide solutions that otherwise would take some years to effect because the problems may not in fact be identified until some considerable time later.

The next area that is implicit in my motion is that regarding parental funding. I indicated in my speech to this House last night that I was gravely concerned about the trend to back-to-parent funding that we are at present seeing take place. I suppose 'trend' is even the wrong word, because we are not slowly easing our way back. We are not seeing minuscule increases from year to year. We are seeing massive increases being put on parents in the pre-school area.

The Minister, by his own statements, acknowledges that parents could be paying up to \$42 a year more and, for some parents in some situations, that could approach up to 100 per cent more than they are paying at the moment. We know that in many child-parent centres and kindergartens operating grants will be cut by 50 per cent. I spoke at some length last night on how it is intriguing to note that we now seem to be entering the era where that 50 per cent can be referred to as 'only 50 per cent', but I will not belabour that point on this occasion.

Suffice it to say that the whole question of 'user pays' needs to be investigated in some considerable depth. We need to state where we feel parent funding lies in terms of funding of education. But, in so doing, I want to put the proposition that indeed we are wrongly interpreting the user pays principle. There is another way of interpreting user pays other than having the user pay at the point of service provision. That other way, of course, is that you can regard taxation payments as a kind of insurance premium towards a series of policies that cover a number of areas of life, one of which is education.

As people pay taxation payments they are contributing through their working lives, through their tax paying lives, towards an education policy. At various times in their working lives they will draw on that policy to try to claim

educational services for their children. So, they are 'user pays' already; the taxpayer is paying it. But they are paying in little amounts over a long period of time rather than relatively large amounts for a short period of time.

If we want to take the user pays principle one step further, we should remember that one of the most significant users of all educational services and pre-school educational services by consequence is society at large. All we have to do is to think what our society would be like without those services. If it did not have them it would be much the poorer in many, many regards. Therefore, it benefits by having those services. It therefore is a user of those services and it therefore should pay for those services.

I did establish at some length last night, again, how the increasing trend towards expecting parents to pay for pre-school education was putting an onerous burden on many homes. I read out examples written by parents in this State who clearly show that they could not easily bear that extra burden. We have parents in this State who are talking about not being able to continue sending their children to pre-school education. That would be a grave pity, a grave pity certainly for the children involved and for the homes involved, but also a pity for society at large.

The third point related to Federal Government funding. It is, as I said, true that the Federal Government has not lived up to its responsibilities in this area. That does not fully answer the present crisis we have with regard to Budget operating allowances, because a close look at the figures in the State Budget with regard to kindergarten and child-parent centre education shows that the entire effect of Federal Government cuts in this area has been fed back to the parents. Nowhere else in the pre-school education system or in the education system generally is expected to alleviate that. The parents are paying the lot. The lack of the buck stops with the parents.

I suggest that, when members consider this matter, they look at the Federal Government Budget papers regarding one area of payments. We receive two categories of payment from the Commonwealth Government; one relates to recurrent grants for pre-schools. We see that from the years 1977-78 to 1981-82 there has been a significant drop. The proposed figures for 1981-82 are only 83.2 per cent of the 1977-78 figures. What is very sad to note is that South Australia has fared much worse than have the other States of the nation. Indeed, it has fared the worst. The figure proposed for this year for recurrent spending is only 71.8 per cent of the 1977-78 figure, and takes no account of inflation in the intervening years. That makes the impact considerably greater.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Have you done a calculation for what the impact is, that is, the percentage reduction if you take inflation into account?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: No, I was coming to that. If one takes inflation into account the impact is significantly greater than that, I admit. I am certain that, when the Minister of Transport involves himself in this debate, he will be pleased to present those calculations to the House. The other point about Federal Government funding goes back to a comment made by the former Minister of Education in 1974, Mr Hudson, when he indicated:

The programme for the extension of pre-schools which is aimed at establishing a universal system of pre-school education will occupy at least six years.

That, interestingly takes us to last year. He continued:

Priorities and areas not served by pre-schools will have to be established by the [then] recently-formed South Australian Pre-school Education Committee.

The then Minister came back to his comment that this would rely upon Federal Government funding. That is important in terms of providing that coverage. Many people

from kindergartens have written to me indicating the problems they face in providing adequate pre-school education facilities. The response is that capital works money is not available, for example. An area in my electorate has been told that.

The outcome of all that is that we do not see a planned approach to pre-school education. I remind you, Sir, that the Hon. Hugh Hudson indicated that there was clearly a planned approach in mind towards developing universal access to pre-school education. What we see, instead, is a crisis-based response type in pre-school education. I draw attention of the House to a response a kindergarten in my area received from the Minister of Education when it asked when it could expect larger and improved facilities to take account of the population growth that has occurred. The Minister's response was, in part:

In an ideal funding climate it would be highly desirable to provide facilities before the need becomes critical.

I have, on another occasion, criticised the spirit of that statement, because it clearly indicates that the planning mode or the reaction mode of Government to pre-school education is crisis based and is not one based upon principles of sound educational planning. Criticisms can be levelled at the State Government for that, but also I acknowledge that criticisms would have to be levelled at the Federal Government in that regard, because by its erosion of responsibility in this field it takes away the capacity to plan for major capital facilities. That does not answer the problem of Budget operating allowance costs, because that figure is insignificant in terms of the total education budget available to this State.

As I said last night, cut-backs in that area represent nothing other than a mean-minded approach by the State Government to education at this time. As time is short, and we have other business to get on with, I look forward to hearing comments of other members in this place, such as the Minister of Transport. I know that the Minister of Education will be involved at some stage, and I hope that this motion receives early passage, so that the Federal Government can pick up where we stand on education, also so that the community can understand where we stand as a State Parliament regarding the educational value of pre-schools and regarding the parent funding role.

Dr BILLARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ashenden:

That this House urges all members to study and consider the serious ramifications of the recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission on assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984, in view of the danger to South Australian employment and industrial development should the recommendations be adopted.

(Continued from 30 September. Page 1293.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that this motion is somewhat curious and quite inadequate, which is not to say that we cannot support it to the extent to which it goes. It deals with a matter of vital importance to this State, one which has already been debated and voted on in this place, that is, the Industries Assistance Commission report on assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984. I say the motion is a curious one because it does not really do very much; it urges us to study the recommendations, and to consider their serious ramifications, which is quite worthy. In the latter part it suggests that there is some danger to South Australian employment and industrial

development should the recommendations be adopted. Then it stops. But, the motion goes no further regarding actually doing anything about it.

Mr Ashenden: The motion was constrained by Standing Orders.

Mr BANNON: Perhaps those constraints are what shows it up. I have not checked the position on this, but does that mean that no amendments can be moved to it? I suggest an addendum, and I intend to move it, that proposes specific action being taken, namely, conveying our concern to the Prime Minister. These are not the words of the amendment; I seek your guidance as to the wording, Sir. Also, it will request action by certain South Australian Senators in respect of the matter.

Mr Ashenden: That was ruled out of order when I spoke with the Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): It is capable of amendment, if the Leader so wishes.

Mr BANNON: I will be amending, and if some ruling prevents me, so be it. But, it is a pity in a way that there should be any constraint on how we tackle this matter, because one aspect of it that I certainly share with the honourable member is that it is a serious and important matter on which this House must express its concern. In this session we have already debated this motion in this House. Unfortunately, that debate did not result in the passing of a motion which really required concrete action by this Parliament.

There were recommendations for action, namely, conveying the resolution to the Prime Minister. That is fine. No doubt, he looked at the letter and did much the same as he does to other submissions made to him by this Government, despite the similarity of political colour, despite the fact that the Premier campaigned very vigorously indeed for the Prime Minister in 1980, and claimed some credit for the fact that the Prime Minister was returned, even although the current Government in Canberra holds a minority of seats in the House of Representatives from this State. Despite that, I do not believe that submissions passed on to the Prime Minister are really having very much effect at all.

Certainly I would concede, as indeed I conceded in another debate, that the Government in this State at least has taken a line which has rejected the recommendations of the Industrial Assistance Commission and has attempted to point out the serious ramifications that would result from their adoption. The fact remains that in Canberra there is a strong lobby, mainly back-benchers, but probably with sympathies within the Cabinet and within the Ministry, who believe in some form of free trade principle and who have been gathering support in the Liberal Party room amongst their colleagues, assisted by the National Country Party, to a certain extent, to try to get the Government to adopt these recommendations.

I think when the report was first published it was felt that there was really nothing to get worried about. After all, the I.A.C. has reported in similar terms previously. The proposals are to reduce tariffs to 35 per cent by 1990 (currently they stand at 45 per cent plus 12½ per cent duty on quotas), to abolish quotas on imported vehicles, which currently are 20 per cent of the market, and, in effect, to abolish the 85 per cent Australian content that is required at the moment. As I say, it is not new for the I.A.C. to have made recommendations along these lines.

In 1974 the I.A.C. recommended to the then Whitlam Government that the local content plan should not apply and that 25 per cent protection should apply from 1 January 1982. If we had 25 per cent protection from next January, which is what was envisaged in that 1974 report, we would have been, in effect, without a substantial motor vehicle

industry in this country at all. That report went fairly close to adoption. There was at the time on both sides of the House a fairly strong what one could call a free trade lobby, particularly in view of the international movement of prices and the level of inflation in Australia, which was arguing quite strongly that we had to free up the importing of goods from overseas, first, to have an effect on lowering price levels in Australia and, secondly, to force manufacturing industry in Australia to become more efficient.

Both those objectives are fairly desirable. The 25 per cent across the board tariff cut did not achieve the first, which was its primary aim, that of lowering prices. What it did do was in practice allow many importers to make massive profits in an unwarranted fashion, but it did not have a major dampening on the price of goods in Australia or its effect. The second prong of that attack on the level of tariffs was to attempt to make industry more efficient. I do not think there is any argument about that.

Obviously in the long term for the industry to survive it must be competitive, and it must be export oriented because of the size of our market in Australia, but I think what we are arguing about on this occasion, as we were in 1974, is the pace and manner of doing that. Clearly, the I.A.C. went far beyond what was practical; clearly the I.A.C. on that occasion, as on this, ignored evidence which related to the effect not just on those directly employed in the motor vehicle industry but on all the surrounding component manufacturers and others who derive their income and their economic activity from it.

I think one of the crucial things about that 1974 exercise was the intervention of the then State Labor Government. It was fairly unprecedented for a Government to intervene, and the key part of its submission was to present considerable detail on the indirect effects of the tariff cuts proposed by the I.A.C. It did that in a comprehensive and extremely compelling way and I think it helped to indicate, first, that the I.A.C. had not done its homework properly and, secondly, urged on the then Labor Government the gravity of effect of any action it would take.

That crisis was staved off and thank goodness it was, because, apart from that recommendation that we would be down to only 25 per cent protection by January of next year, there was the recommendation by the I.A.C. that Australian producers should concentrate on the six-cylinder market. That was an extraordinarily bad prophecy in the light of trends which even then were becoming apparent. This was of course the time that Leyland was embarking on its ill-fated P76 venture. It was a time when American motor companies had not seen the writing on the wall concerning six and eight-cylinder cars. The move was to small cars but it had not gathered pace. The I.A.C. in its in-depth examination in 1974 said that the answer for the indigenous Australian motor vehicle manufacturers was to concentrate on six-cylinder cars and not to go into smaller cars.

Thank goodness that advice was not accepted either by the Government or by the motor vehicle industry. Part of the key to the development and survival of our industry today has been that a few manufacturers, belatedly in some cases, did get the message that small cars were going to be in demand in the market and that they should gear up to produce them and by doing that, by ignoring that recommendation, they are surviving. We avoided disaster then and we avoided it in part because of Government intervention.

That brings me back to the situation today. The Government has moved in this area and we are not loath to congratulate it for taking up that case, but let me return to the Federal Liberal Party and the members in it and point out that, even here in South Australia, where one

would have thought the effects were only too obvious, if they do not want to listen to the Labor Party or people in the industry, they can listen to people such as the Minister of Industrial Affairs or the member for Todd on their own side pointing it out. However, Federal members are prepared to support the so-called Kelly gang. I would have thought that the Liberal Party in South Australia could have made some greater impact on its members here and that those members of the Liberal Party nationally who believe in manufacturing industry, believe that it must have a future in this country, could have put far greater pressure on the Mr Hydes and others of this world who are running around getting up the numbers to get these recommendations accepted. It means that voices must be heard loudly and clearly, and they are beginning to be so.

The industry has mobilised; it has mobilised on the basis of involving management, owners, policy makers, shareholders and the workers within that industry. They recognise their joint and mutual interests, and they have combined to take action by way of submission, deputation, and even street demonstration on this matter. That is a good thing, too. There has also been Parliamentary activity, and this is one example of that.

Export complementation will begin next March. That will allow imports of parts in return for exports. That is a problem I do not think has been sufficiently looked at in expressing our views even on the current situation. It will hit component firms, many of whom are in South Australia, and they could suffer. One thing we have to remember about our motor vehicle industry is that, while we do have two of the major manufacturers (Mitsubishi almost solely based in South Australia and General Motors-Holden's largely based in South Australia and in Victoria), we also have a number of component manufacturers servicing motor vehicle assemblers or manufacturers interstate. A lot of the product made in this State goes interstate and of course it is not just a case of saying that provided General Motors and Mitsubishi survive in the short term so the component manufacturers will survive. We have to ensure that the whole of the motor vehicle industry is soundly based.

That again is something that is sometimes forgotten in the course of the debate. At the moment we are still in the situation where no decision has been made. The Government has delayed that decision, and the latest estimate was that it would be announced towards the end of November. Previously, we were supposed to have a decision in September. I think it is important that a lot of effort be directed to ensuring that a decision is made, and made quickly. There are some who argue that the longer the Government takes to make up its mind the less likely the I.A.C. recommendations will be accepted. I do not know that that is necessarily true; you could argue on both sides. It is clear that Mr Hyde and his supporters in the Federal Caucus are continuing their campaign and are finding a ready forum in some parts of the press and among certain groups, so the longer they have to push their message out perhaps the more likely it will be that the I.A.C. recommendations will be accepted.

On the other hand, the argument against those recommendations and a searching analysis of the I.A.C. recommendations and their impact are also occurring. I think that all the manufacturers and all the component makers would agree that delay can only cause uncertainty and can only defer forward planning and create a loss of morale and confidence in the industry, and the sooner they are told the better. It is a great pity that this whole inquiry intervened, because the industry, I believe, had responded very well and quite fully to the existing plan. Whatever their doubts about it at the stage it was formulated, they were adjusting to it, and it seems to me extraordinary that they are being

forced into another period of total uncertainty, not only, of course, those planning at the management or policy levels of the firm: what about the employees? Their jobs and their futures are bound up in this. Is their Christmas present going to be an announcement from the Federal Government that these recommendations will be accepted and they can say 'Goodbye' to their jobs over the period that the plan is implemented? I think we should be urging them that delay must cease and the decision must be made.

Queensland and Western Australia seem to be the place where the tariff cuts are being most strongly supported. That stands to reason, because they are the so-called resource States; they do not like Australian manufacturing industry, because in a sense they can claim they do not need it. To the extent that there is a manufacturing base in Queensland, much of it is related to food processing. In the case of States such as Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales, we do rely on a manufacturing industry base and employment in those areas, and we cannot see them go to the wall, because resource development is no alternative in South Australia or Victoria for a sound, well-established manufacturing base. I think we ought not only take the battle up to Queensland and over to Western Australia at the State and Federal level; we ought to ensure that all our South Australian members clearly see the case and support it.

I have heard, for instance, that the member for Barker, Mr James Porter, supports these I.A.C. recommendations. I do not know whether he has made a firm statement to that effect, but if he does it is unfortunate, and I think he ought to be spoken to very firmly by his colleagues in the Liberal Party in South Australia; similarly, with any other people who may be wavering in this matter, because we must have a united voice from South Australia cutting across all Parties and all interests, as our economy is so dependent on the survival of this industry. This is not to say that we must allow it simply to shelter under its tariff protection and become inefficient, but I do not think anyone is suggesting that that is the alternative. It is not the alternative at all; regulated and planned change in an industry is a good thing, but the sledgehammer or slashing approach adopted by the I.A.C. is not the way to provide balanced development.

The climate for tariff cuts, I believe, has been fuelled by the balance of payments position. I think the argument has been carried through on the basis that there is such a large inflow of capital, particularly for resource-based projects, and we have in fact a Federal Budget strategy based on that. We have a tight rein being placed on domestic credit because of it, with a resultant impact on interest rates, particularly in the housing sphere. Of course, that indicates that at the higher policy levels the Federal Government would be rather favourably inclined to the I.A.C. approach to this. Again, I think that does create a sense of urgency that we make our submissions very strongly to them and get a favourable decision as soon as possible.

Capital inflow in the latest quarter has slumped, and whether as the Treasurer would suggest it is merely some seasonal aberration, or whether as the Opposition suspects it indicates a greater underlying and long-term problem, it has slumped, and we cannot afford a surge in imports advanced by capital inflow in the near future. The argument for lower protection and more imports is now very much weakened in the light of what has been happening with that capital inflow. We have to take that situation into account to strengthen our case in support of the motor vehicle industry as against the I.A.C. The Government should take note of that position and maintain assistance for the car industry. It is now more inappropriate than ever, I would suggest, to cut protection.

The extent of the impact on South Australia has been well established. We would be very hard hit by this both in direct employment with the manufacturers and in the component firms that support the car industry. Even the study done for the car importers by Professor Parry, interestingly enough, makes this point, that Adelaide and Geelong are likely problem areas, which is Professor Parry's delicate way of putting it, when it comes to coping with job losses caused by changes in the motor industry. Professor Parry's study favours low protection and favours the I.A.C. reports, but even in this anti-protection study he is prepared, and must be prepared because the objective evidence is there, to admit that the effect on Adelaide and Geelong, as the other areas mentioned, will be to create major problem areas. That is well worth remembering.

So let us back the industry we already have. Let us back manufacturing because of its employment importance in this State, and let us tell the Fraser Government very firmly to leave the car industry alone and let it get on with what is a very efficient and well organised restructuring of that industry in the context of firm tariff protection proposals, which are well understood by the industry and are being accommodated by it. We do not deny that the industry should change over time, but we believe it must be on a planned basis. We have advocated at the national level a motor vehicle authority to try to do just that. I think it would be as well if the House supported steps being taken in that way, which would mean that we would not have these periodic crises brought about by the I.A.C. and its reports. I conclude by moving my amendment, which adds the words:

and directs Mr Speaker to convey the concern of the House to the Prime Minister and further requests that South Australian Senators meet the Prime Minister, as a group, to support South Australia's case.

I so move.

Mr ASHENDEN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I wished to have an addition made to the motion that I originally moved, which I believe was very similar to that which the Leader has moved. It was put to me by the Speaker that such action would be out of order because there was an existing motion on the Notice Paper. I would be quite happy to wait for a ruling from the Speaker on this matter if you feel that that would be advisable. However, I make members aware of the point that I have raised.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): It is my intention to seek a seconder to the amendment. Then I will discuss the matter with the Speaker to find out his intent and bring the ruling in later. Is there a seconder to the amendment?

Mr McRAE (Playford): Yes, Sir. I wish to be heard briefly in seconding the motion. I understood from your ruling from the Chair after taking advice that you were going to raise the matters with the Speaker, and I do not want to pre-empt that. I simply want to place on record my support for the motion so far as it goes. However, I indicate that it would be a far more realistic situation if this amendment could be considered. I now seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MARKET GARDENING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lynn Arnold:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a Joint Committee be established as a matter of urgency to inquire into all aspects of the market gardening industry in South Australia with particular regard to:

(a) wholesaling and retailing of produce, including the question of growers' markets; and

(b) the need for technical assistance to the industry, including the proposal for a vegetable research institute.

(Continued from 30 September. Page 1300.)

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): Members will recall that when the member for Salisbury moved his motion he informed the Parliament of his long-term interest in the market gardening industry, and in particular of his long-term interest in the welfare of those gardeners who are constituents of his in the northern regions of Adelaide. There have been a number of occasions when members in this House, in response to representations, or, indeed, in response to the requirements of their local constituents, have raised this matter. I mention this at the outset because I am aware of the interest, concern and, indeed, the extreme efforts that have been made by the member for Goyder on behalf of market gardeners in his district, especially in that part of his district that extends south into the northern regions of the Adelaide Plains.

Members of Parliament from both sides of this House have demonstrated, in a variety of ways, the need of that industry for attention. Immediately after we came into Government I received deputations from market gardeners, packers, wholesalers and merchants, all of whom had a deep involvement in the market gardening industry and the marketing of fruit and vegetables in South Australia. Clearly, as a result of those representations, which emanate from a variety of sources and which have been drawn to the attention of this Parliament, one can conclude that it is an area in need of attention.

The Department of Agriculture is very conscious of the need for attention and assistance in this regard. In response to the motion moved by the member for Salisbury, I believe it is essential to identify some of those areas where both the previous and present Governments have extended service to that sector of the community. The marketing of fruit and vegetables in South Australia was studied in depth by the East End Market Relocation Committee, which was appointed in 1975 by the then Government. It is clear from the personnel on that committee that indeed every effort was made by the then Minister to have the widest possible representation that could be found. In fact, in that case people were invited to contribute towards the study made by the committee, which subsequently reported to both the previous Government and to me.

The committee's first report, dated October 1975, is descriptive of the wholesale marketing system and contains recommendations for the relocations of the market. New terms of reference were then provided and the committee conducted detailed studies of the fruit and vegetable industries and their marketing at the wholesale and retail levels. The findings are set out in the Report on the Marketing of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables in South Australia, issued in 1978. Supplementary reports used in the committee include a report on the real value of the market gardening area of the northern Adelaide Plains, a region to which I referred earlier, which was prepared for the Underground Water Advisory Committee in 1974. There was a report on the factors explaining consumer buying habits of fresh fruit and vegetables, prepared by W. D. Scott and Company for the East End Market Relocation Committee in 1976. Following these reports, recommendations for the redevelopment of the wholesale market have not been implemented, largely, I concede, on financial grounds. Proposals for market regulation that are dependent on redevelopment have also not proceeded. A group of growers from the Virginia area formed the United Market Gardeners Organisation early in 1981.

Mr Lynn Arnold: The Virginia-Salisbury area.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I take the point raised by the member for Salisbury that, indeed, the district of Salisbury is identified in that movement. We are all aware of the dissatisfaction that arose in that particular direction with the viability of their enterprises and the marketing system. They seek the establishment of a growers' market in the Salisbury district as an outlet for their produce and as a way of putting pressure for change on the wholesale marketing system. Under the provisions of the Market Clauses Act, 1870-1956, the establishment of a market outside the city centre requires the approval of the local government.

You, Mr Speaker, as well as the other members who represent the respective portions of the Northern Plains area, would be well aware of the need for the approval of the local government body. The Government made a site available for a growers' market at Salisbury, but, as already has been canvassed in this place and publicly on a number of occasions, the Salisbury council has not agreed to the establishment of it.

It is with considerable disappointment that I learned of the ultimate decision of the Salisbury council to deny these people the opportunity of trying out their proposal within the district council area of Salisbury. This was especially so after their efforts to secure a suitable site and their efforts to comply with the basic health and good conduct requirement that one would expect an occupier of a site of that kind to adopt. My colleague, the Minister of Transport, along with another colleague, the Minister of Education, extended the utmost co-operation wherein both Ministers offered, in the immediate and convenient region of the Salisbury township, parcels of land that were seen to be suitable for the purpose.

The area involving the State Transport Authority land was identified for several reasons as being appropriate for this purpose. After having had direct consultation with members in the district and members of that particular grower organisation, I was satisfied that they were fair dinkum about their intent and were prepared to comply, as far as humanly possible, in their efforts to conduct their activities in the interests of the residents and occupiers of adjacent land in that Salisbury district.

It was on that note that we agreed to support them to the extent that we have. I repeat my disappointment that their move in that direction has stumbled at the local government level. It is not for me or any other member of this Government to interfere with the functions of local government, but, in saying that, I do not believe that this group should, in their genuine efforts to conduct a trial marketing system in their immediate region, cease at that level. This group should continue with their endeavours and they will have the support of the Government to do so, as long as they uphold their undertaking to market their own grown fruit. I mention that because it is important that we be not involved in, or seen to be involved in, financially, technically, or advisedly, sponsoring a group who are setting out in a pseudo-situation where they commence to sell their own fruit and then drift into a situation where they have become retailers of the produce of other growers.

We have had an assurance (and I know the member for Salisbury is aware of what I am talking about in this instance), and I hope that that undertaking will be upheld throughout their exercise to try the methods of selling. This matter is being pursued and it is considered that a joint committee investigation would not achieve anything that cannot be achieved by the current negotiations and action being undertaken. It is on that note that the establishment of a joint committee, as constituting part of the proposal in the motion moved by the honourable member, ought not be agreed to.

However, not only incorporated in the motion but in his remarks to this House on 30 September a number of other matters were cited, to which I will respond. Regarding the need for technical assistance to the market-gardening industry, this is clearly recognised. A report on a letter from the General Manager of the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Society in March 1981 identified 11 positions in the Department of Agriculture concerned with the research and extension for the industry. At the time it was noted that there was some staff movement and replacements would have to be found in some positions. I assure the House that moves are proceeding in this direction, with recommendations current for the filling of two positions.

A suggestion that a vegetable research institute be set up within the South Australian Department of Agriculture to promote applied research and extension in the market garden industry has been floated from time to time. It, too, constitutes a line of the motion. The idea appears to have been derived from research structures developed in areas of very large population where there is a huge market gardening industry, such as in Holland (as cited by the honourable member).

An institutional approach has been adopted by the Victorian Department of Agriculture, where population and facilities are far greater than they are here in South Australia. I agree that it does not necessarily follow that, because we are smaller by regional geography, population, production, or some of the other areas cited by the honourable member, we should not go on with it. I would like to go further not only in relation to what we are unable to do, but also in identifying what has already been done in this direction.

The desirability of such an approach was considered in a report to the then Minister of Agriculture in July 1979. The clear conclusion was that the establishment of a research institute in South Australia was not warranted. The expression on behalf of the Government that I make on this occasion is not inconsistent with what has been made before, albeit with substantial research and background noting behind it. Currently a review of the role of the research centres in the research programme of the department is being conducted and will consider, amongst other matters, the cost effectiveness and the scientific merit of using research centres compared to other sites for the conduct of scientific investigation. This review, to be completed later this year, will have a bearing on any considerations of centralising vegetable research programmes in South Australia.

The vegetable-growing industry is a very diverse one and I have no desire to canvass in any great detail the wide diversity that is involved. However, each of the many types of vegetables is a separate crop and almost a separate industry in its own right. The agronomy, handling and marketing problems of each particular species of vegetable are distinct and different from those of the other types. This means that separate research programmes may have to be developed for each type of vegetable, in many cases involving a very wide range indeed, if we are to attempt to establish a full-scale centralised research facility here in South Australia, as is implied in the motion.

Unfortunately, the resources of the Department of Agriculture have never been sufficient for such a massive programme to be undertaken. Indeed, only in areas of very much greater population could such a proposal be contemplated. Fortunately, however, we are able in very many instances to add to the research work which we are doing ourselves by tapping into the research activities being undertaken by other vegetable research groups around Australia. Much of the basic crop production technology is

common to several States, and interstate research is applicable.

Where this is not the case, in areas such as localised weed problems or disease, every effort is being made to solve the important problems by local research on producers' own properties and in the laboratory here in South Australia. Funding of additional research by the industry itself could well be a matter that should be followed up, and I think that so far I have demonstrated that in most, if not all, of what the member has proposed there is an element of good sense and an element of ideal, but funding, of course, must be considered when proposals of this very wide nature, are put forward for the purposes of the Government upholding the responsibility.

However, very great legal and social problems would have to be solved, because of the complexity and diversity of the industry. In any case, there is no evidence to suggest that research work done on an institutional basis, separated from the practicalities of commercial production, would be more effective than the research done on producers' own properties. Indeed, our experience has been that in very many instances a better result is obtained and there is a quicker acceptance of new practices by the growers themselves when the research is done on their own land and in close association with the grower community.

In very briefly enlarging on that matter, I think that it is relevant also to indicate to the House the quite deliberate efforts that have been made by the Department of Agriculture in very recent times. I propose to touch on this point later, but I think it is significant to note that in the Salisbury-Virginia region we have recently established an officer, not only a person with the technical and scientific expertise to assist those growers, but a person who can actually function in a form of co-operation with the growers on their land.

He has already been identified with the position at Virginia, and temporary premises have been installed for him to occupy, wherein, in those cases where the language problem occurs, he, as an officer in charge of that particular liaison project, can draw on interpreter facilities for the purpose of overcoming the problems that have been so often identified in that particular region.

In regard to the price and supply control mechanisms, as mentioned by the member for Salisbury, this is a very contentious area and one of very great difficulty in the relatively uncontrolled market system that we have. Our industry and our market is so much smaller than the ones he quoted in Holland and in Italy that the practicality of such a system under our conditions must be very much open to question. In saying that, I have no criticism whatsoever of the member for the interest and efforts that he has demonstrated on this subject, but, if he comes into this place and cites examples of situations that occur in other countries, the element of relativity must be taken into account and the size and magnitude of the operations in the countries which he cited cannot be fairly or reasonably related to our situation in this State. Our industry is so much tied in with the interstate production and marketing arrangements that the price and the supply situation are often controlled by influences which operate outside the State and which are completely beyond our control.

I suppose the most recent incident involving the movement of fruit from Queensland to South Australia demonstrates how readily this sort of thing can occur and how wild it can become, as was demonstrated only a couple of weeks ago in the tomato industry. It is the aim of the present Liberal Government to deregulate industries where possible and to step in only where it is vitally necessary for the enlargement of control. I do not believe that it would be correct or feasible for South Australia to introduce any

detailed form of supply regulation when we are such a relatively small market and where interstate influences are clearly so great.

In conclusion, the marketing of fruit and vegetables is an area that has received a good deal of detailed investigation by the Government in recent years, and I repeat not only by the present Government but also by the previous Government. It has done so on behalf of producers themselves, and much information is available on which the Government can now formulate policy for the benefit of the industry.

Further, the question of technical support from the Government for the producers themselves in terms of advisory services and research services is one which has received much study in recent times. The current review of research centres, which I mentioned earlier, will consider the possible need for a centralised research facility, while advisory services have been enlarged by the opening of the new Department of Agriculture office at Virginia. In the light of these considerations, it appears that the marketing problems of the market garden industry and its need for technical assistance have been adequately investigated recently, and that those measures that are practical are now being implemented.

This whole subject is one that ought not be taken lightly. Without any element of Party-political involvement in this area, I would like to commend the interest demonstrated by the member for Salisbury and by the member for Goyder, both of whom are well known to us all and, indeed, that support that they are giving the industry, I hope, is recognised in the same non-Party political fashion in that all-important region of the Northern Plains.

There are a number of other subjects related to this industry that I could quite easily link to the motion that is before the House. As much as I would desire to do so now, I must take them up at some other time, but it does not lessen in any respect the consideration that has been given by officers of my department to the material put forward in the motion, with consultation with those directly associated with the industry. But the reply I have given today is one on behalf of the Government, and we are unable to accept the motion in its present form.

Mr RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Schmidt:

That this House encourage, by way of legislation or by other means, the dissemination of information which will enable individuals to make informed choices about the nature and extent of professional health services which are available to them.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 947).

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): My motion deals with the necessity to disseminate information about medical services to new residents in my area. When I debated this matter earlier, I gave a brief history of my southern suburbs electorate, and the sorts of problems people have experienced over the years whilst waiting for these medical services to expand. Briefly, I said that we should look at the dissemination of information as a form of welfare, because it is in the interests of the recipients of the service that they be correctly informed about what medical services are available; in that sense, it becomes a welfare approach.

People going to a new area often do not know what is available, and they rely heavily on word of mouth for information. If they are not particularly sociable in their lifestyle, it is difficult for them. We must provide infor-

mation to them about the medical facilities in the area. However, over a period of time circumstances have changed. Some seven or eight years ago in the south one was lucky to find a few doctors. Now, we have 27 or more surgeries there. The State Government provided the rescue helicopter, in conjunction with private enterprise. In the first 12 months of that service some 40 air-borne medical related services were provided throughout the State. Some seven or eight calls were made in that time in the southern area, ranging from a heart attack victim at Victor Harbor to smash victims at Aldinga Beach, as well as other forms of emergency service. Most of the seven or eight patients treated by the retrieval team were transported to Flinders Medical Centre by the helicopter. People were anxious once about lack of facilities. When I moved into the area much campaigning and lobbying went on for emergency services, because of the isolation, which has now been overcome by the rescue helicopter service, which takes only 20 minutes from the pick-up of the retrieval team from Flinders Medical Centre to get, for instance, to Yankalilla. In a quarter or half an hour that retrieval team from Flinders Medical Centre can be at someone's doorstep in the general southern area.

Meanwhile, the ambulance service has been extensively upgraded. Four ambulances are now situated at the Morphett Vale St John's depot. I earlier commended the work of the full-time and voluntary medical officers there. Many services are now available, which were not previously available. Some time ago there was a lack of specialists and general practitioners. Now, there is a host of general practitioners and a number of specialists in that area, but people need to be informed of available services by word of mouth or through their local doctor. In an issue of the *News* last year a headline stated, 'Doctor advertising may be relaxed' in relation to South Australia. The report states:

The traditional ban on doctor advertising has been relaxed in South Australia. Doctors will be able to make information sheets available to *bona fide* patients so that they are aware of the services available. The information sheets would contain details of surgery consultation hours, after-hours arrangements and the names and addresses of doctors connected to a practice.

That is fine in itself, but if we analyse who will benefit from this sort of information we will see that it will be only the person who already knows where the information is, namely, the person who has gone to his doctor. All the patient is getting is an update from his own doctor of the services provided by his own doctor. He is not made aware of services provided by other doctors, he is not made aware of maybe a service closer to his home, and he is not made aware of other specialist services unless he is directly referred to them by the doctor. In the article to which I just referred, which appeared in the *News* of 28 August, the then President of the South Australian A.M.A., Dr Jeanette Linn, said:

New South Wales is leading the field in this area and we will wait to see how the situation develops there.

Very often South Australia has been regarded as a State that leads the other States, and education is one area in which we lead the other States. I call upon the private doctors in this State to think a bit more seriously about the possibility of their becoming leaders. An article in a newspaper last week referred to a doctor who has made much information available about the effects of salt in the diet and the effect of salt on coronary disease. This is a major breakthrough by a South Australian doctor. I would like to commend that doctor on his findings and on the research that he has done.

I call upon the doctors to put aside the conservative approach, to get together and think seriously about how they can work together to allow themselves, under the

auspices of the A.M.A. and in conjunction with Government departments, to advertise in an informative but not a promotional way. In the *Australian* on 2 April 1980, Dr Madden, from the New South Wales Health Commission, was quoted as follows:

Advertising would allow for competitive forces to operate in the medical profession, and provide much more natural control of fees.

That is a side benefit of advertising that I have not yet touched upon. In the expanded guidelines published by the South Australian A.M.A. last year it was stated specifically that fees charged by the doctor would not be included in those sheets. If patients had available to them a list showing the charges made by various doctors, a person who could not afford a costly G.P. would have the choice available to him to go to someone who could still provide the same service, but at a lower cost. That is another benefit we would have to look at in the whole aspect of the advertising of medical services. More importantly, Dr Madden said, when they were considering this problem in New South Wales, that advertising by G.P.'s should be informative and not promotional.

I think we should stress that. I think it is important that members of the A.M.A. sit down and look at what they regard as informative advertising, so that we do not open up a Pandora's box of advertising that will allow a doctor to promote himself. The present practice has been followed for many years and one must commend them for that. The last thing we want to see is the advertising of personalities rather than services. We must keep the service as the paramount purpose behind advertising. The article from the *Australian* further states:

A spokesman for the State branch of the A.M.A. said yesterday he did not object to informative advertising by doctors but any changes to the Medical Practitioners Act would have to be made in close consultation with the A.M.A.

One would not deny the right of the A.M.A. to sit in on those close consultations. The doctors there indicated that they were not averse to the idea of disseminating informative literature. So, in concluding my remarks I reiterate that, before we as a Parliament take any action to force on doctors advertising or anything of that nature, it would be better if the doctors were able to get together, consider the requirements of their patients, and consider the necessity to get information quickly. There is no reason why a conglomerate of doctors in a given area should not get together and put out a general information sheet that could be letterboxed throughout the area, disseminated through health centres, or distributed by any other means they choose, so that residents can look at a complete list to see where the various doctors are located, whether they be G.P.'s, specialists, dentists, paediatricians, psychologists, or whatever. All of these services could be made available. Perhaps a local medical booklet could be produced, outlining the various medical services available in that area. If that could be done, we would not have to go through the process of trying to draw up regulations through Parliament; rather, they would have a self-regulating body which could continue to exercise close control, and which would give more flexibility, keeping to the fore the needs of the patient rather than being over-protective amongst themselves.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that the motion moved by the honourable member for Mawson be agreed to. Those in favour say 'Aye'. Those against say 'No'. I think the Ayes have it.

A division on the motion was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: By leave, I indicate that the call by me to divide was incorrect, and I seek leave to withdraw that call.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: The question was that the motion be agreed to. I had started to mouth the result, which was that the Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

SMALL BUSINESS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Olsen:

That this House affirms that small business in this State would be irrevocably harmed and thus render irrelevant the provision of loan funds to small business operations if the policies of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch, were effected, with particular reference to the introduction of:

- (a) a 35-hour week;
- (b) *pro rata* long service leave after five years of service;
- (c) full quarterly cost of living adjustments based on the c.p.i. which is inconsistent with Australia's centralised wage fixation system and an attack on eminent members of successive national and State wage tribunals who have rejected the proposal;
- (d) annual productivity cases; and
- (e) mandatory severance pay for redundancies.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 945.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I oppose the motion; at an appropriate time I will be moving to amend it. We should first look at the motion. It seems that the honourable member, in moving it, became very negative in his outlook, because he refers to all the things that the Labor Party has in its policies rather than the things that ought to be in the policy of the Liberal Party. He talks about the 35-hour week, about *pro rata* long service leave after five years of service, and about full quarterly cost-of-living adjustments based on the c.p.i., which is consistent with Australia's centralised wage fixation system and an attack on eminent members of successive national and State wage tribunals who have rejected the proposal. He also talks about annual productivity cases and mandatory severance pay for redundancies.

It seems that, if the member is at all sincere in his attempt to try to support small business, he would not have been so negative about his proposition. He has put nothing positive in it at all. He is a self-appointed spokesman on small business.

Mr Billard: He is a small business man.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will get to that. That is why the motion is very interesting, as I will be pointing out at a later stage. Rather than being positive about what he wanted to do, and telling South Australia, particularly small South Australian business men, what the policies of the Liberal Party ought to be, the honourable member chose to decry those policies that he suggests are those of the Australian Labor Party.

I am not sure where he got all those policies. To deal with them one by one, he refers, first, to the 35-hour week. The 35-hour week has been an objective of the Labor Party for as long as I can remember. The Labor Party itself has never said that it will introduce a 35-hour week on return to Government. The policy at the moment is what was stated at the last conference, and I imagine that that policy will be maintained after the next policy convention—

Mr Becker: If you say so.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not got that sort of power; the honourable member gives me credit for more power than I have. The Labor Party policy, as enunciated at the last election, was to reduce the working hours of State Government employees from 40 hours a week, to be consistent, to 37½ hours a week, because there is discrimination, especially within the public sector. Irrespective of where one examines the situation, one finds time and again

that the Public Service itself discriminates against certain employees who work for the Government. Many employees in Government departments work fewer than 40 hours. There is evidence of that, and I have obtained that evidence from the Public Service Board. I will be using it in another speech.

I make the point that, when the Labor Party is returned to the Treasury benches at the next election (and there is little doubt about that, because of the way in which this Government is performing), one of its first actions will be to examine the possibility of reducing its own employees to an equal basis, and not beyond that. The equal basis at the moment, to satisfy everyone and avoid discrimination within Government departments, would be to reduce the hours of those workers to 37½ a week. That, I think, is the proper attitude. Why should some public servants have privileges that other people do not enjoy?

I will give examples of such cases. For many years clerical staff, administrative clerks, and other administrative categories have had the benefit of a 37½-hour week. That came about not by any great struggle, but by court actions, and so forth. On the other hand, the majority of weekly-paid employees or the day-labour forces are working a 40-hour week. I do not know how one can argue against that policy. It is one, I think, that would treat everybody equally and fairly. It is one that I, as the Minister of Industrial Relations, will be trying to implement when the Labor Party is returned to the Treasury benches. I think it is a proper one.

Now the honourable member's next proposition is *pro rata* long service leave after five years of service. That is something I support. I can see nothing wrong with that proposition if someone puts in five years service with an employer, and if, for no reason of his own, he is forced to leave that employment or if the employer terminates his services other than for misconduct. That is how the legislation is operating at the moment. The honourable member would know, as would other honourable members, that the current situation in South Australia in relation to long service leave is that *pro rata* leave applies after seven years. The motion brings it back to five years, reducing the period by two years. The point I want to make is that it does not happen very often anyway—

Mr Olsen: But there is the cost involved.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is quite wrong when he says there is a large cost factor involved; there is no cost factor involved at all, or very little because it very rarely occurs. It is simply a protection in the case where somebody's service is terminated for reasons beyond his control, perhaps through sickness, or having been sacked by the employer for other than misconduct, because the employer wants to reduce his staff. Why should that employee be forced to go to 10 years to receive his long service leave, or to seven years when it is no fault of his own? I believe that there is little credence in the argument put forward by the honourable member, the future Minister, no doubt, in a few weeks or months time.

I do not believe there is a large cost structure in that provision because it will not happen often. It does not happen often with the seven years long service leave, because, if most people work for an employer for from five to seven years, it is usually the case (unless the employer finds he has to close down or terminate the employee's service, which is beyond the employee's control) that the employee goes on and works for that employer until he qualifies for his long service leave after 10 years, or until his retirement. That provision is a sham. It is not going to cost any business, small or large, very much.

Mr Olsen: The 35-hour week—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have already explained the 35-hour week. Why was the member not listening? The next point in the motion is as follows:

Full quarterly cost of living adjustments based on the c.p.i. which is inconsistent with Australia's centralised wage fixation system and an attack on eminent members of successive national and State wage tribunals who have rejected the proposal;

That is naivety at its worst, in my view. The proposition put forward by the member proves he does not know what he is talking about. He has not studied the wage-fixing system in Australia. He ought to re-examine his stand. He should examine the attitude of the Liberal Party on this issue; if anybody has destroyed the wage-fixing system in this nation it is the Liberal Party. Quite clearly, its actions have demonstrated that it wanted to destroy the wage-fixing system, and that is further proof of what the member wants to do. I have advocated consistently that we need a central wage-fixing system and c.p.i. adjustments.

Mr Olsen: Check what I said when I introduced it, and my response to your interjection.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am pleased that I am getting interjections from the honourable member, because I know that I am getting under his skin. He, like his Party, would destroy a central wage-fixing system in this nation. He does not want a central wage-fixing system, and there is evidence of that. He is criticising the Labor Party for wanting it and advocating it. Bob Hawke was here. He is the major spokesman in this nation, the only person in the Federal Government, on either side of the political fence, who has guts enough to get out and advocate what it is all about. He has been received by business men who understand the wage-fixing system of this nation.

If we depart from that situation there will be war in the community. Let us look at the applications in the arbitration system here at the moment. It is bogged down with applications because the Federal Liberal Government, supported very strongly by Liberal Governments throughout Australia, has destroyed the best wage-fixing system since the 1940s and 1950s. I believe that we should go back beyond the 1970s, beyond the wage indexation system introduced in 1975, and back to the 1950s, to re-examine what occurred there. We should take an analysis and a census of the industrial disputations that occurred in those years as opposed to what is occurring now.

Why did the Liberal Government destroy the wage-fixing system of this nation? There has not been one occasion since 1975, when the Liberal Government, either State or Federal, has gone into the arbitration system of this nation and advocated the full c.p.i. increases. Every time the arbitration system has held its cases, the Liberal Governments have gone into the Arbitration Court and argued for a lesser increase than the workers were entitled to. The Labor Party throughout Australia argued on behalf of the trade unions and supported the trade union applications that full c.p.i. increases were merited. No-one can deny that. If a cost structure is working within a nation, and if that cost structure gets out of context each three or six months or whatever the period, in order to keep real wages up, there must be an increase according to those c.p.i. increases. That is what happened in the 1950s. Let me tell the member for Rocky River that there were no cases in the 1940s and 1950s, because there was no need for them. There were automatic c.p.i. adjustments every three months, according to the c.p.i. movement through those periods.

If workers' real wages are maintained and contained—which is more important—there is less room and less manoeuvring for disputation, less disagreement, and the industrial relations scene must improve. This proposition is supporting Fraser and the Liberal Government's

attitude. I thought the member for Rocky River was much more progressive. I thought he was one member of the other side who was progressive in his views, who understood some of the problems faced and suffered by the working-class people of this nation.

Mr Olsen: Check *Hansard* when I introduced the motion to the House. I responded to your interjection on that point. Check the *Hansard* record.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am very pleased you are interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would indicate to honourable members that interjections are out of order and provocation to interject is also unseemly.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There can be little doubt that the Liberal Party, State and Federal, has no reason to hold its head very high about its role in the destruction of the wage indexation system of this nation. Had it not been for the attitude adopted by the various Liberal Parties in this country, I believe wage indexation would now still be in operation. I sincerely mean that, and I believe it. The Liberal Parties of this nation and the employer organisations of this nation placed Sir John Moore and his Federal Bench in a most invidious position right from the beginning of wage indexation. Wage indexation surely means indexation on the basis of what is happening with the c.p.i. movements. As I said earlier, on each and every occasion the Liberal Parties, both State and Federal, followed the lead from the employer organisations of this nation in a very serious attempt to retard the wages progress and relativities and the control and maintenance of real wage movements of the working class of this country. If the member for Rocky River wants to ally himself to that sort of conduct, that is up to him. If they are the philosophies that he wants to follow as a Liberal, then certainly he can elect to do that, but I am surprised that he does.

The next thing that the member for Rocky River talks about in his bogus resolution is the condemnation of the annual productivity cases. If the honourable member really directed this particular resolution as he said he did, at small business, the question arises as to how often annual productivity increases would affect small business. Can the Minister cite any circumstances where small business would be affected by annual productivity? However, let me say this: annual productivity is part of the improvement of the wages concept throughout the nation. It is recognised within the arbitration system. Therefore, it is no good the member for Rocky River coming into this Parliament and trying to convince us that it is A.L.P. policy that is bringing about the downfall of small business; it is no good the honourable member trying to not recognise that annual productivity increases are being granted by all State courts and all Federal courts throughout the nation; it is no good his saying that the Electricity Trust of Victoria or the Electricity Trust of South Australia or big businesses are not going out and talking to working class people about productivity increases. It is part of the bargaining scheme of this moment. At Mitsubishi or at Holdens or anywhere else, productivity is an accepted and integral part of the wages movement and the working hours movement, for that matter as well.

I do not think that applies to small business. The member for Rocky River might know more than I do about this, but I have not experienced one circumstance where small business has been part of any argument or debate, or for that matter, any dispute, about productivity increases. So again, we find a shamble in the resolution, a further concoction of his resolution to try, as I said earlier, to be as negative as he could about this resolution and to not be in any way positive about what he was doing. I am open to information about this matter; if the member for Rocky

River or any other member from the other side of the House can produce one atom of evidence showing that small business has been affected by annual productivity increases, then I am prepared to listen to it. If it is, it is an agreed matter anyway. The employer has got to agree to annual productivity increases; if the employer does not agree, they do not apply. That is the circumstance of annual productivity. In many cases the situation at the moment is that employers and employees are appearing before the arbitration system and asking it to award on annual productivity increases. It is not a new thing, but I want to know from the member for Rocky River or from any other member where they think it has affected small business, as he has expressed it in his resolution. I do not know of any such circumstances, even though I have had a lot of contact with small business people and representatives of small business. Last Monday morning I had through my office some chemists and other people complaining about the attitudes of this Government, which, of course, one can understand. Nevertheless, none of the people who have come to see me have complained about any of the matters contained in this resolution, and certainly not about annual productivity.

Mr Olsen: What about the policy document?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What policy document?

Mr Olsen: Your policy document as dictated by South Terrace.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There is no policy document available for you or for anybody else at the moment.

Mr Olsen: We are very much aware of that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It will be open to the public by about the middle of November, not like yours—hidden in a drawer and never used. The final thing that the member talks about concerns mandatory severance pay for redundancy. Again, the arbitration courts, both Federal and State, have for some time been making decisions on redundancy payments. The Federal courts were the first to do it, and it has been in operation I would say for 10 or 12 years, and why should it not be? Why should redundancy payments not be an award of the court? The court looks at hours of work, at wages, at sick leave and all the other things that matter in day-to-day operations so far as employees in an industry are concerned. If an employer chooses to close down his business, either just for profit or because he wants to move to some other area or some other State, why should an employee be forced to leave that employer with nothing, after the employee has given the employer many years of faithful service? No! What the member for Rocky River wants is for the benefit to be all on the other side: he wants the employee to be dismissed and given nothing—not even a golden handshake and not even a pat on the back from the employer saying 'Well done, John.' What the member for Rocky River wants is for the employer to have the right to dismiss an employee, willy-nilly any time he wants to, and say 'Ta ta', and that is it. If that is the philosophy of the Liberal Party, let me say that it is a long way from the philosophy of the Labor Party, because the Labor Party believes in the protection of all people, and so do the courts of Australia; so do the State courts here and the Federal courts, and so do the courts in other States of Australia.

With regard to this very negative proposition of the member for Rocky River, one would think that the Labor Party was leading the field in all of these things in South Australia. One would think that all of the things which have gone into this very negative proposition were the invention of the South Australian Labor Party; that is what the member for Rocky River is trying to establish, of course, because he knows his own Government is in real trouble. The point is that certainly most, if not all, of those

things that I have talked about are in fact in operation in every other State in Australia and will continue to be in operation in every other State in Australia.

Having dealt with the proposition as outlined by the member for Rocky River, I still say that the honourable member took a very negative approach to it and I now want to deal with some of the things on which I thought the honourable member left himself very open. The motion was moved by the Government's self-appointed expert on small business. The speech that the honourable member gave when he moved his motion last Wednesday showed that he is more interested in playing politics than putting forward constructive policies to help the vital small business sector in this State.

Mr Olsen: It was in August that I moved it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am coming to that; the day after the Budget.

Mr Olsen: It wasn't last Wednesday.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It would have been if it had got on on that particular day. The member for Rocky River's speech also showed that his understanding of the problems faced by small business is abysmal. The speech came just one day after the Premier delivered the Budget, which for the first time for a number of years did not increase the exemption level on pay-roll tax so that business was not slugged with the hidden tax of inflation. The effect of that Budget is to make small businesses pay more tax at every level up to an annual pay-roll of \$250 000 than competitors in Victoria have to pay. I ask the member for Rocky River whether or not he had any discussions with the Premier prior to introduction of the Budget. Quite clearly I would have thought that one who sets himself up (in this House, anyway, and probably outside) as the spokesman for small business from the Liberal Party, and one who is a small business person himself, would have taken into consideration the effect on the Government of the pay-roll taxes introduced by this Budget.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is referring to his second speech.

Mr Olsen: I made a speech last night.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You did not mention it in the speech I am referring to.

Mr Olsen: I did last night.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am dealing with your first speech; the honourable member is referring to his second speech that he made last night.

Mr Olsen: No, third.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I want to know from the honourable member when he replies in this debate, whether or not he was taken into confidence by the Premier in relation to what was in the Budget about pay-roll tax for small business and whether he had seen the Budget papers before they came in. If one was moving positively and not negatively in this area, as I would have hoped this member would have moved, the first thing that he would have done would be criticise, not the Labor Party, but the Government, for these policies which he described as being cost factors. Why did he not criticise his own Premier for not looking at and taking into consideration the pay-roll tax remissions? What has happened is that this Government has placed a disadvantage between our closest neighbours, the Victorians, and the South Australian business men. The honourable member did not say very much about that. One day after the Budget the member for Rocky River came into this House and praised the Government for its significant policy decisions in relation to the pay-roll tax. He said:

I think one of the most significant policy decisions this Government has made is in relation to pay-roll tax, about which I have

spoken before in this House. When I indicated one of the most iniquitous taxes that can be placed in any section of the community is pay-roll tax. I have spoken about its cancerous growth and cost pressures and of its soaking up of liquidity of the small business community. The Tonkin Government has taken measures to reduce that pressure. We have seen over the past years pay-roll tax growing by stealth. As wages have increased, so pay-roll tax has increased.

What actions did the Government take to relieve the small business people in this State in regard to pay-roll tax?

Mr Olsen: In decentralised areas in this State it offered a 100 per cent rebate for pay-roll tax and land tax incentives. In near metropolitan areas it offered—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I know that the member for Rocky River is getting quite excited. I can understand that; he is a new member in the House and is probably feeling embarrassed about the circumstances. I am convinced that I gave the member for Rocky River some respect when he was speaking and did not interfere with him. I know that he is getting very excited; I would like him to calm down a bit. The facts are that the Government has placed small business at a disadvantage, not at an advantage. The honourable member did not say anything about that. I do not believe that the honourable member knew what was in the Budget speech. I do not believe he looked at it, because, in all conscience, seriousness and honesty, he could not come into this House, produce such a negative resolution, and not say anything about the inactivities of his own Government. I honestly believe that the member stands condemned for that. What he tried to do was a sham. It was not serious and was completely playing politics. I am not saying that the member does not have an interest in small business; I believe he has. However, this resolution does not attempt to help small business at all. It is merely an attempt to embarrass the Labor Party.

Under the former Labor Government, pay-roll tax schedules in South Australia were kept identical to those in Victoria, which is our major competitor. I can remember Don Dunstan bringing additional Bills into the House to change the exemption level to ensure that we stayed competitive. After the 1981 Tonkin Budget, that competitive position has been lost for those people whose pay-rolls are less than \$250 000; in other words, small business.

Mr Olsen: What about New South Wales?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: We are not in New South Wales, we are in South Australia. We are talking about the activities of the South Australian Government.

Mr Olsen: But you just compared it with Victoria. I said, 'What about New South Wales?'

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am talking about Victoria because it is our nearest neighbour, our major competitor, as far as small business is concerned. Here we go again getting total interjections; I will take the same liberties when you reply to this debate if you are to continue. Clearly, this Government does not care. I have given illustrations that when the Victorian Budget came in later than the South Australian Budget, Premier Dunstan took the initiative to bring extra Bills into the House to give the same compensation to small business. The member would not be aware of that. We were concerned about small business at that particular stage. What has this Government done about that? This Government left it at that level last year, giving the Victorians a benefit, and has done exactly the same thing this year. What has the Premier said about that when he has been questioned? He said, 'We will look at that later because it does not happen until 1 January.' He did not look at it last year later, and I would guess that, unless the member for Rocky River has more influence over the Premier than I think he has, the Premier will not do it this year. If the member for Rocky River is earnest, sincere and devoted to small business, as he says he is, then he will move on the Premier in his own Party meeting

rooms and attempt to have this position solved. The member smiles; well he should smile. He knows what I am saying is exactly true of this Government. There are no interjections now.

Last year the Premier allowed the general exemption from pay-roll tax in South Australia to fall behind the Victorian exemption. He provided an exemption from tax for pay-rolls of up to \$84 000, while Victoria's exemption was set at \$96 000. This year the South Australian level has been frozen at \$84 000, while Victorian pay-roll exemptions are up to \$125 000 and in New South Wales the exemption has been raised to \$120 000. A few moments ago the member for Rocky River was interjecting, as he has done throughout the major part of this speech. He said 'What about New South Wales?' He now has his answer about New South Wales. At the moment South Australia is exactly \$36 000 behind what is happening in New South Wales. We are behind Victoria more than that; we are \$41 000 behind what is happening there. It is clear that the member for Rocky River evaded his responsibility to small businesses when he made his speech in Parliament. He came in here simply to do nothing other than try to embarrass the A.L.P. I do not think that is good enough for a member who is putting himself forward as a prospective future Minister. There should be more responsibility in a person who is ambitious and wants to move up the ladder; and no doubt he will if he is given some time. The honourable member has to improve his performance before that eye will be cast over him, and he has to be honest in his approach to this situation—positive, and not negative.

It is this Government, the Tonkin Liberal Government, that has increased pay-roll tax by stealth. It is this Government that is adding to the cost pressures and soaking up the liquidity of small business, which the member for Rocky River pretends to be so concerned about. Small business of this size is the lifeblood of the South Australian economy. In the manufacturing sector alone, which is not as dependent on small business as the rest of the economy, some 11 000 persons worked in plants employing 20 persons or fewer, broadly equivalent to firms with pay-rolls of \$250 000 or less. I estimate that, at a conservative assessment, small business in Australia employs 40 per cent of the private work force. It has great potential to generate employment. What does the member for Rocky River say about that? He says:

If we are serious about reducing unemployment, if we are serious about creating more job opportunities in this State, then we must tackle the heart of the problem and take off the cost factors. The disadvantage and the disincentive that is placed on business men to create job opportunities, and there is no greater disincentive than the pay-roll tax disincentive.

How can the member be as hypocritical as that? How can a member of Parliament get up in this place and talk about pay-roll tax as being one of the burdens placed on small business, or any business for that matter? I do not like the tax, either: it is certainly an iniquitous tax. How can the member get up in this House and talk such rubbish? How, on the one hand, can he talk about that, when his own Government, which he must have supported at some particular stage, did not give the same benefit to small business people on the pay-roll tax rebate as was given in Victoria and New South Wales? How can that be justified? What does the honourable member say about that?

The honourable member must want to have some standing within the community; he must want to be respected within the community. We find that he comes in here with this load of hogwash trying to embarrass the Labor Party and finally he finds himself embarrassed by the actions of his own Government. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision with respect to the exploration for and the exploitation of the petroleum resources and certain other resources of certain submerged lands adjacent to the coasts of South Australia, to amend the Off-shore Waters (Application of Laws) Act, 1976-1980, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It will replace the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1967-1974. The proposed legislation will control petroleum operations in the territorial sea off the coast of South Australia on the basis that the width of the territorial sea is three nautical miles. The Bill complements similar Commonwealth legislation covering the exploitation of petroleum resources on the continental shelf beyond the territorial sea.

The Bill forms part of a legislative package which was agreed to after the 1975 High Court decision on the Seas and Submerged Lands Act, 1973, of the Commonwealth which declared and enacted that sovereignty in respect of the territorial sea and sovereign rights in respect of the continental shelf, for the purpose of exploration and exploitation of its natural resources, were vested in and exercisable by the Crown in right of the Commonwealth. The High Court decision, however, left unsettled complex and contentious offshore constitutional issues. In order to resolve these issues, at the Premiers' Conference of 29 June 1979 the Commonwealth and the States completed an agreement on a legislative package that was intended to vest the administration of the law relating to the exploitation of resources in the continental shelf adjacent to each State in the State concerned without derogating from the Commonwealth's responsibility in matters of overriding national or international importance. The legislative package will give to each State the same powers with respect to the territorial sea (including the seabed) as it would have if the waters were within the limits of the State. To give effect to the package, the State has passed the Constitutional Powers (Coastal Waters) Act, 1980, and the Commonwealth has enacted the Coastal Waters (State Powers) Act, 1980, and the Coastal Waters (State Title) Act, 1980. These Acts have yet to be proclaimed.

By proclamation made under section 7 of the Seas and Submerged Lands Act, 1973, the Governor-General has power to declare the limits of the territorial sea abutting South Australia. Negotiations between the State and the Commonwealth are in progress, but it has been tentatively agreed that the territorial sea adjacent to the gulfs will lie seaward of a baseline drawn from Cape Carnot at the bottom of Eyre Peninsula to Vennachar Point on the western end of Kangaroo Island. It will travel along the southern coast of the island and then from Cape Willoughby it will travel to Newland Head on the mainland via the Pages Islands. Waters lying on the landward side of the baseline will be internal waters of the State. Both gulfs, Investigator

Strait and Backstairs Passage, therefore, will fall into this category and this Bill will not apply to them. The Petroleum Act, 1940-1981, will provide for the exploration for and recovery of petroleum in these waters.

Offshore petroleum operations outside the three-mile territorial sea limit will be governed by Commonwealth legislation alone. The Commonwealth Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Amendment Act, 1980, has already passed both Houses of Parliament and is awaiting the passing of the appropriate complementary State legislation (over territorial sea areas) before being proclaimed. Under that Act the day-by-day administration of the adjacent area beyond the territorial sea will continue to be in the hands of the designated authority appointed for the adjacent area of each State. The designated authority is a State Minister, and it will continue to be State officers who will administer the day-by-day operation of the Act. However, this Commonwealth legislation will establish for the first time a joint authority for each adjacent area, consisting of the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister, and these joint authorities will be concerned with decisions on major matters arising under the legislation.

The Bill before the House will regulate petroleum operations inside the outer limit of the three-mile territorial sea. It will be administered by State authorities alone and will complement the Commonwealth Act in that the Common Mining Code will be retained and existing permittees and licensees will not be disadvantaged. The Bill includes transitional provisions to cover cases where existing permits straddle the outer limit of the territorial sea and to cover those cases where petroleum fields straddle legislative boundaries.

Commenting specifically on the Bill, it will be noted that the main variations contained in the clauses of the Bill as compared with the present provisions contained in the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1967-1974, are as follows: Preamble—This recites the new agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. It will be noted that paragraph (d) of the fifth recital refers to parties maintaining a common mining code for petroleum resources of the submerged lands that are on the seaward side of the inner limits of the territorial sea of Australia. This will ensure that offshore petroleum explorers and producers will carry on their operations throughout Australia within the framework of a consistent set of rules. Application of Laws—The Off-shore Waters (Application of Laws) Act, 1976-1980, provides that State legislation applies to waters off the coast of South Australia. The Bill before the House, however, provides for the making of regulations which can modify or exclude the operation of State legislation in that area in so far as it relates to petroleum operations. Thus, certain State laws which are appropriate to onshore situations but may be inappropriate, or even potentially hazardous offshore, may be modified or excluded altogether. It will also allow an offshore petroleum regime to be established which will be able to be administered by a single Government agency. This is the course that has been followed by Victoria in the past and also the course approved by the United Kingdom Government in November 1980 for adoption in the North Sea area following the recommendations made in the Burgoyne report on offshore safety.

Mining for Petroleum—Because it has been proven with 13 years operating experience in the Bass Strait that the Common Mining Code contained in the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1967, was a completely satisfactory legislative base for such operations, the decision was taken to keep amendments to a minimum. Petroleum explorers and producers should have no problem whatsoever in accepting the new legislation package. Royalties—Sections 42, 129, 130 and 143 to 151, inclusive, relating to royalty

are complementary to the legislation passed by the Commonwealth for the Commonwealth adjacent area and are similar to existing legislation, first, in respect of the rates of royalty to be imposed and, secondly, to the extent that such royalty will be calculated on the wellhead value of the petroleum. It has been agreed that the Commonwealth-State royalty sharing arrangements which apply in the Commonwealth adjacent area will apply also to royalties collected pursuant to this legislation. Regulations—The introduction of this Bill will necessitate the preparation of new rules. This has been an ongoing situation in the past and no difficulties are anticipated in having a new set of rules covering all aspects of offshore petroleum operations, including the safety, health and welfare of persons engaged in such operations, ready for issue upon the commencement of the Act.

The offshore constitutional settlement giving rise to this Bill has been claimed in other forums as a major achievement of the policy of co-operative federalism. The Government believes that the legislative base upon which the exploration for and the production of these offshore petroleum resources are carried out is unequalled in any other nation of the world.

Clause 1 provides that the Act may be cited as the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1981, and shall come into operation on the first day on which certain specified Commonwealth Acts are in operation. Clause 2 repeals the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, 1967-1974, and amends the Off-shore Waters (Application of Laws) Act, 1976-1980, and gives effect to certain transitional provisions set out in the fourth and fifth schedules. Clause 3 sets out the Divisions of the Act.

Clause 4 contains provisions relating to the interpretation of the provisions of the Act. The definition of 'the adjacent area' is particularly important. The area is basically the territorial sea as declared by proclamation under the Seas and Submerged Lands Act, 1973, of the Commonwealth, but by reason of subsection (2) of section 4 cannot extend seaward more than three nautical miles. As I mentioned earlier, the baseline crosses from Eyre and Fleurieu Peninsulas to Kangaroo Island and, therefore, the gulfs are not included in the adjacent area. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the definition, together with subsection (3) of section 4, comprise a transitional provision to preserve the position under this Bill of permits under Commonwealth legislation in areas that would otherwise, when this Bill becomes law, be internal waters of the State.

Clause 5 provides that the Act is to be construed having regard to the limits on the powers of the Parliament to legislate. Clause 6 applies the Act to all natural persons and corporations, whether South Australian or not. Clause 7 contains provisions relating to petroleum recovered from a field extending into two or more areas. Clause 8 defines the geodetic datum to be used in measurements under the Act. Clause 9 defines the 'Commonwealth adjacent area'. Clause 10 relates to the exercise of powers by the Minister under the Commonwealth Act as a member of the joint authority. Clause 11 authorises the Minister to be the designated authority under the Commonwealth Act in the Commonwealth adjacent area. Clause 12 covers delegations by the Minister under the Commonwealth Act to State Public Service officers.

Clause 13 requires public servants to perform functions as directed by the Minister as the designated authority or as a member of the joint authority. Clause 14 enables the Governor to make regulations varying the operation of the Off-shore Waters (Application of Laws) Act, 1976-1980. Clause 15 is consequential. Clause 16 empowers the Minister to delegate his powers or functions under the Act. Clause 17 specifies the gratulation of the earth's surface

for the purposes of the Act. Clause 18 provides for the reservations of blocks. Clause 19 prohibits exploration for petroleum except in accordance with a permit or with the provisions of Part III of the Act. Clause 20 enables the Minister to invite applications for the grant of permits in respect of blocks. Clause 21 prescribes requirements of applications for permits. Clause 22 provides for the grant or refusal of permits by the Minister.

Clause 23 enables the Minister to invite applications for permits for blocks in respect of which a previous licence or permit has been cancelled or surrendered. Clause 24 prescribes requirements for an application under section 23. Clause 25 provides the manner in which the Minister may deal with applications. Clause 26 provides for the making of a request to the Minister and the lodging of a security. Clause 27 covers the granting of a permit on request by an applicant. Clause 28 details the rights conferred by a permit. Clause 29 outlines the period during which a permit remains in force. Clause 30 details procedures required by a permittee desiring to renew a permit. Clause 31 sets out the formula to be used in determining the area over which a permit may be renewed.

Clause 32 gives power to the Minister to renew a permit. Clause 33 allows conditions to be attached to a permit. Clause 34 requires the discovery of petroleum to be notified to the Minister. Clause 35 gives the Minister power to direct action in the event of a discovery of petroleum. Clause 36 details the procedures required by the permittee to nominate a block for the purposes of declaring a location. Clause 37 outlines the procedures to be followed in respect of the declaration of a location for licence purposes. Clause 38 defines adjoining blocks for the purposes of defining locations. Clause 39 requires persons to obtain a licence before recovering petroleum from the adjacent area. Clause 40 specifies the number of blocks in respect of which a permittee may apply for a licence. Clause 41 specifies the form in which a licence application may be made.

Clause 42 relates to royalty rates payable where a secondary licence is applied for. Clause 43 covers the notification to the applicant that the Minister is prepared to grant the licence. Clause 44 covers the procedure by which the applicant who has been served a notice under section 43 may accept the offer of a licence. Clause 45 makes provision for a variation by the Minister of the licence area. Clause 46 provides for the determination of a permit in respect of location blocks not taken up by the licensee. Clause 47 provides for a procedure for subsequent application for a licence in respect of surrendered, etc., blocks. Clause 48 outlines fees required for the application and grant of a licence.

Clause 49 details the procedures required by the applicant for the grant of a licence. Clause 50 obliges the Minister to grant a licence upon request under the provisions of section 49. Clause 51 makes provision for the granting of two or more individual licences over areas in which a single licence is existing. Clause 52 specifies the rights conferred by a licence. Clause 53 prescribes the term of licence, including a renewed licence. Clause 54 outlines the procedures required on an application for renewal of a licence. Clause 55 sets out the powers of the Minister to grant or refuse renewal of a licence. Clause 56 relates to conditions contained in a licence. Clause 57 prescribes a minimum monetary commitment for each block in a licence.

Clause 58 allows directions by the Minister to be given in respect of recovery of petroleum. Clause 59 relates to unit developments agreements. Clause 60 requires the operator of a pipeline to obtain a pipeline licence. Clause 61 provides exemptions to the provisions of section 60 for acts done in an emergency. Clause 62 provides for the removal of a pipeline or associated facilities which have

been constructed in contravention of the Act. Clause 63 provides power for the Minister to declare a terminal station. Clause 64 details the procedures to be followed in the application for a pipeline licence. Clause 65 sets out the power of the Minister to grant or refuse a pipeline licence. Clause 66 sets out the rights conferred by a pipeline licence.

Clause 67 details the term of the pipeline licence. Clause 68 allows a pipeline licensee to make application for renewal of a pipeline licence. Clause 69 contains provisions which must be taken into consideration by the Minister in renewing or refusing to renew a pipeline licence. Clause 70 details the conditions to which a pipeline licence may be subject. Clause 71 enables a pipeline licensee to make application for the variation of a pipeline licence. Clause 72 makes provision for variation of a pipeline licence by the Minister. Clause 73 gives the Minister power to direct that a pipeline licensee is a common carrier. Clause 74 prohibits the commencement of operation of a pipeline without the consent of the Minister. Clause 75 requires the Minister to keep a register of certain instruments. Clause 76 details what information is to be maintained in the register. Clause 77 requires memorials of determined permits, etc. to be entered in the register. Clause 78 requires approval and registration of transfers of titles to be entered in the register. Clause 79 covers entries in the register on devolution of title. Clause 80 requires any interests in titles to be created by instrument in writing. Clause 81 covers the approval of instruments creating interests in title. Clause 82 requires the true consideration to be shown for any transfer of title. Clause 83 provides that registration does not affect the legal validity of registrable instruments.

Clause 84 gives the power to the Minister to require information on certain title dealings. Clause 85 authorises the Minister to require production and inspection of certain documents. Clause 86 sets out the conditions relating to the inspection of the register and registered instruments. Clause 87 provides that the register is evidence in all courts. Clause 88 provides that a person may apply for rectification of the register. Clause 89 states that a Minister is not liable to legal action in respect of maintenance of the register. Clause 90 creates offences relating to entries lodged in the register. Clause 91 covers the assessment of the fee payable under section 92. Clause 92 imposes registration fees for documents registered. Clause 93 provides that certain instruments are exempt from stamp duty. Clause 94 details what documents are required to be published in the *Gazette*. Clause 95 provides that certain instruments have effect on publication of notice in the *Gazette*. Clause 96 requires work required to be carried out by a permittee, licensee or pipeline licensee to be commenced within six months of the grant of the permit, licence or pipeline licence. Clause 97 provides that all petroleum operations shall be carried out in accordance with good oilfields practice. Clause 98 requires operators in the adjacent area to maintain structures and other property correctly. Clause 99 makes sections 97 and 98 subject to certain specified provisions. Clause 100 requires Ministerial approval if drilling is carried out closer than 300 metres to a boundary of a permit area or licence area.

Clause 101 sets out the direction-making power of the Minister. Clause 102 requires a person to comply with any direction given by the Minister. Clause 103 gives the Minister power to grant exemptions from conditions of permits and licences, etc. Clause 104 covers the procedure for the surrender of titles. Clause 105 covers the procedures for the cancellation of titles. Clause 106 provides that the holder of a cancelled title is still subject to the provisions of the Act notwithstanding the cancellation. Clause 107 requires the removal of all property from the adjacent area by title holders upon determination or cancellation of such

title. Clause 108 gives the power to the Minister to remove property from the adjacent area. Clause 109 provides that permit and licence fees payable may be paid by instalments. Clause 110 provides a penalty for late payments of instalments under section 109. Clause 111 allows special prospecting authorities to be granted. Clause 112 contains provisions for granting access authorities. Clause 113 sets out the powers of the Minister to remove or dispose of property in the adjacent area. Clause 114 details the security required for the varying types of title. Clause 115 gives the Minister an enabling power to require information to be furnished in respect of operations in the adjacent area. Clause 116 gives the Minister power to examine persons on oath. Clause 117 prohibits people from refusing to furnish information, etc. Clause 118 sets out the type of title information that may be released and the timetable at which such information is released.

Clause 119 allows the Minister to specify a safety zone which vessels may not enter around a well or structure. Clause 120 provides for the notification of the discovery and use of water in the adjacent area. Clause 121 relates to the survey of wells drilled in the adjacent area. Clause 122 makes provision for the Minister to direct that certain records be kept. Clause 123 gives the Minister power to consent to scientific investigations. Clause 124 provides that any operations in the adjacent area under the Act are to be carried out without interference with certain other operations. Clause 125 covers the appointment of inspectors under the Act. Clause 126 covers the powers of inspectors appointed under Section 125. Clause 127 gives the property in petroleum to permittees or licensees. Clause 128 gives power to the Minister to suspend the rights conferred by permit. Clause 129 provides that certain royalty payments are to be made by the State to the Commonwealth. Clause 130 relates to a determination as to wellhead value in calculating the royalty to the Commonwealth in section 129. Clause 131 covers offences against the regulations or directions under the Act. Clause 132 makes a person who has been concerned in the commission of an offence guilty of the offence himself. Clause 133 covers procedures for the prosecution of offences under the Act. Clause 134 provides for the forfeiture of certain equipment in respect of certain licences. Clause 135 covers the disposal of goods forfeited under the provisions of section 133. Clause 136 sets out the time for bringing proceedings for offences. Clause 137 requires courts to take judicial notice of the signature of the Minister. Clause 138 relates to the service of notices. Clause 139 covers permit fees. Clause 140 covers licence fees. Clause 141 covers pipeline licence fees. Clause 142 covers the time of payment of fees. Clause 143 requires a permittee or licensee to pay royalty to the Minister. Clause 144 makes allowance for reduction of royalty in certain cases. Clause 145 gives the power to the Minister to not require royalty to be paid in certain cases. Clause 146 relates to the ascertainment of the position of the wellhead for royalty purposes. Clause 147 relates to the ascertainment of the value of petroleum at the wellhead for royalty purposes. Clause 148 provides for the ascertainment of quantity of petroleum recovered from a well. Clause 149 relates to the time of payment of royalty. Clause 150 provides a penalty for late payment of royalty. Clause 151 states that fees and penalties are debts due to the State of South Australia. Clause 152 sets out the regulation-making powers of the Governor in Council.

Schedules

The first schedule lists amendments to and repeals of certain enactments. The second schedule sets out the 1958

Convention on the Continental Shelf. The third schedule describes the area that includes the adjacent area under this Act. The fourth schedule sets out transitional provisions which will apply to permits and pipeline licences that straddle the boundary of the territorial sea. The fifth schedule contains transitional provisions ensuring that certain things done under the Commonwealth Act prior to the commencement of this Act continue to have effect for the purposes of this Act.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967-1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In the course of discussions concerning the proposed Moomba to Stony Point Liquids pipeline, it has become apparent that it would be desirable for the Cooper Basin producers to construct and operate the pipeline in an easement that would become (and remain) the property of the authority. However, it is not normally possible for the proprietor of an easement to transfer the benefit of the easement without relinquishing his title to the easement. In view of the desirability of the authority owning the easement, it is important that its right to permit others to enjoy the benefit of the easement be put beyond doubt. It is also important to ensure that the powers of the authority, and in particular its powers of compulsory acquisition, are adequate for the implementation of the scheme that the authority and the Cooper Basin producers have in view. This short Bill is designed to accomplish these objects. It provides that the authority may acquire land for the construction, operation, maintenance and repair of a pipeline irrespective of whether the authority or some other person is to operate the pipelines. It also provides that the authority may, for the purpose of facilitating the construction, operation, maintenance or repair of a pipeline by some other person grant licences over property of the authority, or authorise the use by that other person of easements that exist in favour of the authority. An authorisation to use an easement confers, to the extent set forth in the authorisation, the rights of the proprietor of the easement. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 10 of the principal Act which sets out the general powers of the authority. This amendment makes it clear that the authority has power to facilitate the construction, operation or repair of a pipeline by other persons.

Clause 3 amends section 12, which deals with the acquisition of land. The amendment provides that land may be required for a pipeline whether it is to be constructed or operated by the authority or by some other person. Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act. The amendment empowers the authority to grant licences over its property and to authorise the use by some other person of easements that exist in favour of the authority.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Transport Authority Act, 1974-81. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The State Transport Authority was established under the State Transport Authority Act, 1974, and, since that time, has operated under a miscellany of statutory provisions drawn from that Act, the Bus and Tramways Act, 1935-1978, and the Railways Act, 1936-1979. This Bill attempts a major rationalisation of the existing legislation. It repeals both the Bus and Tramways Act and the Railways Act and incorporates into the State Transport Authority Act the powers necessary for the continued operation of the State Transport Authority.

When the State Transport Authority Act was first enacted in 1974, there were three bodies concerned with the operation of the major forms of public transport in South Australia. These were the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board. Initially, the State Transport Authority was not invested with power to assume the functions of these authorities itself. Its function was limited to direction and control of their activities. But it did have a statutory obligation to advise the Minister of Transport, to whom the administration of the Act was committed, on ways and means by which the operational functions and activities of the three bodies could be assumed directly or indirectly by the authority. A report was in fact prepared and in 1975 amendments were made to the Railways Act and the Bus and Tramways Act under which the State Transport Authority directly assumed the functions of the authorities enumerated above. However, under more recent amendments, the functions and activities previously undertaken by the Transport Control Board were transferred from the authority to the direct responsibility of the Minister of Transport and are now administered by the new Division of Road Safety and Motor Transport that has been established within the Department of Transport.

The legislative changes that I have briefly outlined above left the Railways Act and the Bus and Tramways Act in force, but, of course, in a modified form. These Acts are rather antiquated documents which do not, in their present form, provide an adequate charter for the authority. In particular, they do not provide for the modern automated and semi-automated vehicular systems that are now becoming possible by reason of advancing technology. The purpose of the present Bill is to restate the statutory powers of the authority in a modernised and simplified form.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the Bus and Tramways Act and the Railways Act. Clause 4 is formal. Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts section 4 of the principal Act; this section deals with the definitions that are required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing that the

authority is subject to the control or direction of the Minister.

Clause 7 repeals certain provisions of the principal Act and enacts new provisions empowering the authority to delegate its powers, dealing with various financial matters, and providing for the authority to issue an annual report. Clause 8 is the major provision of the Bill. It repeals the existing Part III of the principal Act and enacts new Parts III and IV. New Part III deals with the powers and functions of the authority. New section 17 sets out those powers and functions. New section 18 provides for the acquisition of land under the Land Acquisition Act for the purpose of establishing, extending or altering a public transport system. New section 19 empowers the authority to carry works that are necessary for the establishment, maintenance, extension, alteration or discontinuance of a public transport system. New section 20 empowers the authority to carry out structural works in relation to public streets or roads.

The authority is required to make good any damage that arises from these works and, subject to any agreement with the authority responsible for the care, control and management of the street or road, is liable to maintain structures established by the authority in relation to a street or road. New subsection (3) requires the authority to give notice of works that will involve disturbance of the surface of a public street or road. New section 21 deals with a discontinuance of a public transport system or part of a public transport system. It provides that the authority may, with the consent of the Minister, take up and remove structures that are not required in view of the discontinuance and sell or dispose of materials or equipment that is surplus to the authority's requirements in view of the discontinuance. New section 22 empowers the Authority to determine the routes along which Public Transport Services are to be provided and the places at which stations, stops or other points for embarkation or disembarkation of passengers or goods are to be established. Where the authority proposes to commence using a public street or road on a regular basis for the purpose of public transport services the authority is required to notify the relevant road maintenance authority. Before the authority establishes a bus stop or other point for embarkation or disembarkation of passengers or goods, the authority is required to consult with the relevant road maintenance authority. New section 23 provides that where it is, in the opinion of the authority, desirable that facilities or amenities for recreation or refreshment be available in connection with a public transport system, the authority may itself provide such facilities or amenities, or may grant leases or licences over property of the authority with a view to provision by the lessees or licencees of such facilities or amenities. The present powers of the authority to provide liquor at the railway refreshment rooms at the Adelaide Railway Station are preserved under this new section. New section 24 makes it an offence for a person to hinder an employee of the authority in the exercise of a duty assigned to him by the authority. New section 25 creates offences of damaging or defacing property of the authority. Upon conviction the convicted person may be required to pay compensation. New section 26 makes it an offence for a person to behave in a disorderly or offensive manner while in a vehicle operated by the Authority. It empowers employees of the authority to require any person who behaves in such a manner to alight from the vehicle, and if he refuses or fails to do so, to exercise reasonable force to remove him from the vehicle. New section 27 is directed at avoidance of fares payable to the authority. New section 28 makes it an offence for a person to carry a dangerous or offensive object or substance on a vehicle operated by the authority. New section 29 provides for the summary disposal of offences. It empowers the authority to issue expiation notices

in respect of offences. New section 30 exempts from stamp duty instruments under which the authority acquires an estate or interest in real or personal property, or takes property on hire. New section 31 is a regulation making power.

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

RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an act to provide for the acquisition of land necessary for the purposes of carrying out flood mitigation works and establishing a linear park along the River Torrens, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Government has recently published a scheme for implementing a plan for the establishment of a linear park along the course of the River Torrens from the Gorge Weir to the sea and for carrying out flood mitigation works along the length of the river. On 5 June 1981 representatives of all riparian councils met with the Premier and relevant State Ministers. At this meeting the Government announced its proposals for the River Torrens. The constructive and co-operative attitude of all councils was evident. On 12 June 1981 the Premier wrote to all councils asking that they confirm their general agreement to the proposal.

Subject to satisfactory formal agreement being reached with all riparian councils concerning the scope of the work to be undertaken by the Government, cost-sharing arrangements and responsibility for ongoing maintenance, the Government has announced its intention to establish a project team within the Engineering and Water Supply Department to implement the proposal. The Government has also decided that, due to the possible serious consequences of a major flood along the River Torrens, the flood mitigation scheme in particular should be allocated top priority for its full implementation. Furthermore, since this scheme is fully complementary to the River Torrens-Linear Park Scheme, as defined in the earlier River Torrens Study Report, 1979, the Government has decided that both schemes should proceed simultaneously, with the target completion date of 1986 to coincide with the State's sesquicentennial celebrations.

The present Bill will enable the compulsory acquisition of land necessary to implement the scheme. It is necessary because an examination of existing legislation reveals that none of the present Acts applicable to the river is quite apt to cover implementation of the scheme.

The Bill confers upon the Minister of Water Resources power to acquire land for the purpose of establishing the linear park along sections of the River Torrens extending from the sea to the Gorge Weir, but excluding the section of the river within the City of Adelaide. It includes power to acquire land for the linear park within the area between O.G. Road and Park Terrace; this particular section of the river is associated with the north-east busway. Although compulsory acquisition of land will be used only as a last resort, it is vital that adequate legislative power is available to avoid major delays. This measure will be necessary only

for the duration of the scheme, which is proposed to be completed by 31 December 1986, at which time the Act will expire.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 gives the Minister of Water Resources the power to acquire land adjacent to and including the Torrens River from Gorge Weir to the sea, excluding land under the control of the Adelaide City Council. Clause 4 will enable the Act to expire on the completion of the scheme.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

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

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to and that the resolution agreed to by Committee B be noted,

which Mr Bannon had moved to amend by inserting after the words 'agreed to', first occurring, the words 'except that the Vote—Premier and Cabinet, \$2 958 000 be reduced by \$100'.

(Continued from 20 October. Page 1436).

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I understood that I would be the second speaker this evening, but there has been some mishap in the Liberal Party. I am going to make a few observations, which I imagine the Minister of Agriculture will not be interested in, about the activities of the Estimates Committees this year compared to those of last year.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are not going to criticise my performance, are you?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not have the pleasure of being a member of that committee, so I cannot commend it or praise it. I think it is as well to place on record that I was quite critical about the way the Committees worked last year. I thought that last year Government Ministers made it very clear that they were going to give very long-winded answers. The major committee that I served on last year dealt with industrial affairs. The Minister of Industrial Affairs allowed very little response from his public servants in reply to questions which I thought related to departmental matters rather than policy.

I was also critical of the very gross interference last year by Government members in relation to retarding the progress of the Committees. This year I believe that the Committees (on which I worked) worked much better than they did last year. I am not going to say that it is the most satisfactory arrangement that I have yet seen, because there are still some problems to be sorted out. One of the major problems, if a Minister gives very longwinded answers, is the time taken up by Government members which could still be broken down quite a bit. It is possible under the present Estimates Committees system to retard the progress of the committees. I make no criticism of the Chairmen, because the Chairmen I served under were very fair, I thought, and tried to do their best to allow the Committees to flow in a reasonable manner, and in most cases they did. However, there is still an opportunity for Government members to occupy the crease, as it were, for quite long periods, and therefore retard the progress of a Committee.

After all, I believe that Estimates Committees function largely for the Opposition to investigate and obtain information from the Government. I do not believe that we have yet overcome that problem. There were numerous examples of the situation I have just referred to. It seems to me that

a better method needs to be worked out either in relation to the time factor or the control of progress. In relation to the major Committees that I was concerned with (although I was concerned with all of them, of course), the Committee dealing with industrial affairs and public works, we just did not get time to ask all of our questions. The Committee sat all day, but unfortunately each member was allowed to ask only three or four questions in the very important area of public works, which I wanted to pursue at quite some length. However, the lack of time debarred us from doing that. I believe that the Government needs to rethink this situation and examine it in much finer detail than it is being examined at the moment.

Mr Gunn: It is a job for the Standing Orders Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes and, as I said, there has been an improvement. I am not denying that there was an improvement this year. I believe that the willingness of Ministers to allow the public servants to enter non-policy areas in regard to finance and machinations within the department was much greater than was the case last year. That is a good thing. Nevertheless, I do not say that the system was perfect. I believe that it can be improved, and the Standing Orders Committee that considered the situation after last year's hearings should review the situation again this year and bring down further recommendations.

I do not say, in any way, that these Committees cannot work. If the Committees proceed in the spirit in which they should proceed, they are a useful exercise to obtain information. In those circumstances, I hope that next year, if the present Government is still on the Treasury benches, it will consider what I have said. I doubt that it will still be in office if there is an election between now and then. One would not be far off the mark in predicting that in all probability there will be an election by this time next year, or very close to that time.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Don't bet on it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Someone else told me not to hold my breath. The Government likes being in power so much that it may wait until March, to give it some respite. We may see these Committees working once more under the present Government. We should review what happened on this occasion and improve on it, because there is room for some improvement. However, like most members, I believe that more satisfaction was obtained this year from the Estimates Committee programme than was obtained on the last occasion. I suppose that we are all learning to conduct ourselves in a style different from that which applied in the old system of the operation of the full House. This is a learning process for us. I have been informed that this system works fairly well federally. There is no reason why it cannot work here. An effort is needed by the Government and the Opposition to make it work so that the Committees can flow in a proper way.

Exactly one month ago today, full page advertisements were placed in the *Advertiser* and the *News* by a group of unnamed business men who felt obliged to prop up this Government and who were too ashamed to link their names publicly with that advertisement. On that occasion, those business men were able to acquire space from the Myer group. I am not indicating by that statement that under any circumstances Myers paid for the advertisement, because I do not believe that Myers did that. It is quite clear that Myers is also in contention with this Government about shopping hours.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Really?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister says 'Really'. The Minister knows that I know what I am talking about in this area. There is a great deal of contention at present between the Myer group and this Government over shopping hours. I am not indicating that, in any circumstances,

the Myer group is responsible for paying for the advertisement that was inserted by unnamed business men. What I want to make clear is that these people who were prepared to put such an advertisement in the newspaper were not game to put their names to it. They were ashamed to do that, although they paid for the advertisement in an attempt to prop up the falling South Australian Government. The advertisement states:

Two great years of steady achievement.

It is steady, all right—very steady. In fact, it is so steady that we are going backwards very quickly. It continues:

A few timely reminders that the record is solidly impressive. We must keep pulling together to make South Australia the greatest State.

That was the leading comment in the advertisement. Even the Minister of Agriculture cannot help laughing; he knows full well that all of those statements were totally inaccurate, so totally inaccurate that the people who paid for the advertisement would not sign the cheque. They would not put their name on the paper. That is how proud these business men are of this Government at present. Surely, if all of the things they said were true and if they were confident about what was happening, they would have been proud to put their names to the advertisement. What did they do? They backed away from the attempt to prop up the Government, so that no-one in the streets could say, 'You were responsible for that advertisement.' They had to duck around corners to hide themselves.

I want to do a bit of an analysis tonight, but I do not suppose that time will allow me to do an in-depth analysis, of the record, which shows that leg-pulling is the only solidly impressive performance of the Premier and his Government. Is it leg-pulling or grandstanding? I do not know which is the more apt description. The Premier is talking things up, telling everyone how well the State is going. The Premier was at it again today, in response to the member for Mawson, who could not frame his question and had to have the Premier do it for him. Nevertheless, we saw another example of the Premier's talking up the State when, he, the Minister of Agriculture and, more particularly, the member for Todd know how this Government is performing. The member for Todd is becoming worried. Do not let us kid ourselves. The member for Todd is a very worried man, as are all back-bench members opposite who are in marginal seats. If the honourable member is not worried now, he may be worried after I finish quoting some statistics that apply at present. I want to put on record what I believe is a chronicle of failure by this Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Whose name are you going to attach to these allegations?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Australian Bureau of Statistics, which does put its name to documents, unlike the business men who refused to put their names to the advertisement. The bureau is responsible for all of the statistics that I will quote in a moment. The latest indicators in a range of economic areas show that, despite the Premier's boosting, the real record indicates that he has been attempting to play the fiddle while the *Titanic* goes down. For instance, these figures show that, while total unemployment last month (and it may be as well if the member for Todd listens to these figures) was down by 3.1 per cent, compared with the unemployment level of two years ago in September 1979, in South Australia total unemployment had risen by 4.1 per cent between September 1979 and September 1981. Is that a figure to boast about? Is that a figure for this Government to feel confident about and in regard to which it hopes to be re-elected? Throughout Australia, there is an uplift in the economy, but in South Australia there is a downgrade in the economy.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the member for Todd does not believe these figures, he can go to the library to see for himself. I am quoting from A.B.S. statistics. The Premier has boasted about his record of creating employment. The official statistics show that job vacancies across Australia during the same two-year period have increased by 5.2 per cent. However, in South Australia job vacancies were down by a massive 59.1 per cent, compared with the position during the last month in which Labor was in office. Members opposite may want to dispute those figures. Perhaps they should check them or ask the library to check them. They are the facts. In Australia the figure for the registration of new motor vehicles is plus 5.4 per cent, compared with the figure for two years ago, but in South Australia registrations are down by 12.4 per cent. These are the things that the Premier is trying to boost and to talk up. The Premier is trying to instil confidence.

Only 2½ years ago, he described this as the leper State. I can only say that, if there was a mild attack of leprosy at that stage, we have all got it now under this Government. The statistics for building approvals for dwellings show that across Australia building approvals are up 13 per cent on the figure two years ago, but in South Australia they are down a massive 28.4 per cent. I ask the Government to think about those figures. It should stop boasting and getting false advertisements put in the paper by its business-men puppets who want to keep the Government there if they can, although those people are not very wrapped up in the Government at the moment. There is plenty of condemnation about this Government at the moment by small and large business people. If back-benchers are not picking this up, they are not talking to people, as it is certainly there.

The Opposition is getting much more contact with the business people of this State than it has ever had. Almost daily, the Leader and I are having lunch with some business or industry group that tells us its troubles, which have been caused by this Government. That is a fact. Indeed, if one looks at my diary, one sees that I have appointments for tomorrow and again next Tuesday.

Let us look at unemployment. The latest unemployment figures issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that last month 47 800 people were unemployed in South Australia. That is 7.9 per cent of our population, the highest figure in Australia. What has this Government got to boast about? I have been through all the statistics, but there is not one area in which the Government has improved the situation. There are now 1 900 more people unemployed than were unemployed at the time of the last election, even though there has been a tremendous exodus of population from this State during the past two years, equivalent to losing a city greater than the size of Port Lincoln.

This Government stands indicted and condemned for the major loss of our young people who are leaving this State. The figures are now in excess of 10 000. They are not my figures but are recorded A.B.S. figures. People who are unable to find employment and are dissatisfied with the policies of this Government are migrating elsewhere to try to find employment. How do we get those trained people back?

Mr Ashenden: They're coming back. The last four reports—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is reading different books from what I am reading.

Mr Ashenden: Look at the A.B.S. figures.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is reading different statistics from those which I am reading. In excess of 10 000 people left the State during the past financial year, and I guess that another 10 000 will leave this year. I should like to dwell on that figure for a moment.

Mr Ashenden: Talk the truth for a change.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am speaking the truth, but the Government is not doing so. If those 10 000 people were still here, nearly 60 000 people in South Australia would be unemployed. That is something for the Government to boast about and about which to get an advertisement in the local press. See if some business man will advertise that for the Government: that it is responsible for 60 000 South Australians being unemployed. I put that to the Government to tell its business men.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You be careful what you say. Mr Brown is on his way up to the House.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not care about Mr Brown or anyone else. After the Premier was elected, he said that there was unmistakable proof that his economic policies were working. Yet again the official figures show that, in every one of the past 21 months, South Australia has had the highest unemployment rate of any State in Australia. South Australia reached that unenviable position three months after this Government was elected, and it has maintained it.

At least the Government's record is consistent. The good thing that I have to say about this Government is that it obtained the peak three months after it was elected, and, 21 months thereafter, it is maintaining that peak. So, there is some consistency about this Government. It obviously believes in about 7.9 per cent or 8.8 per cent being unemployed at any given moment.

The Premier has boasted about employment growth, but the vast proportion of that growth, which has been undercut by soaring unemployment, has occurred in country areas because of the expansion in agricultural production that followed the ending of South Australia's biggest drought several years ago. It was pointed out to me during my term as a Minister, when unemployment was rising, that one of the real reasons at that stage was the bad economic circumstances in the agricultural area. The Minister would know, since he has an interest in that area. There was a three-year drought at that stage. Agricultural machinery sales were at an all-time low. People were being put off in industry, and God knows how many jobs were lost at that stage.

This Government has had the benefit of two of the best years that I can remember. Quite clearly from that, as the Minister of Agriculture knows (because he is making a lot of money out of his farm these days), farmers are making a lot of money from their farms. I do not begrudge them that. Good luck to them. However, I think that we need to point to it as a statistic as to why some employment has been picked up in this State; it is all in the agricultural area.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You blame us for the storms but you give us no credit for the good seasons. Be fair, Jack.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the call.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Sir, for your protection from those bullies on the other side. If that drought had not ended (and the Premier can hardly claim credit for rainfall figures), South Australia's unemployment position would now be far worse. It becomes increasingly clear that a job creation scheme is necessary in the Adelaide metropolitan area, as the figures show that 9 per cent of the labour force in the metropolitan area is unemployed. That is far higher than the country unemployment rate of 5.1 per cent.

I am certainly not advocating any reduction in support for country areas, but it is quite clear from the way in which incentives are being offered by this Government that it is pork-barrelling for country electorates at the expense

of the metropolitan area. They are the stark figures. On the one hand, in the city metropolitan area we have an average of 9 per cent unemployed, whereas in the country areas it averages 5.1 per cent. That is where the incentives are going from this Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Come on!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Rocky River said so in an interjection to me tonight: that the incentives were being poured into the country areas. The Government now needs to pour some incentives into the city areas in order to uplift the employment situation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Can you identify the nature of the incentives that you claim are being directed to the country?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I cannot do so in this speech, but I can certainly identify them for the Minister. I do not have very much longer to go now, with all the interjections that have been made. We have become the sick State of Australia, and it is particularly sick when one realises that one-quarter of young South Australians are out of work. They are spending much longer periods on the dole as well. The latest figures, which may interest the member for Todd, show that the average unemployed person in South Australia spends 45.1 weeks without work. That is 50 per cent more than when Labor was in office two years ago.

That is a very proud record for this Government to have and about which it can boast and talk in relation to how well the economy is going. I am willing to predict even worse results. When the next figures come out, the average period of unemployment in South Australia will be close to a year, and the national average closer to eight months. I stake my reputation as a predictor that that will be the case when the next figures come out.

The failure of this Government to put funds into job creation schemes for young people is creating a frustrated, and sometimes bitter, pool of unused talent and unskilled expectations. Not surprisingly, those young people feel that the system is against them, and this is reflected in the increased vandalism and crime. Crime has risen under this Government. There is no question about that. It is in the Police Commissioner's report. It is no good the Minister of Education laughing about the increase in crime. He must support it, as he laughed when I mentioned crime.

Unfortunately, this Government has locked itself into a commitment not to initiate direct job creation schemes and, even though Treasury reports show that the pay-roll tax incentive schemes for youth unemployed has failed, the Government's political face has been put before policy considerations. The scheme that was supposed to create 10 000 jobs has created a measly 600 jobs. That is how many jobs you have got out of the pay-roll tax reduction scheme. In each year that it has been in operation, the Budget allocation for the scheme has been cut by half, because employers have simply found the scheme unattractive in persuading them to take on new employees, yet the Government continues with these policies. Unfortunately, the Budget Estimates Committee papers tried to hide this fact, just as the Minister of Industrial Affairs refuses to provide me with accurate figures of how many jobs have been created.

I have said from the beginning that this scheme would not be a success, and I am correct about that. I have written to the Minister asking him to provide the detail of the jobs that this scheme has created, and I have asked him for the information in the Estimates Committee. The Minister has refused point blank to answer that question. The Chairman of Estimates Committee B would certainly remember my question about that and remember my reminding the Minister that I had written to him about it,

but he will not provide the facts because he does not have any to back him up.

If the Premier and his ambitious Minister of Industrial Affairs are at all genuine in their commitment to providing more jobs for young South Australians, let them release Treasury reports on the effectiveness of this scheme. I also know for a positive fact that there was a very effective analysis of this scheme done by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and the Minister will not release that, either. One minute we find the Premier boasting about his effectiveness and boasting about the State, talking the State up, when in fact things are going badly. Let him produce evidence that the schemes the Government has introduced are working. I and the whole State know that they are not working but I have not the facilities at my disposal that the Government has to do these things. Let the Government produce the facts if the scheme is working. The Government is hiding the facts, because it knows that what I and saying is true and it would be an embarrassment to the Government if it produced the facts.

Several weeks ago I issued a statement that there would be a reshuffle of the Cabinet over the Christmas holiday. My predictions, based on information I received from members opposite, was that the Chief Secretary would be removed from Cabinet and that the Minister of Education would be shifted, sideways, probably, to take up the community welfare portfolio.

I place on record the fact that I do not hold anything personally against the Chief Secretary. I rather like the man. I have got on well with him, but the things that I am going to say are not personal: they are political. His disastrous performance during the past weeks would, if logic prevailed, ensure his demise much more quickly than suggested. In fact, I was reliably informed that the Chief Secretary would be replaced after the Police Ministers conference in mid-November. It may well be now that the Premier's vigorous defence of the Chief Secretary will mean that he is obliged to keep him on longer, again in order to keep face.

Mr Keneally: Would Fisher be the new Minister?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He ought to be. He is a very competent man and has had long service. However, the good money is that the Minister will be knighted in the new year honours list and dispatched by March next year.

The statements by the member for Rocky River about marine and harbors matters, and the obvious glee of the member for Hanson, show that the lobbying has already begun. My predictions of a couple of weeks ago may eventually prove correct, but the controversies that surround the Minister will not end with this week's attempts in Parliament to expose his incompetence. That incompetence relates not only to his handling of police and prison matters.

This afternoon I received information that reveals a scandalous situation in the Minister's management of the Fisheries Department. I do not intend to reveal that information tonight, but I can assure the Minister of Fisheries that the public interest in his mismanagement of the Police portfolio will be matched when we reveal how he has bungled his fisheries responsibilities. No amount of hiding behind press secretaries and running out back doors to escape journalists will prevent the true story from coming out.

Mr Keneally: What about that, Ted?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The fisheries scandal will doubtless implicate the Minister of Agriculture as well because he has been the pseudo Minister in this area. I remember the member for Stuart telling us about the nursing that the Minister had to give in Port Augusta some time ago to talk to local fishermen.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The Minister should have been accompanied by the local member, but he didn't have the bloody guts to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The position will be quite clear. The Minister is getting wild. He knows that we may be able to implicate him as well.

Finally, I refer to the Government's promises to slash taxes. During the past 12 months the Government has increased more than 60 State charges. The Opposition has called those increased State charges back-door taxation because they are designed to recoup the revenue that was lost in disposing of taxes that affected only the wealthiest sections of our community. This is back-door taxation without a doubt, and I have also been informed that another round of State charges is to come. The Government has itself in such a state of economic demise that it needs another round of State charges. I have been member for Adelaide for 10 years and have never previously put out a pamphlet that has created more interest than has one that I put out a couple of months ago identifying every State charge that this Government has imposed since coming to office. I received 300 inquiries in my office about the charges and I had allegations about this Government not doing its job and placing its taxes in the wrong area.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): It will not take me long to respond to the comments of the Deputy Leader, because I think that how seriously we can take them can be summed up in what he said in relation to the information that he allegedly gets from the Liberal Party. The Premier, before he makes any decisions, of course, consults with the Deputy Leader to determine what he should be doing in relation to his Cabinet! The Deputy Leader's own words were that he was reliably informed that, come Christmas, we will have the Chief Secretary knighted, and various moves will take place. I remind the Deputy Leader that he said the same thing earlier this year when other lists were coming up, and he was proved wrong. I think all his comments tonight can be taken with the same grain of salt.

After all, this State has 10 years of socialist Labor Government to live down. In 10 years, the Labor Government almost ruined the State, and it expects this Government, in two years, to have it back where it was 10 years ago. The Deputy Leader selectively chose figures, and where he could not give A.B.S. figures he blithely ignored to tell us what his source was. He chose some figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics but most of the figures he gave were plucked out of the air and absolutely unsorted.

When this Government came to office, the number of jobs available in South Australia was declining extremely rapidly, and since we have come to office that number has gone up by in excess of 12 000, so let us think what the unemployment situation would have been if the previous Government had still been occupying the Treasury benches. Let us also look at other comments made by the Deputy Leader. He said that migration from this State was greater than it had ever been previously. Certainly, during the term of the previous Government, quarter by quarter the greatest exodus occurred. But, in the last quarter of 1980 and the first quarter of 1981, for the first time in years, the number of people coming into South Australia was greater than the number going out, and my source, for the Deputy Leader's information, is the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Once again, statements made by the Deputy Leader are completely without foundation.

He also said that, where employment was growing, it was in the country. Regarding the 200 jobs at Raytheon, I thought Raytheon was at Hendon, I did not realise it was in the country. I thought that General Motors-Holden's plastics plant was at Elizabeth, but obviously it is in the country. Shearers, which during the period of the Labor Government left South Australia to go to Queensland and has now come back, is established in the metropolitan area and has consolidated its activities there. We find Grundfos Pumps coming to the metropolitan area of South Australia and, if members look at speeches that the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs and I have made, they will find endless companies that have opened operations in the metropolitan area of Adelaide or have expanded their operations there.

So much for the rubbish put forward by the Deputy Leader. It is incredible that a person can make those comments and expect people to believe him.

I must now take up comments made by the member for Spence last night. Once again it would appear that members opposite are not very interested in putting forward the truth of a situation. Either that, or he was attempting to hide his own and his Party's complete ineptitude in the handling of the questions in the Estimates Committees which have just been completed.

Mr Keneally: The member for Spence hasn't even spoken. That's how clever you are.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am sorry, I mean the member for Price. He has not contributed much to Parliament since I have been here, so I did not realise what district he represented. Last night the member for Price said:

But then we came to the stage where the member for Todd thought that the Opposition was getting too much information and that he would start to chip in with some irrelevant questions.

I will look at those supposedly irrelevant questions shortly. He continued:

He did so, and the member for Henley Beach did the same.

The member for Henley Beach was not even on the Committee, so that is not a bad statement.

Let us now look at the questions which the honourable member believes were irrelevant. The first one that I asked was in relation to road safety. I guess that is quite 'irrelevant'. The honourable member opposite thinks it is irrelevant to ask the Minister of Transport a question on road safety. I would ask the honourable member, if he were in the House (which he is not), of which Minister I should ask that type of question. I put forward a number of points in that question that I thought the Minister and his officers should consider in regard to improving road safety in the metropolitan areas of Adelaide. The Minister and his officers agreed that the points I put forward were most worthy of consideration, and they will most certainly be providing me with details of the points I raised. That was the first question on road safety which was 'irrelevant'!

My second question was on community bus services. Again, the honourable member may believe that community bus services are unimportant, but I certainly do not. They are an absolutely essential part of my electorate. How on earth can a question I asked on community bus services be regarded as irrelevant or unimportant? My third question was again related to public transport, and this time it asked the Minister to determine what steps the Government would be taking to cater for the disabled on public transport. Again, the honourable member regards that as irrelevant and unimportant. I am sure his constituents would not be very pleased to hear him say that any question to do with catering for the disabled is irrelevant or unimportant. I then continued that question to the Minister and related it to the new bus service that will be provided along the guide-way to the north-eastern suburbs, to make sure that there

will be facilities to cater for the disabled on that service when it is commenced. I was given the assurance that that would be the case. But, the honourable member regards that as irrelevant or unimportant.

What was the fourth question I asked of the Minister in that Committee? It was in relation to the provision of a bus service from the north-eastern suburbs to the Port Adelaide area. One person in three living in my electorate and earning a wage works in the direction of Port Adelaide. Obviously such a bus service is extremely important to my constituents, and I therefore asked a question on that, but again the honourable member regarded it as irrelevant and unimportant. I would certainly like him to come into my electorate and let the electors there know that a representative of the Australian Labor Party regards those points as unimportant and irrelevant and that their member should not have had the gall to ask such questions of the Minister. I would be delighted for that to happen, as I have said. I am sure that the people out there would be shocked to learn just how the Labor Party regards those issues in the electorate of Todd. He then went on to say that I took up too much of the Minister's time. There were the only four questions I asked in a period of eight and a half hours. How he can make such allegations is beyond me. The reason I asked those questions was that they were of the utmost importance to me.

I also believe that such times are made available predominantly for members of the Opposition to question the Government and to get information. As they will acknowledge, a member of the Government Party is in a position to obtain information more easily than they are and therefore I did not abuse the time available. Certainly, anyone hearing comments like those made by the honourable member would make one wonder why I did not take up more of the time, particularly when I saw how inept the Opposition's questioning was during that period. That is the reason that media reference was made to boredom; the Opposition's questioning was not incisive, it was not deep, and it did not follow a theme. Members opposite wasted the opportunity they had and were embarrassed when Government members asked questions that were relevant, pertinent and important.

I had not intended to speak at all tonight but, having heard those earlier comments and realising that they would be recorded in *Hansard*, I knew that I would have to correct the situation because some people may even believe such inane allegations. Concerning the charges made against me and another member on this side who was not even on the Committee, I trust that that situation has now been fully explained. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his Party want to keep believing that sort of thing, that is fine by me, but that certainly is not the impression in my electorate.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat said one intelligent thing during his contribution to the debate and that was that he had not intended to speak tonight. Unfortunately, he did not heed the advice he had given himself, and in speaking he did not do his cause or that of his colleagues any good whatsoever. He wanted to complain and criticise the member for Spence. He was so accurate in his remarks that he could not tell the difference between the member for Spence and the member for Price. It was only after prompting from this side that he even knew about whom he was talking. That tends to confirm the earlier decision he made that I commended him for—that he ought not to have spoken at all. What a pity he did not stick to his original decision.

He went on to say that the figures being produced on unemployment by the Deputy Leader were unsourced. He

corrected that to a degree by saying that the figures being used were from the Australian Bureau of Statistics; apparently he did not want to criticise those figures, and he mumbled that some of them, anyway, were not sourced. He believes that if he makes such wild unsubstantiated remarks no-one will take any notice of him. He is entirely wrong, and the real key to that matter is the way in which the emphasis has been carefully shifted on his side of the House in relation to this whole matter. Whereas when they first came to power in 1979 Government members were not loath to use the term 'unemployment', that word is no longer in their vocabulary. The term now used is 'jobs created'. They have a guilt feeling about this, and so they ought to have.

In a quite shonky way, they became elected, promising job creation and a reduction of unemployment, but they have not been able to live up to those terms and do not have a hope of living up to them, as the last two years have proven. As the Deputy Leader pointed out, their record for consistency can at least can be commended. They have gone from bad to worse, things have gone down the drain and unemployment has remained steady or increased during that period. That is why that word is no longer in their vocabulary.

That is all one needs to devote to the honourable member who spoke earlier, except to say that he was at some pains to demonstrate that he asked four important questions in the Estimates Committee with which he was concerned. He said that he had asked questions about community buses and a transport service for people living in his area who wished to travel to the Port area for work or other purposes, and I want to tell the honourable member that as a member of the Government Party he could have got the answers to everyone of those things on which he took up the time of the Estimates Committee by ringing John Campbell in the Minister's Office, who probably could have told him the answers in a return call in five minutes. He would not then have needed to ask those relatively irrelevant questions at a time when the Committee was, as was rightly pointed out by the member for Hanson earlier, concerned about questions of finance, costing and programme evaluation, and so on. The honourable member's routine questions could easily have been answered by a simple phone call to the person I have mentioned.

All members know this, yet for all portfolios programme performance budgets documents were available, and quite a lot has been said about whether they should have been available earlier and about the value or otherwise of those documents, and so on. I do not wish to canvass that area any longer, but I think there would be some agreement on both sides of the House that the documents ought to have been available a little earlier. The proof of that was that, if one examined what was occurring on the Committees by the second week of their sitting, there was a distinct lifting of the game on all sides, by the officers, the Ministers and all members, because they had had a reasonable time to study what was a veritable welter of information that originally had suddenly been launched on members within a couple of days of the first Committee hearings.

I hope the Minister of Mines and Energy will take the trouble or have one of his officers read the remarks I am going to make now about page 38 of the document, where under 'Specific targets/objectives for 1981-82' one of the targets is 'Establish the availability of underground water from the Great Artesian Basin in connection with mine development at Roxby Downs, Beverley and Honeymoon'. If we look, for example, at page 14 of the Honeymoon environmental impact statement, which is available these days, we find, under the heading 'Ground Water—B. The Great Artesian Basin', the following words:

High yields . . . are readily obtainable from the main Artesian Basin aquifer.

There is another statement:

Some doubt as to their relationship exists to the Great Artesian Basin.

Whilst I welcome the fact that there is at least some investigation to be carried out, I also want to sound to the Minister a note of caution and warning about that vast fossil water resource we have in the Great Artesian Basin. Members would be well aware, I think, that the vast body of water contained in the Great Artesian Basin did not arrive there overnight, or indeed in a relatively short time of a few hundred years: it has been built up over a very long time. That much apparently is known about that resource. I think that Australia as a whole and South Australia in particular need to be very careful about the use and the husbanding of that resource. There are many examples, in the United States, where wrong decisions were taken quite carelessly, as has been proven by the passage of time, to break into underground water basin systems without proper thought and control.

For example, I understand that in Phoenix, Arizona, tapping the basin there to establish that township (which subsequently became a city), which the extensive construction of housing, resorts, swimming pools, and the like, has resulted in lowering the levels of that basin to where the alternative now being considered to provide water for the continuance of that city is a project involving \$2 000 000 000 and pipelines being brought from over 400 miles away, because of the way in which, without care, thought, proper planning and research, the vast resource that existed under that desert area was tapped and used in a reckless way. I trust that the Minister has in mind my remarks and other literature available on this subject before any decision is taken in relation to the industrial use—which is what it comes down to—of that underground resource. Within the same portfolio, at page 42, specific targets/objectives for this current financial year include the following:

To optimise development of the 12 oil and gas fields, due on stream in the next three years [that would be referring to the Cooper Basin in the main].

To maximise and conserve the State's petroleum resources.

To establish realistic oil/gas/coal reserves estimates to facilitate the State's forward energy planning programmes.

I have no quarrel with those targets and, in fact, I commend the Minister for continuing what was already in train and in progress during the previous Administration under the Labor Government, and under the care and stewardship of the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who was then the Minister of Mines and Energy, and under the good administrative set-up which existed in the Mines Department and is still there under the present Minister. I have no quarrel with that. I would think that that is a policy and target which we would all endorse, but in that connection, I think it is time that we recognised the kind of swindle being perpetrated by the Minister in respect of gas reserves in South Australia, contracts which exist in that area, and the statements being made continually by the Minister on a political basis which are not borne out or supported by those involved in the industry.

I will quote from a document which is freely available at the South Australian Gas Company today and which was issued as a press release, as follows:

Gas employees assured no shortage of gas. Employees of the South Australian Gas Company have been assured that the State has ample supplies of natural gas and that other options for gas supplies are being investigated. This assurance has been given in a letter issued to employees by the General Manager of the Gas Company, Mr J. P. Burnside—

and few people in this State would be better qualified to comment on whether or not gas is available and whether

that utility can continue to operate. Mr Burnside goes on to say in his letter to all employees:

Recent media statements about future gas supplies for South Australia could be disturbing to employees of the company and cause concern to gas consumers. 'Contrary to implications in the articles, the end of 1987 does not spell the end of Cooper Basin gas to Adelaide,' Mr Burnside said. 'That is the date on which our present contract for gas supply will be renegotiated'—

and that is the real position; it has always been that way, and the Minister of Mines and Energy in this State for the last two years has been guilty of distorting the true facts in the matter. I am very pleased to see that at least one person in the community, and someone of considerable stature, has at least attempted to put the record straight. Mr Burnside's letter goes on to say:

Since the Gas Company started to take natural gas in 1969 exploration in the Cooper Basin since that date has discovered more gas than has been used.

He also said:

The end of 1987 is the date on which our present contract for gas supply will be renegotiated, and provisions for this are already laid down in our contract with the Pipelines Authority of Australia.

So much for the Minister of Mines and Energy's Doomsday prediction of 1987 being the turn-off of gas for Adelaide. Not only does the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company point out that gas is being discovered all the time but also he points out that in the existing contract documents the arrangements for renegotiation of further contracts exist. That is the true situation. I am sure that the member for Hanson knows that, because of his interest in contractual and financial matters generally, and his ability to read some of those documents perhaps with a little more care and accuracy than apparently the Minister of Mines and Energy has been able to do. I am being charitable in suggesting that the Minister must have misunderstood rather than suggesting that he has been deliberately distorting the facts. The letter that Mr Burnside has so freely made available to all employees of the company and also publicly goes on to say:

There is no reason to doubt that this will continue—

referring to the fact that gas finds have been continuing—and adequate reserves will be available in 1987 to renew our contract well after the year 2000.

He pointed out that the Gas Company had operated continuously since 1861 and, despite many drastic changes in manufacturing methods and raw materials, the gas supply to customers had never been disrupted. Mr Burnside then described the other measures that the company was concerned with, as follows:

The company was actively involved in surveying optional supplies of gas for the distant future—

he is not referring to 1987—

including the piping of supplies from other gas fields in Australia, the possibilities of gas from other sources such as coal, and the storage and future importation of liquefied natural gas. The company had just engaged Bechtel Pacific Corporation to carry out a feasibility study into the practical aspects of providing a L.N.G. storage facility to service Adelaide.

If there is any doubt in any member's mind, the concluding paragraph of the letter will remove it. Mr Burnside said:

I can assure all employees that we will continue to serve South Australia as a gas utility just as vigorously in the future as we do at present, and you can assure present and prospective customers that they can rely on gas, the fuel of the future.

If members have any doubts about future supplies, I would remind them of the regular finds that occur in the Cooper Basin, the latest of which occurred only as recently as the 19th of this month. The *News* reported as follows:

Santos Ltd and its partners have found more gas in the Far North of South Australia. Delhi Petroleum Pty Ltd as operator of the Cooper Basin consortium reported the new gas flow today. Delhi said gas had flowed at the rate of 100 000 cubic metres a day from the Dilchee No. 1 exploration well.

So, it was another exploration drill that found gas. These finds have been occurring from time to time, as members will know. The *News* then reported technical details relating to the flow, methods used to record the actual flow rate, and so on. That may now put to rest the nonsensical campaign conducted by the Minister of Mines and Energy—the fear campaign and the political campaign—whereby he has been attempting to discredit the Labor Government and at the same time alarming users of gas in South Australia in relation to future supplies. That is clearly dispelled once and for all by the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company.

Earlier in this debate we saw a massive and orchestrated attack upon the member for Elizabeth and the Leader of the Opposition by a bevy of heavies from the other side of the House. Because members of the Opposition were attempting to carry out their responsibilities in a matter concerning the Police Force in South Australia, and for that matter the administration of the Police Force by the Minister concerned, Government members deliberately, for some reason which can only be political, distorted the perfectly legitimate matters raised by both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Elizabeth concerning recent events involving the Police Force. It was a disgusting attack planned to protect the inept Minister concerned with the police, namely, the Chief Secretary.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who spoke not long before I did, pointed out that the Chief Secretary is, of course, a person who is universally accepted and liked as a person. However, that does not mean that he is allowed to get 100 per cent as a Minister performing his duties unless he can deliver, which is what this matter has been about. The Premier and the other heavies about whom I have spoken have been, I believe, partially to blame for the poor performance of the Minister, because they will not leave him alone; one never sees him on his own anywhere: one or two Ministers are always breathing down his neck. When simple questions are asked in this House, he is always immediately fired with advice from behind by the member for Glenelg (I am sure that he would ignore that advice, and I hope so, because that would not be of any use to him); he receives instructions from the Minister of Industrial Affairs passed through the Minister of Education, who puts his own connotation on them, and all the time breathing down his neck nudging his right shoulder is the Minister of Agriculture. I think, in some ways, that we should give the gentleman an accolade for standing up to all that and still appearing to be heading his departments.

What are the facts of this matter? The member for Elizabeth, the Leader of the Opposition, and the shadow Minister for the Chief Secretary's affairs (the member for Stuart) raised in a perfectly legitimate way their concern about what might be the situation in the Police Force. There was an outcry and a deliberate attempt by the Premier and the other members that I have mentioned to divert this issue as an attack on the Police Force and, what is more, an attack without foundation. That is their whole aim.

What is the real scene in the South Australian Police Force at the moment? Who could better comment on that than the Commissioner himself, Mr Draper? I have known this man for some years. I met him when I was a Minister in the former Government, and I have the greatest respect for him. I would say that he would be held in the highest respect throughout South Australia by all concerned. Mr Draper has never attempted to hide that there are some problems in the Police Force. He has said openly that there have been problems. As recently as 10 September, just over a month ago, an article in the *Advertiser* written by police

reporter Greg Mayfield, and headed 'Worst for police in 40 years', stated:

The Police Department had been hit by the worst series of cases against police in 40 years, the Police Commissioner, Mr L. D. Draper, said last night.

That was not the member for Elizabeth, the member for Stuart or the Leader of the Opposition raising this matter, but it is proof that they are justified in reporting and raising their concern about a series of happenings in the Police Force, as detailed to the public of South Australia by the Commissioner. The article further states:

He [Mr Draper] could not recall so many cases against police in one year. He was commenting on the latest incident in which a uniformed officer has resigned and other police are to be questioned after an internal inquiry into thefts in the Christies Beach area.

The report also states:

Other incidents involving police this year have included: issuing of warrants for the arrest of former Detective Colin James Creed . . . ; charges of conspiracy and other offences against a Whyalla detective; the resignation of a Darlington officer after a police inquiry into allegations that he ran a cabaret . . .

and so on. It is not my intention to stand up in the House and denigrate police officers doing their job. On the contrary, I am trying to illustrate, and I believe I have illustrated clearly to the House, that there are some problems in the Police Force and that members of the Opposition have as have do members on the other side, a perfect right to be concerned about that matter and to raise their concern, in the House and elsewhere, in a reasonable way.

That is what has been done. The member for Stuart, as our shadow Minister on this subject, during the Estimates Committees very properly set out his belief, before asking even one question of the Minister on this matter, that South Australia is fortunate in having a good force, the best in Australia (he may be a little parochial about that, but we understand his saying that), a force, which, from Gallup polls conducted over the years, has been shown to have the respect of up to 80 per cent of the population. The Gallup poll asked, 'Are you satisfied that the police do a good or fair job?' More than 80 per cent answered 'Yes' to either good or fair. No other force in Australia has come anywhere near that.

It is not wrong for members to be concerned when a force of such stature and reputation is threatened by what the Police Commissioner described as the 'worst for police in 40 years'. If we were not asking questions about it, then we would not be doing our job. I am certain that every officer in the force who is doing his job properly—and that would be the vast majority—is concerned about this matter, and will be just as anxious to get rid of those few bad apples in the barrel, so that the rest will not be tarred or tainted with the same brush.

For the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Chief Secretary to suggest that this is an attack on the police, for an attack's sake, is absolute nonsense, and has been proven untrue by the facts that I have put forward in a non-partisan way and from quotes from the Commissioner himself. We do not seek to denigrate the force but simply to illustrate that the Commissioner himself knows that there has been a bad spot, and he has been just as anxious as anybody else to do something about it.

We saw an amazing performance in the House by the Chief Secretary yesterday and again today. Instead of standing up for the force and commending members who have tried to be of help in the matter (we would have no quarrel if he was critical of the publicity that was used, or something like that), the Chief Secretary and those other heavies have tried to divert it and say that there has been an attack. It is not an attack: I deny that. As a member of the Opposition, I have the same regard for the force as was expressed by the shadow Minister (the member for Stuart),

the Leader of the Opposition, and so on. Let us put that to rest for good.

Criticism was levelled at the member for Elizabeth in that he did not proffer any information, yet on the same page of *Hansard* the statement was also made by the Deputy Premier that he did give information and that it had come to nought. The name of a certain prisoner had been put forward. If he gave no information, why did the Deputy Commissioner interview the man? How did he get the information unless it was given? We know that, on occasion, they may not be willing to talk on day two. On day one they may have a feeling that there is some information they are going to supply, but subsequently they rethink the matter.

In retrospect, members who examine what I have put forward in relation to the matter will see the actions of the Opposition members who have spoken on the topic, either in the Estimates Committees or elsewhere, in a different light. I support the amendment that my Leader has put forward in relation to the reduction in the line on the basis of the performance by the Chief Secretary.

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

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I support the motion and oppose the amendment put forward by the Opposition. Before I begin my remarks, let us examine the type of person we have sitting opposite us in this House. If we do that, we must first look at the Federal scene. The Leader of the Federal A.L.P. is a man who says:

The 1980s are looming as a decade of despair.

Mr Hayden said that in a press statement on 22 October 1978. He also said:

The decade of the 1980s will be a decade of gloom.

He said this at a speech to the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union on 20 November 1978. It seems to be inbred into A.L.P. members that they must espouse gloom, gloom, gloom, and that is all we ever get from the Opposition: never a positive word or suggestion; nothing but gloom. So much for their psychology when it comes to trying to work with people. Surprisingly, we have the very same man who is preaching gloom also saying:

But by nature I am inclined to be optimistic.

On the one hand, he preaches gloom, but his very nature is optimistic. The man does not know whether he is coming or going. When he was preaching gloom for the 1980s, he said:

We just don't know what it is going to be like in two years time, and anyone who suggests otherwise is talking through the back of his head.

He said this in the *National Times* on 21 July 1979. On the one hand, he preaches gloom, as we see the Opposition doing in this State, and, on the other hand, he says, 'I am optimistic, that is why I preach gloom and doom.' He then says, 'You can't forecast, because if you are doing that you are talking through the back of your head.' He is doing the same thing himself. The man does not know where he is.

We have the same sort of attitude coming to us through the whole Budget review from the Opposition. They got up with a lot of ballyhoo, they wasted time about arguing the merits of the Budget review sessions and yet, on the other hand, they acknowledge that it is the most information they have ever had. We heard the Deputy Leader say, 'At least this year we got a bit more information.' This was mainly because Opposition members decided this year that they might sit down and do a bit of work instead of mucking around as they did last year, wasting time, walking into the Chamber with a cup of coffee when it was out of order.

They then complain about our wasting time. They ballyhoo like that.

A prime example was given on the news last Wednesday evening in relation to the afternoon session, particularly in the health area, when the Opposition tried to introduce a no-confidence motion in the Minister of Health. It was beautifully reported in the ABC news that night that the Opposition had made absolute fools of themselves. Members of the Opposition had been supplied with books full of information, yet they obviously had not done their homework. That is how astute members opposite are.

Mr Olsen: It was not only on the health committee.

Mr SCHMIDT: No, it was not only on the health committee; it was on just about every committee. Members opposite asked questions, yet they could have obtained the answers in the review books. They wasted time, tried to pass censure and no-confidence motions, and carried on with all sorts of bally-hoo, just to waste time and air their grievances. If members opposite were sincere about trying to do something positive for this State they would have sat down and carefully examined those books.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCHMIDT: Perhaps that is the case; we did not have time to add the figures up properly for them. By the same token, members on this side were criticised for asking questions. On page 211 of *Hansard* I asked a question about forecasting manpower and how successful the schemes were in providing employment for young people, yet the Deputy Leader asked tonight what this Government has done about trying to create jobs for the young in this State. He was on that blessed committee, but obviously he was not listening. If he had listened he would have heard. As proof of the fact that he was not listening, he got up after I asked those questions and was most irate because I jumped a question on him. He then spent the next five minutes debating with the Chairman on whether or not, in future, A.L.P. members should have the right to ask the first question on any line. That is an indication of how concerned he was about the interests of our young people who are looking for work. He was not concerned about them at all. He was more concerned about grandstanding and politicising. He was upset because he could not ask the first question. That is an indication of how sincere he was.

Exactly the same thing occurred in the education debate. The Opposition spokesman for education trotted out and made speeches on the steps of Parliament. This afternoon he said that perhaps he referred to \$8 000 000 going to the north-east busway, but he had said that only in a light-hearted fashion. According to the S.A.I.T. journal, 500 people attended that rally on the steps, but I am sure that those 500 people did not approach that rally in a light-hearted fashion—they took it seriously. However, the member for Salisbury said this afternoon that it was light hearted.

An honourable member: He did it to incite them.

Mr SCHMIDT: Of course he did it to incite them. It was political grandstanding. How sincere was he in trying to get the information? The same thing happened on this committee. I started to ask a question about administration costs within the Kindergarten Union, the Childhood Services Council and the Education Department. I was pursuing the question of why the Kindergarten Union had not informed the kindergartens before sending out that first cheque. What happened? The Opposition members went running to the Chairman and pointed out that I had asked four questions. If they had listened carefully, they would have realised that one of my questions was a repeat, because I had not received an answer. Members opposite should check *Hansard* on page 366. Once again, members opposite were not really interested in education; they were more

concerned about their grandstanding and politicising. As the good Chairman on that occasion, which was you, Mr Deputy Speaker, you pointed out what actually had happened: you had allowed the Opposition spokesmen to ask 35 questions before allowing me to ask four. The Opposition members became upset because I had asked four questions! How sincere are they?

Let us think for a moment about the type of persons we have in the Opposition. As I have said, we have had nothing but gloom and doom from the Opposition. That has come through in everything we have heard. When they cannot get anywhere they resort to character assassination. In the last few days we have had nothing but character assassination. They do it on every occasion, during every election campaign. In 1975 they character assassinated Doug Anthony; in the 1977 election campaign they character assassinated Lynch; and in the 1979 election campaign they character assassinated someone else. That is the only tactic they use at every election. Why do they do it? It is because they do not get down to the facts. They do not think positively. All they can do is cast gloom and resort to character assassination.

I turn now to a couple of salient points, because I do not want to take up any more time than is necessary. Members opposite ask what the Government is doing. The member for Mitchell criticised us earlier for using the word 'employment'. What is wrong with using the word 'employment'? Surely 'employment' is a positive statement. There is nothing negative about it. To reinforce that point the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that in August 1977 there were 568 000 jobs in this State. In August 1979, after two years of Labor Administration, there were only 547 400 jobs. Surely, if members opposite are going to preach gloom and doom, that is when they should have been doing it; that is precisely what they were accomplishing. If one is to preach gloom and doom and take a negative approach, one will get negative results. Those negative results are evident in the employment rate over those two years.

My Party has been in power for a little less than two years, and we have adopted a very positive approach. We have thought positively and we have encouraged people to be positive. We are not denying that times are hard. No-one is denying that. However, we do not make hard times better by preaching gloom and doom. We have to give people some confidence and they have to be encouraged. I lift my lid to a teacher I know who had 56 young people in his class on a special work experience programme. Within the last 12 months, 54 of those pupils have taken jobs. They are all happy and he has only two pupils left in his class.

One girl had applied for 100 different jobs. Did he say, 'Look, kid, you may as well give up, there is no hope'? That is not the way; he kept on encouraging her. He adopted a positive approach, and she is now a happy young girl, because she has a job that she likes. That is a result of being positive; it is not casting the gloom and doom that we get from the Opposition.

I now turn to the 18 months that my Party have been in Government. I said that in August 1979 there were 547 400 jobs in this State—a very low figure. However, by July 1981 employment has been increased to 561 300 jobs. That is a positive, not a negative approach. In relation to incentives for young people, the Opposition should surely be aware that their colleague in New South Wales, who, as part of their election strategy and as part of their own Budget, whilst on the one hand they increased pay-roll tax for larger firms and other small businesses, on the other hand, they provided incentives to employers for employing people under the age of 18 years. That is the policy this Government employed as soon as it took Government. How-

ever, members opposite have the audacity to say that we are not doing anything for young people. However, the Wran Administration in New South Wales followed our example, because it could see that it was a positive step and that there was a need to encourage young people. Is our policy wrong? I do not think so. If it was wrong, I doubt very much whether Mr Wran would have adopted it.

Members opposite should examine their own Party structure first, to see where positive approaches could be adopted, and try to do something positive themselves. When the Leader of the Opposition could not come up with other facts he was reduced to innuendo, implying that so-and-so would be out of Cabinet in such-and-such a time, someone else would be moving here, and so on. Gloom and doom again! He could not say anything positive; he had to be negative.

A person in my area (I believe it is the Opposition candidate) put a scathing comment in the local paper saying how woeful is the present Government, and that since 1975 there has been a 167 per cent increase in bankruptcies in this State.

What an indictment on their own Party! What an indictment on the Opposition! If one looks at the facts and figures, one sees that the majority of that happened when the Labor Party was in Government. The Liberal Party has been in power for the past two years, and that figure has reversed. In 1978-79, it was 24 per cent, in 1979-80 it was 19 per cent, and in 1980-81, that figure reversed to minus 2.5 per cent. Since we have been in Government the bankruptcy rate in this State has gone to the peak and reversed. Our growth in regard to bankruptcy has not been of the magnitude that occurred under the Labor Administration. The indictment is on the Labor Party, not on this Government. Let members opposite be positive about that.

Let us hearken to the words of one of the former colleagues of members opposite, a person whom no doubt they still want to worship. That man, in the light of the declining economy that was occurring under the Labor Administration (and members opposite would do well to take note of his comments—and the man to whom I refer is none other than Mr Don Dunstan), in regard to education, stated:

Expenditure on primary and secondary education represents the single largest item in the State Budget. Accordingly, when growth in State revenues is restricted, either by the depressed state of the economy [which was occurring at that time] or by deliberate Commonwealth policy, it is idle to pretend that education can be shielded from the effects. Those commentators who pass off reductions in the real level of Commonwealth assistance to the States as painless or, indeed, beneficial in bringing home to recalcitrant State Governments the need for restraint in public spending would do a service to the standard of public debate about fiscal policy if they took the trouble to gain an understanding of elementary facts such as this.

For 1978-79 the Education Department has a small increase in its allocation from \$299 200 000 to \$308 000 000.

That was a pitiful 3 per cent increase in the Budget allocation. In 1978 did we hear the big hoo-hoo that we are hearing now in the press? Did we have rallies on the steps of Parliament House? Of course not! Did we have SAIT coming out and trumpeting how bad are these cuts in education? Not a word!

Mr Peterson: They were good cuts.

Mr Schmidt: The honourable member says that they were good cuts. There was only a pitiful 3 per cent increase in the education allocation. In 1978, the inflation rate was about 12 per cent. Absolutely nothing!

Mr Mathwin: That was dapper Don.

Mr Schmidt: That was the man who had the whole world in his hands. Was not that the case? He went on to say, in regard to this small increase, the following:

In broad terms, this will allow only a continuation of education programmes at about existing levels overall. One of the implications

of this is that, as new schools are opened or existing schools expand, the means to operate them must be found by re-deploying resources which are already available in the department.

Members opposite must realise that money does not grow on trees, as people would like. It does not fall from the sky, as manna fell for Moses when he was walking through the wilderness. Money must be generated from somewhere. We still give about one-third of our whole State Budget funds to education. It is time people realised that we must make the most of what we have got. Times are hard, so we must give all we have got. Be positive! It is very easy to sit out in the community and be negative all of the time. If people are negative now, why were they not negative in those days when the real cuts began to occur? They should have been screaming then, not now.

Mr Peterson (Semaphore): It is always hard to follow the gloom and doom. I seem to follow the rippers in this House. I might say that I am an optimist. I always look on the bright side of things. I look for the better things in life. In South Australia today, it is a little difficult to look ahead. I happen to be a sentimental person and I can say without hesitation that I love this State in which I live. It has been very good to me. I was born and raised in this State, and I have been here for some four score years.

Mr O'Neill: You mean two score years.

Mr Peterson: That is right. I have seen some good and bad times. As honourable members know, I am a fair man, but I believe that these are bad times. I want to see the State develop. I want to see plenty of work for people and a happy population. I do not see that today. It is not there. Philosophies were referred to earlier. I suppose that in some areas at some time the philosophy of members opposite is successful and workable. However, that political and philosophical debate can be taken up elsewhere. In my opinion, at this stage in South Australia the Government's philosophy is not working properly.

I would like to comment first on the timing of the supply of information for the Estimates Committees. On the last sitting day before the Committees were to meet, we were handed 14 folders of information, 14 volumes of fairly involved and intricate data relating to every Ministerial portfolio that was to be investigated by the Committees. I must say that the information was very well laid out. It was helpful and detailed. However, I believe that it was provided far too late to be of any real use to members. We had to work from notes instead of being able to research beforehand. I am sure that this information was of far greater use to the members who were allocated specific areas than that provided previously, but I do not believe there was sufficient time to fully investigate the information.

Of the information that was provided on the last sitting day before the Committees were to meet, volume 1 had 411 pages, volume 2 book 1 had 95 pages, volume 2 book 2 had 55 pages, volume 2 book 3 had 101 pages, volume 2 book 4 had 73 pages, and on it goes. In the end, there were some 14 books containing 1 456 pages. There just was not enough time to look at that data. Last year after the Estimates Committees I criticised the system, and I do so again this year. I believe that the conducting of two Committees simultaneously is far too restrictive.

Mr Oswald: How would you do it?

Mr Peterson: That interjection is out of order, but I will say how I would do it. I would go back to the previous system that obtained in the first year in which I had the honour and privilege to sit in this House, where the whole House debated the Budget. That was probably not the best way and it could have been adjusted, so that the Ministers and their advisers could have been in the House under a

system similar to the Committee system. The House in its entirety could investigate the Budget. That is the best way to do it.

Mr Oswald: Did you receive more information in that way?

Mr PETERSON: Again, that interjection is out of order, but I can indicate that I believe I did receive more information. Members opposite have more controlled access to Committees than do some other members of this House, who will remain nameless. Access is restricted in regard to the loose members in the House.

Mr Becker: What about providing a system of public servants to advise what is contained in the documents?

Mr PETERSON: Again, I think that that interjection is out of order. However, on the subject of assistance, I think that that would be a great idea. That is one of the problems that we had this year: to be able to analyse that information in time really to form a picture of what was happening. There should have been a briefing on those books to give people information, so that they could analyse the details contained therein before sitting in the Committee. It was too late when one was sitting in the Committee.

Mr Becker: Then support my suggestion next time. I put it up last night.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Semaphore does not really need the assistance of the member for Hanson.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. However, the suggestion regarding the briefing is certainly worth a try, in my opinion. It would allow access to far more information than can be gleaned in the time allowed.

The other point that I made last year is that I believe that the system of two Committees sitting simultaneously is far too restrictive in relation to the access that one can get to them. With the best of intentions a member of Parliament or a member of the public can be in only one Committee at a time. They are the points that I made last year when I had the privilege of speaking to the Standing Orders Committee. Although I made those points to the Committee, unfortunately it did not see the wisdom of my suggestions. However, that is how I saw them.

I now turn to the Estimates Committee's procedure. It was pleasing to hear the Minister of Environment and Planning say in the Committee, 'It is not my intention to wind down the Coast Protection Board.' I am sure that all members of this House are fairly well aware of my thoughts on the performance of the Coast Protection Board over the years. Certainly, I have not been quiet about it. I would certainly like to see a far more active role being taken in relation to coast protection in that area. Earlier this year, I took the bull by the horns and approached the Minister of Environment and Planning and the local council, and arranged for a committee to be formed so that these two bodies could meet and discuss the problems that we have with the foreshores in my electorate. The committee has not really worked well yet, although I hope that it will do so. I am pleased to see that there is no intention to take away the Coast Protection Board.

Mr Becker: There's an increased allocation.

Mr PETERSON: I did notice a small increase, from memory. It is indeed interesting to see where it is spent. One can look at the performance over the years. My previous comments are recorded in *Hansard*, and I will not go over that matter again. The vast majority of that money is spent on a very small area of the State's coast, and most of that money is spent on repairs to the foreshores that have been damaged in certain electorates and on the sand replenishment scheme, to take sand from the northern metropolitan to the southern metropolitan beaches.

As I have said before, I do not hold that against the areas that need this service. It is great that we have in this State an organisation which can provide this service. I believe that it is necessary, and I certainly hope that it continues and that the southern metropolitan beaches continue to get the benefit that they need out of that system. I do not hold that against them at all. As I have also said previously, I wish that a little would be spent on the northern metropolitan beaches. I do not expect much to be spent: just enough to make us a little better off.

I noticed another aspect of the Environment Minister's portfolio. In this respect, I refer to pollution management. I notice that \$252 000 was allocated for wages, salaries and expenses. I have spoken in the House previously on the subject of marine pollution and said that the levels of some heavy metals in shell fish in this State are up to 15 times the level recommended by the Australian Health Organisation.

An interesting situation is occurring in relation to marine pollution in St Vincent's Gulf. I suppose that it is in the metropolitan area: the mangroves are dying off. This is indeed of concern to the Department of Fisheries. Indeed, only last week I took a helicopter inspection tour of the mangrove to see how bad it was.

I now refer to the August edition, volume 12, of *Search* magazine, an article in which I should like to bring to the Minister's attention, as it supports my previous point regarding the contamination of the sea and the water around our metropolitan area. This is a problem that I think will grow in the future. We are all aware of the problems that occur now and then in metropolitan waters because of oil pollution, which is a man-made problem and one that is easily visible and dealt with fairly well, although I do not believe that it is treated completely.

An insidious pollution is occurring in the waters of the gulf, and it is not monitored anywhere near enough. I refer to this article, which supports what I have thought for some time, namely, that the pollution has been accumulating and will one day cause us a lot of problems unless we do something about it. I refer to the report in *Search* headed 'The Case for the Protection of Mangrove Swamps—Geochemical Considerations', written by Pat Harbison of the Centre for Environmental Studies at the University of Adelaide. He states:

The pattern of sedimentation in the mangrove habitat, the high content of organic debris, and the associated flora and fauna, may all contribute to a unique potential for the accumulation of metallic wastes—

I did mention previously that the cadmium build-up in shell fish was a problem; it is a metallic build-up. The report continues:

and the redistribution of these wastes in the marine environment. This potential should be considered in assessing the suitability of the mangrove swamps for industrial development. It may also provide an important rationale for the conservation of the mangrove habitat.

I will quote selectively from this report, and will not read it all. I have the article here if any honourable member wishes to read it. The report states:

While the productivity and shelter of the mangrove community is obviously of great importance to marine and intertidal ecology, a further reason for the protection of mangroves from industrial development has not yet been considered. This is the possibility that the mangrove swamp has a unique potential for accumulating industrial metal wastes, and for redistributing these wastes, with enhanced impact, in the marine environment. If this is so, the industrial developments on or near mangrove shorelines may lead to the local accumulation of waste materials, and provide a long-term source of contamination for the marine habitat as these materials are remobilised in the future.

The impact of industrial metal wastes on the mangrove habitat has not yet been investigated in South Australia, but it is possible to examine, from a geochemical aspect, the correlation between

the sedimentary characteristics of the mangrove habitat and the factors which are known to influence the accumulation of heavy metals at the sediment/water interface.

The nature of industrial wastes in South Australian gulf waters:

The term 'wastes' covers a wide variety of discharged materials, including heated water released by power stations, the treated effluents from sewage works, dusts from stockpiled metal concentrates, wash water from smelting works and organic residues from abattoirs. The most significant inputs to Gulf St Vincent ... probably come from Torrens Island and Bolivar.

A significant feature of all these discharges, apart from the heated water, is the content of heavy metals. Even the treated water from Bolivar shows marked elevations in the content of mercury, cadmium, and copper at some periods of the year. There is no documented reason for these periodic high levels of metals in the water, but the contribution to the dissolved load could have significant effects on accumulated levels in the shallow-water marine sediments.

Heavy metals do not, like cyanides, produce immediately obvious 'fish kills' unless discharged in very large quantities, but because of their accumulation and transformation in the sediments may have an insidious and very long-term effect on the ecology of gulf waters.

I will read on because I think it important that this information be recorded. Someone may read it and may respond. It goes on:

The large tidal amplitude associated with the mangrove shoreline in the shallow northern gulf waters results in the exposure of enormous areas of intertidal mudflats at low tide. During daylight hours in summer the mud surface becomes very hot, so that when it is covered by shallow water at high tide the water temperature can be as high as 36°C. This could contribute to the remobilisation of metals at the sediment/water interface.

The concentration of metals in sediment samples collected during the present study suggests that the natural physical and chemical characteristics of mangrove swamps do favour the accumulation of heavy metals in sediment. The effect of wide fluctuations in pH, salinity and temperature, as well as the exposure of disturbed anoxic sediments, on the remobilisation of metals is currently being investigated.

The vulnerability of the mangrove fauna:

Among the organisms found in the mangrove community are juvenile forms of commercial fish species, representing the seasonal recruitment to populations in the wider marine environment. Recent research has demonstrated the greater vulnerability of juvenile organisms to toxic metals.

Organisms living in the surface mud are food items for larger fish or wading birds. These worms, molluscs, and small crabs may be directly affected by toxic metals in solution, or they may accumulate metals to very high body concentrations, which then become available to predators. Filter feeding organisms, such as small oysters, mussels and barnacles which shelter among or attach to pneumatophores, are capable of high levels of metal concentration.

However, the sedimentary characteristics of the mangrove swamp suggest that it must inevitably become a sink for metallic wastes. The impact of this sedimentary source, once accumulated, could then be enhanced in the wider marine environment by chemical remobilisation, through food chains, or by mortality among juvenile classes of fish populations. Such redistribution could continue to affect the near-shore marine environment for many years after industrial inputs ceased.

I consider that to be a very significant problem and a significant risk to all our marine life in the area, as well as to commercial fishing. I suppose we could say that anyone who picks a cockle from the sand and eats it is running a risk because of this contamination. I have raised the matter in the hope of evoking a response from the Minister responsible.

Earlier this year, I asked a question in this House of the Minister of Fisheries, requesting that an officer be located in an office in Port Adelaide to facilitate the issuing of licences and the provision of fishing information. The letter I received from the Minister states:

I refer to your question in the House of Assembly on 5 June 1981 and advise that a Department of Fisheries office was opened in the Department of Agriculture building, 131 Lipson Street, Port Adelaide on 23 April 1981, and is manned when officers are not on patrol.

However, a transfer device is to be installed to enable telephone inquiries directed to the Port Adelaide office to be attended to by the Adelaide office when this office is not manned. The Port

Adelaide office provides information on legislation and licensing matters to both the recreational and commercial fishing sectors.

I knew that when I asked the question. I wanted an officer to make the system work. There is a large concentration of recreational and professional fishermen in the area, and we want an officer down there to service their needs. The Estimate of Receipts, page 7 states that the Minister of Fisheries will increase his receipts from \$38 650 last year to \$70 000 next year. Obviously, there is some substantial increase to financial inflow anticipated, and we could ask for an officer down there to service the needs.

I would like to touch upon the Minister of Marine's portfolio. There has been concern for some time that the manning of the dockyard at Glanville in my electorate is decreasing, and that the facilities available, the manpower, skill and expertise developed over many years, are not being utilised for the greatest benefit to the State. I wish to suggest to the Minister, not in any disrespectful way, that this facility and these men be better used.

I refer to the new wharf about to be built on the Port River by Eglo. The report came down from the Public Works Committee only the other day. I hope all this work is directed towards employees at the Department of Marine and Harbors because it is well within their skill and ability to construct it. There are proposals to build a new bulk grain loading facility at Tickera, on the gulf, and again it is a job that these workmen in the dockyard can capably handle, and I hope it is given to them to do. I hope the department will take up this work, as that will be to the financial benefit of the State as a whole.

In the Estimates Committee deliberations, Mr Kinnane, when asked to reply to a question in relation to the *H. C. Meyer*—the dredge which tragically capsized in the river last year and which has been recovered and placed in the dockyard—stated:

At the present time no decision has been made regarding the future of the *H. C. Meyer*. It has some value as a floating platform. There are a number of spare parts and mechanical parts which are still in working order, and the department is assessing whether some of those components could be used in other floating plant. When this assessment is complete, in all probability the floating platform or the hull of the *H. C. Meyer* will be disposed of by public tender.

I hope that that does not happen. I believe we have a purpose and a use for that platform in this State for an ongoing project, and other projects that have to be undertaken from time to time by the Department of Marine and Harbors. The Coast Protection Board is committed to an ongoing programme of sand replenishment for the southern metropolitan beaches. It is created because of the northern littoral drift of the sand. There is no solution to the problem; the sand must just be picked up and put back. I believe it was planned by the Government to hire a dredge to create a bank or a source of sand along the northern metropolitan beaches for use as required on the Brighton, Grange and Glenelg beaches.

If we have to hire a dredge to do the work, I suggest that the Minister consider modifying the *H. C. Meyer* to perform this function. The platform is there—surely it is only a matter of converting it. A lot of the machinery is there, as was told to the shadow Minister in the Estimates Committee. It can be converted to a screw dredge and it would serve the purposes of the Department of Marine and Harbors and the Coast Protection Board. I believe that in the long run it would save the State a great deal of money in hiring dredges and would create work for the dockyard, where there is the skill and expertise to do the work.

There is an urgent need for some sort of dredging unit that can place the sand on the beaches. At the northern end of the metropolitan beaches, already the North Haven project is at some risk because of sand drift. Already a

dredge has been worked in the project to clear the channels and, as the sand builds up on the southern breakwater, it will eventually block it and make the whole facility useless. One way or the other something will have to be done, and I suggest we should do it with our own equipment.

The one other point I want to make is related to the Chief Secretary's portfolio, in regard to the Fire Brigade. I have raised several times in the House the problems that would be created on the Le Fevre Peninsula if the fire service were relocated, and I would like to go over those points again. In the debate in the Estimates Committee it was heartening to hear that the Chief Secretary say that he was aware of the need for a fire station 'on the other side'—I assume he means the other side of the river. That was supported to a degree by the comments of Mr C. S. Morphett, the Acting Chief Fire Officer of the South Australian Fire Brigade, a fine gentleman. I know him personally, having been a fireman under him many years ago; he is a lovely fellow. He said:

It is intended, as part of the Cox Report, to construct as one of the stations a metropolitan support station at Port Adelaide which will be quite a bit larger than the existing station. It is planned to concentrate at that base a lot of appliances that are in and around Port Adelaide. We are looking carefully at the moment, and certainly will be doing so when this committee is appointed, at the possible need for a fire station on the Le Fevre Peninsula. We are looking at a site at Taperoo in case this is necessary. Prior to the Cox Report we had taken steps to acquire land at Taperoo on the corner of Stratfield Terrace. The time trials that will be conducted as part of the Cox Report implementation will take into account the possibility of bridge problems, and so on, as well as the time trial, given a smooth run in that area.

I am pleased the Chief Secretary is here because I believe that one significant point has been overlooked and must be considered. I understand the time trials have been undertaken and I believe a time of 10½ minutes was achieved from the area near the Colac Hotel, where the new station will go, to Outer Harbor. I know that when the fire station is established they will put in traffic light control units and be able to control traffic flow to a greater degree. However, the one point everyone has forgotten is that, by the end of next year, there will be a standard gauge rail line across the northern side of the Victoria Road bridge (the Jervis bridge). That will carry freight trains, which could be 20 or 30 carriages long. The Fire Brigade cannot control that crossing. Thus, the situation could arise whereby that 10 minutes could easily become 20 or 30 minutes, depending on traffic at the particular hour. With a large multiple movement of freight trains across the base of that bridge, the Fire Brigade will be absolutely prevented from using that bridge. I would like that fact to be taken into consideration by the Chief Secretary.

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

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I take this opportunity to express some disappointment with some aspects of the Estimates Committees. I have an interest in two specific areas, namely, tourism and recreation and sport, and in both instances I believe that insufficient time was given to a full and proper investigation of those estimates. I certainly had a great number of questions to ask; however, time did not allow me to pursue all those questions. Members may recall that the health vote took up greater time in the Estimates Committee than did the tourism vote.

Dr Billard: With some time wasted by a stupid censure motion.

Mr SLATER: I also recall that the member for Newland was part of that Committee considering the health vote.

True, some delays occurred because of the procrastinations of Government members. We had only two hours to consider the subject of tourism. I am grateful to members of the Committee that the health vote was disposed of by 8 o'clock in the evening (that vote could have taken all day and probably the next day as well), and as a consequence we were able to pay some attention to the area of tourism. It was obvious to me that members of the Committee could have asked a great many more questions and sought a great deal more information if they had had the opportunity to do so.

The lines dealing with recreation and sport were to a great extent interwoven with the transport portfolio, as recreation and sport forms a division of the Department of Transport. As a consequence, the course of questioning and the subject matter generally was varied. For example, a member may have asked a question about highways and then a further question involving the S.T.A. The information that I sought mostly concerned recreation and sport, and it was frustrating not to be able to continue questioning the Minister, although I admit that a number of questions in sequence were allowed on a particular subject. However, if one wants to follow up completely replies of the Minister or his departmental advisers, until a subject is adequately dealt with, greater flexibility is needed.

In saying this, I am casting no reflection on the Chairman, the member for Goyder, who I believe acted very fairly and reasonably and who was impartial in his chairmanship. My disappointment perhaps concerns the method by which the Estimates Committees are conducted. I have heard it said by Government members that the Opposition was supplied with a great deal of information that was not provided under the previous system, but at times that can be an encumbrance rather than an asset.

Dr Billard: All you have to do is read it.

Mr SLATER: I point out to the member for Newland that the Committee dealing with recreation, sport, and transport sat on the Tuesday, the first day of the fortnight's session, and, as members on this side of the House received the programme documents only on the previous Friday morning, we did not have a great deal of time to study them in any detail. I admit that certain information was provided that has never been provided to us previously, although some members may have found much of it confusing and perplexing. When I asked my first question in regard to the programme papers, the Minister's advisers indicated that there was an error and corrected that error in the papers. The papers were not foolproof. The information at times was incorrect, and we did not have a great deal of time to prepare ourselves for those Estimates Committees, particularly on the first day when recreation and transport came before the Committee.

On many occasions Committee members made long and sometimes irrelevant remarks before putting a question. Alternatively, they gave a dissertation on their political philosophy, which was both time consuming and not relevant to the subject under discussion. This also allowed the Minister some respite—if I can use that term—from questions by the Opposition. To give an example, I will quote the efforts on one occasion by the member for Mallee in the Estimates Committee considering the tourism vote (it is the greatest gobbledegook you have ever heard). The member for Mallee said:

In this instance the department now has programmes afoot to analyse the potential areas in which the market can develop and the kind of priorities that need to be established in developing the infra-structure without wasting capital out of sequence in the course of that development, as well as programmes which will stimulate demand for the services that a non-existent industry in terms of its potential may ultimately be able to supply.

Having made those background comments that relate to the material that other members have had the Committee consider, and which more recently in the management area, and the administrative and supervisory area we have now come to understand, and the in-house training programme that is going on—

It goes on. These comments are not relevant to the matter before the Estimates Committee. I use that as an example of the time-wasting exercise in some of the Committees. Not all members conducted themselves like this. If the system is to work successfully, however, there must be a limitation of time for asking questions. The Chairman endeavoured to be fair and reasonable, and some members of the Committee took advantage of this. The member for Mallee was one of those; it happened on four or five occasions in the time that I was on the Committee. I want to refer to a line of questioning in the Estimates Committees on which I have previously asked a question in this House, and it is in regard to T.A.B. Members may recall that on 24 September (page 1175 of *Hansard*) I directed a question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport about a shortfall of funds at the Riverton T.A.B. I asked the Minister whether he could give information about investigations that were proceeding at that time. There were three investigations: one by the Auditor-General; an internal investigation by T.A.B.; and another by the Fraud Squad of the South Australian Police Department.

The Minister seemed to be quite uncomfortable, as was the Chairman of the T.A.B., that I should ask this question during the Estimates Committee hearing. I believe, and I made this point quite clearly, that members of the public are entitled to know exactly what occurred so that they can ascertain exactly what happened to cause a \$350 000 shortfall at the Riverton sub-agency. I believe that the Minister should, as much as possible, make public the information that I was seeking. I am less than satisfied with the answers that the Minister of Recreation and Sport and to some degree his adviser, the Chairman of the T.A.B., gave to the Estimates Committee.

I now turn to some of the comments that were made during the Estimates Committee hearing. I asked the following question:

I have directed a question in the House to the Minister in regard to the Riverton sub-agency and was told that a shortfall of \$350 000 had occurred. I know the Minister and the T.A.B. have made no public comment because investigations have been proceeding. People generally are concerned to know exactly how this shortfall occurred. In answer to my question in the House, the Minister explained that three separate investigations were being conducted, one internally by the T.A.B., another by the Fraud Squad, and another by the Auditor-General's Department. Have those investigations been completed and, if so, is it possible for the public to be advised by the Minister what exactly happened, how it occurred, and whether it is likely to occur again? There is public apprehension that this should have occurred. It is thought that such an error should have been picked up before such a shortfall occurred. Can the Minister explain to me and the Committee, and for the benefit of the public generally, what did occur?

The Minister then replied:

The apprehension that the honourable member expresses is shared by both the Chairman of the T.A.B. and myself. The Chairman can speak for himself in a minute. In regard to the specific items that the honourable member has mentioned, through the Chairman I have received a report from the Auditor-General, so that that investigation is complete. I have received a report from the T.A.B. solicitors, who conducted the first inquiry into the unfortunate incident the honourable member referred to. As yet we do not have a full report from the police. I have had an interim report, and I gave the honourable member the nub of that in the House the other day—that the shortfall was caused by the illegal extension of credit betting facilities at the Riverton sub-agency.

That sub-agency is now closed. The board has taken certain disciplinary action already. The Auditor-General's Report makes plain that systems within the T.A.B. are correct for internal auditing. There are certain reservations as to the way those systems are carried out. The board is considering that matter at the moment in consultation with me. I cannot add much more to what I have

said because, as I told the member for Gilles in the House, it is possible that prosecutions may follow.

Once again, I did not receive a definite answer about why this particular shortfall occurred. I believe that the public of South Australia, particularly the racing public, are entitled to know. After all, it would appear that the three racing codes will bear some of these losses. I think it is most unfair that the Minister should hide from the public of South Australia the reason why this shortfall has occurred. One revealing comment that came to my notice when I was questioning the Minister in relation to the T.A.B. was that made by the Chairman of the T.A.B., namely:

I would like to state one or two things within this context, as the Minister has suggested. We have taken rather extensive action within the T.A.B. because of what has happened.

Of course, they have shut the door after the horse has bolted. The Chairman continues:

The Auditor-General's Report, in effect, said that all of the processes developed within the T.A.B. were satisfactory for normal conditions. This was an abnormal condition, and it should have alerted the staff to abnormal conditions to the extent that they should have taken abnormal action to stop it. The fact is that they did not take that abnormal action to stop it.

It is not quite plain to me just what the Chairman of the T.A.B. meant by those comments. The quotation continues:

... I would prefer not to do so until we get the report from the police because we do not know what action the police contemplate. Let me say, however, I am sure most people know what goes on in the courts, even in the lower courts. One of the persons we thought was perhaps more culpable than anyone else in not picking up the matter has been dismissed. We are now in the court to justify our reasons for dismissing her, she having appealed on the grounds of wrongful, improper and unjust dismissal. These are the sort of things we are faced with. I agree entirely with the honourable member that the public are entitled to know, and I intend to inform the Minister fully. I think I have done so up to date, but, although he will have every bit of information . . . we cannot do this until we have the final police report.

I still believe that that is not good enough. We should know how that incident occurred in the first place, and exactly what happened. We should know why the Minister is covering up. The Minister has refused on two occasions to come clean in regard to this incident at the Riverton sub-agency of the T.A.B. The racing public is entitled to know exactly what happened, because the racing codes will be asked to bear some of the losses in regard to this incident. The Minister seems to be a bit paranoid in regard to the T.A.B.

I have had a Question on Notice for the past four or five weeks in relation to the T.A.B. It is Question on Notice No. 152, and it has not been answered, although I believe that the information I am seeking could be made readily available at the T.A.B. My question to the Minister of Transport was as follows:

On how many occasions, on what dates, and for what period of time on each occasion has the Totalizator Agency Board computertab broken down in the past 12 months?

The Minister appears to be unable to answer that question; he is trying to avoid doing so. I challenge the Minister to reply to that question. The public wants to know, because of the inconvenience caused when the computertab breaks down. There has been public apprehension about the T.A.B. This House is to be asked to debate a matter that is relevant to the T.A.B. by way of amendments to the Racing Act and in respect to after-race pay-outs. If we are to debate that matter with any perception, the Minister should come clean and give the answers that we asked for in this House about the T.A.B.

What have the Minister and the T.A.B. to hide? If the public is to patronise the T.A.B., it must have confidence in its operations. The only way to give people confidence is to be honest with them. None of us is infallible. If the

T.A.B. makes a mistake, why should it not admit that? If it cannot admit that, the Minister, who is in charge of that operation, should ensure that the public is treated in a fair and reasonable way. He should give the public the information. I believe that the canny tacticians should be canny enough to know that the public of South Australia wants to know what is going on in regard to the T.A.B.

I refer now to the Estimates Committees and the budget for tourism. Here again, I express my dissatisfaction with the Minister of Tourism in regard to some of the answers to a specific matter about which I sought information. I refer to Mr Geoff Joselin, the former Director of the Department of Tourism, who was dismissed from that position while overseas on State Government business in March this year.

Mr Joselin was replaced by the present Director of Tourism, Mr Graham Inns, and was then made Deputy Director of Tourism in this State. It has been clearly obvious to me that Mr Joselin has been particularly unhappy with the restructuring and administration of the Department of Tourism. The information that I sought arose out of the statement by the Minister of Tourism in relation to Mr Joselin's appointment (if that word could be used) as a consultant on behalf of the State Government in the United Kingdom.

I sought to ascertain what the terms and conditions of that consultancy would be. The Minister was very vague and indefinite about the information that she was prepared to give. I believe that she was very evasive on some matters about which the member for Stuart and I asked. We ought to be entitled to know the conditions of Mr Joselin's appointment in the United Kingdom. I am given to understand that he is to receive \$20 000 for a period of four years and that other matters are associated with the acceptance of that consultancy. The Minister did tell us, as I understood it, that Mr Joselin would not be acting in a tourism capacity only but that the contract for his consultancy in the United Kingdom was between the Premier and Mr Joselin and that, on occasions, Mr Joselin would be acting on behalf of the Minister of Transport. I find it difficult to relate Mr Joselin's expertise in the tourism field to the sort of matters that were related to us by the Minister during the Estimates Committee. It is my personal view that Mr Joselin has been relieved of his positions as Director, and thereafter Deputy-Director, of Tourism because he did not see eye to eye with the Minister or the Government in relation to their philosophy regarding the Department of Tourism.

When the Tonge Report became public and was available for public comment, Mr Joselin was the Director of the Department of Tourism. He made public comment and criticised strongly the recommendations made in the Tonge Report. Mr Joselin came out publicly and said that the report contained distortions, inaccuracies, and so on. I believe that for his trouble in that regard, and for sticking up for his staff and the Department of Tourism, Mr Joselin was quietly given the axe. I challenge the Minister to prove that that is not the case, because it is the case.

The Labor Government, a few years ago, was criticised for taking action against a public servant, namely, the Police Commissioner. Indeed, there was a furore about that matter. I think that this instance is worse, because at least Mr Joselin did not give false information to the Parliament of this State. I believe that he has been treated badly by the Government. Mr Joselin sought a way out of South Australia because of the bad treatment that he had been given by this Government.

During the course of the Estimates Committee, the Minister admitted that Mr Joselin was dismissed (if that word might be used) because of the Rob Tonge Report, one of the recommendations of which was that the Deputy Direc-

tor's position no longer exist. That position has been replaced by four heads of departmental sections.

It appears that Mr Joselin was supernumerary to the requirements of the Department of Tourism and that he has been quietly given the axe. I challenge the Minister of Tourism to prove otherwise. I know that the man was discontented with the attitudes of the Government regarding tourism, so it appears to me that he has been given this consultancy as an opportunity to him to vacate the position.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He is going to do valuable work on international air services to Adelaide.

Mr SLATER: The Minister of Recreation and Sport has come into the House and has sought to interject. No-one denies that Mr Joselin has ability, but, if he had such ability, why was he dismissed as Director of Tourism in the first place? Secondly, why is he now being dismissed as Deputy Director of Tourism? The Minister is not answering. As I have said, it appears to me that he has been given the push.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Who said he has been dismissed as Deputy Director?

Mr SLATER: I used the word 'dismissed'.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That's your word.

Mr SLATER: It is my word. We will say he sought an opportunity to take up a consultancy in the United Kingdom and it was readily accepted by the Government. From the scanty information that the Minister was prepared to give me in the Estimates Committee, Mr Joselin sought the position, and I asked what were the terms of the contract and the consultancy. The Minister said she did not know but that the contract was between the Premier and Mr Joselin.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: In all fairness, all contracts are with the Premier.

Mr SLATER: That was something of which I was not aware. I am prepared to accept that, but there are other aspects of that contract that I want to know about, and I think the people of South Australia are also entitled to know. If the person has all that ability, I cannot understand why the Government should so readily accept the opportunity for him to go back to the United Kingdom. I understand from the scant information given to me that part of the contract is that his fare and the fares of his family back to the United Kingdom will be paid.

Doubtless, there are other aspects of the matter and I think we ought to be honest enough with the public of this State (we are dealing with taxpayers' money) to give the people the detailed terms of the contract. I know, as the Minister of Transport indicated a moment ago, that perhaps part of that contract may relate to transport.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He has a very deep knowledge regarding international air services to Adelaide.

Mr SLATER: I am not denying that. That may be the case, but it is hard to relate the situation as described by the Minister of Tourism, and now supported by the Minister of Transport, that Mr Joselin was such a great asset to us in the United Kingdom to the fact that he was not such a great asset to us in this State. I think the man has been treated rather badly and I believe that the Government should be regarded with scant consideration on the matter. This was an opportunity for him to return to the United Kingdom.

The member for Hanson commented about the man in what I believe was a nasty comment when he first came to South Australia. That member criticised the man's ability and I believe that what he said was not quite the case. Mr Joselin has not had the opportunity to prove himself in the time he has been here in the tourist aspect for a number

of reasons, particularly over the past 18 months or two years.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I understood that this debate was on the motion to note the reports of Estimates Committees A and B. To that end I would like to make a couple of comments because I was involved in some of the debate that took place last year in relation to the effects of the Committee system on independent members of this House. I found that the Committees as they operated this year gave me and any other member of the House every access to the Minister and his departments, or as much access as any member could want. Somebody made the criticism that he could not adequately represent himself or his interests on both Committees at the same time. I think that that is clearly understood. That is the penalty of having to run two Committees at the one time. I think we have all learned to accept that. I do not believe that to continue with the exercise as was commenced last year was a worthwhile venture.

I believe that, with further co-operation of all members, the Estimates Committees can be made to work and be a very effective part of the proceedings of the House. I got the feeling at times that there was an attempt to procrastinate and drag things on. Going by some of the comments made by some of the journalists, they tried to give the impression that it was a waste of time. I could not agree with that. As I said earlier, all members had the opportunity to participate if they wanted to do so.

I would like to take up a couple of points raised in those Committee debates; one in particular was raised by the member for Stuart in the lines under the Minister of Fisheries. It concerned me that there was an attempt being made to put a connotation on the debate and to cast a reflection upon the Minister. I was concerned about the report because the member for Stuart stated that abalone licences are reported to be changing hands at \$150 000 per licence. That is an exorbitant amount. I certainly have not had any experience or any contact with any member who could claim that that figure was used. To that end I endeavoured to track down the article which the member used. I think it should be pointed out that the article was full of inconsistencies. I would like to go into that a little further.

The article was by a Mr Tom Valentine of the *Sydney Morning Herald* in its edition of 19 September 1981, I believe at page 7. The article principally revolved around the Government's and the Federal Government's involvement in trying to police poaching within the abalone industry. In that article it led on to a number of other factors. At one stage in one of the paragraphs it stated that abalone licences had changed hands legally in Tasmania and South Australia for \$150 000 each. The highest figure I have heard for a licence being transferred in South Australia is \$115 000 each. I am not aware of a licence changing hands at a figure greater than that. I do know that any transfer of any licence depends on two principal factors: first, a seller wishing to sell and, secondly, a buyer wishing to buy. That is usually determined by the viability of that industry at that time.

In Tasmania (and I do not have to point out to members opposite that it is a Labor held seat) the management of the abalone industry is considered to be a model for the rest of Australia. The Fisheries Department there believes that if there is a gradual increase in the price of abalone licences it is a very sure and quick indicator of the effectiveness of their management. If the price of licences should collapse then the industry has collapsed.

By the time the licence has collapsed, usually the downfall in the resource stocks has been underway for a period of time long enough that it is almost impossible to correct

that situation by withdrawing the fishing effort. We all know that, if one wanted to withdraw the fishing effort, it would take a long time through the process of attrition to be able to bring about an effective management. We know the previous Government undertook a freeze on A class fishing licences in 1977, and really that is just taking effect in terms of actual reduction in fishing effort on the resource stock. That has taken four years to have an effect on the resource stock. With the licence being an indicator, that is the very first sign that shows up.

It was also mentioned in the article that abalone was being sold for \$7 a kilogram. In the very same sentence, it said that two buckets of abalone meat was worth \$1 000.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Big buckets.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, they would have to be big buckets because that works out at 143 kilograms for those two buckets. I would like to really know and understand how a calculation of that sort could be made. It further goes on to say that the average turnover of an abalone diver is \$100 000 per annum. Another quick calculation indicates that that is 14 285 kilograms of meat a year. On an average diving day of which there are 60 a year, it would be about 550 kilograms of shellfish a day being brought up from the bottom.

Mr Lewis: He'd be a tired diver.

Mr BLACKER: Yes. The realms of possibility are stretched to the limit in making calculations such as that. So the validity of the whole argument as posed on that day was not well founded.

More particularly, the implication that it was a sole South Australian operation as was suggested before in the Estimates Committee, is misleading to the extent that the figures were in fact based on the abalone industry of Tasmania. I understand that the licences in Tasmania are even higher than \$150 000, and that is because of the buoyancy of the industry and the willingness of people to want to buy and become part of that particular industry.

A couple of other matters, projects affecting my area, were raised in the Estimates Committees, one dealing with sewerage schemes, another one was not listed, but I understand it is on the way for preliminary planning, and I refer to the Porter Bay sewerage scheme. This represents a serious problem to people in the Kirton Point area. As most people would understand, this is a well-established area of Port Lincoln but is not serviced by a proper sewerage scheme. I do not think anyone here would tolerate the inconvenience that the residents of that area have to endure. There is sewage running down the roads, and pits have to be pumped out and sewage carted away every three weeks. That is brought about mainly because of the nature of the soil in that area and more particularly because of the prevalence of limestone rock, which means that drainage is not at all effective. Not only do we have the inconvenience of pumping out the pits and the sewage running down the roads, but there is also a health risk with children playing in the gutters and on nearby vacant blocks where raw sewage is abundant. Needless to say, the smell associated with all of that is beyond the pale.

I was pleased to note the announcement of the extension of the Porter Bay slipway. Members of the House would appreciate that the bulk of the State's fishing fleet is based at Port Lincoln; certainly the larger of the vessels are based there. It is gratifying to know that the Government has given due recognition to that fact and intends to extend the facilities and the capacity of the slipway to cater for the largest of the vessels currently fishing out of Port Lincoln. We have a rapidly developing fishing industry, and investment is going into the larger vessels at a greater rate than we have ever known before. There are 11 vessels presently under construction which are all expected to be available

for the next tuna season. I understand that most of those vessels are worth between \$750 000 to \$1 250 000. Therefore, it is a very large investment. It is good to see that the Government is giving at least some recognition to some service facilities for that.

Unfortunately that is not where it ends. What is drastically needed is an adequate anchorage and shelter in Boston Bay to protect not only the fishing fleet but also the many recreational vessels, the yachts, that anchor at harbor. It seems to be a regular occurrence now that every time there is a north wind large tuna vessels and prawn vessels are blown ashore. One can almost guarantee that after a blustery night, and particularly after a northerly wind, there will be one or two of these vessels on the beach adjacent to the yacht club.

The problem is not only in relation to the damage that these vessels themselves encounter; more particularly it concerns the damage that occurs to the lighter craft when a vessel goes through all the moorings. It is a matter of concern to the people in the area that a safe anchorage is not available to them. Moreover, damage has been caused to the Department of Marine and Harbors facilities when these vessels have been blown ashore or blown into the wharf. We have had numerous instances where departmental facilities have had to be repaired because of that. I request the Government to undertake urgent work in the planning and, more particularly, the development of a marina facility, or at least a breakwater facility, behind which these vessels can be given reasonable protection.

I was disappointed that the Government again overlooked an extension of the vote for the Rural Youth Movement. I have been a constant supporter of the movement, having come through its ranks many years ago. It has been to the disadvantage of the youth of our State that both this Government and the previous Government have not given that organisation the due recognition it rightly deserves. I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will revise his position in relation to the Rural Youth Movement, and that former movement members of this House, the member for Rocky River and the member for Mallee, will give support, as I know they do, to the movement and, more particularly, put pressure on the Minister of Agriculture to ensure that more funds are provided.

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): I am glad that the Estimates Committees are over and we are back into the formal sessions of the House and can now settle down to carrying on like a Parliament. My complaints are similar to complaints that have been expressed by other members on this side earlier in the debate. Without casting aspersions on the Chairman of Committee B, at the beginning he gave us an indication of what was to come when he said that we must not spend too much time on one particular vote to the detriment of the time allowed for other votes. Therein was the warning at the beginning of the first Estimates Committee sitting for this year. I was interested to hear the member for Flinders say that he thinks the Estimates Committees have improved. The tactics of the Government with respect to them have certainly improved. I noted on the Tuesday that Government members were showing considerable zeal in asking questions from the programme papers for 1981-82, and it appeared that answers they received were more or less read from the books and embroidered to an extent, which led us to suspect that the whole thing was what one might call a rather long-winded gag or guillotine. The situation was that Government members were there not to elicit information; they do not have to do that. They probably had advance information of what was coming up, or at least the form of it.

It was put on record earlier and during the Estimates Committees that members on this side were not happy with receiving the large volume of material on the Thursday, the last sitting day before the beginning of the Estimates Committees. As has been said this evening, there was a lot of information supplied, but most of it was useless, given the time that we had to go through it. Further, it was difficult to follow through a line of questioning when we were each limited to three questions. Given the rules laid down, the Chairman had little option in this matter. This restricted our ability to engage in any lengthy questioning of a Minister, because after three questions we had to stop. Government members are noticeable by their absence when we are in a Committee of the Whole and questioning a Minister.

Mr Keneally: Particularly at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Mr O'NEILL: Yes, particularly at 4 o'clock in the morning, as my colleague the member for Stuart says. Nevertheless, they were there all day from 11 a.m. until 10 p.m. playing their little game of frustrating our efforts to elicit information. I was in an interesting situation because I was the newest addition to the shadow Ministry, and I did not have a lot of time to be briefed on the people I was shadowing. It was interesting to note from comments in the press that I was shadowing the brightest character in the Ministry and the dullest one, according to reports of late.

Of course, I was shadowing the Minister of Transport. One of the things that I wanted to pursue with the Minister (in fact, I did get a couple of questions in) was the establishment of the central inspection agency at Regency Park. The property and building there was purchased for \$825 000. According to the 1980-81 Auditor-General's Report, that money came from Road Safety Council funds.

I have it on the authority of the previous Minister that the funds would be raised through a \$1 per licence levy, with the agreement of motoring and road safety organisations in South Australia on the strict understanding that that money would go to the Road Safety Council and would be used for road safety. The Minister did not say specifically that that is not so—he said that he knew of no such undertaking. I have it on the authority of the previous Minister that that undertaking was given. During the Estimates Committee hearing the Minister said:

I am not aware of that, or have I ever understood that it was particularly for the Road Safety Council.

He was referring to the \$1 per licence levy which is raised from every licensed driver in South Australia. The money came from Road Safety Council funds, as is clearly indicated in the Auditor-General's Report. On page 178 of the report the following appears:

Receipts by the Road Safety Council of South Australia, \$1 626 000 includes allocations from driving licence fees \$1 550 000, of which \$825 000 was appropriated to purchase premises for the central inspection authority's headquarters.

There is no doubt that that money, according to the Auditor-General, reposed in the coffers of the Road Safety Council. It was appropriated from there by the Minister. I did not receive a clear answer from the Minister about whether or not any duress was involved in removing that money from the Road Safety Council. During the course of the debate it was indicated that the central inspection agency is to be self-supporting. I asked the Minister:

In view of the fact that the central inspection agency is to be self-supporting, is it proposed that the \$825 000 will be refunded to the source whence it came, namely the Road Safety Council?

The Minister replied:

I will not give an unequivocal assurance on that, but it is the aim.

If the money did not belong to the Road Safety Council in the first place, you can bet your life that the Minister would not be aiming to give it back to them. Therefore,

that tends to support the argument that there has been a misappropriation of funds by this Government to try to make up for the shortfalls it has created for itself because of its rather strange budgetary policy. In fact, it would seem that there has been a deliberate abrogation of an undertaking given by a previous Minister to road safety representatives and motoring organisations in this State.

We did not actually get a chance to pursue that matter as we would have liked. The other matter that we would have liked to raise was the interesting bus system which is to be introduced in the north-eastern suburbs and about which there was some discussion earlier today. The member for Todd seemed to be somewhat concerned about the rapid transit transport system to the north-east suburbs.

Dr Billard: Your lack of policy.

Mr O'NEILL: That is an interesting remark from the refugee from academia, the member for Newland. The Labor Party had a policy on this matter when in Government, and it started to build.

Mr Evans: Only one?

Mr O'NEILL: On this matter. One has to explain these things in detail for some members opposite, because they are very dense. It makes one wonder who will be moved to the front bench. There is no shortage of aspirants, by the look of it. Members opposite keep dashing down to try to get on to the front bench before the present incumbent gets off.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr O'NEILL: I could not agree more with that. Members opposite seem to be overlooking the fact that they are now in the box seat. The Opposition's policy is irrelevant. The Government is stuck with the O'Bahn system, which it now prefers to call the north-east busway project. Some of the facts that are beginning to evolve in respect of this commitment are very interesting. One of the problems with the Estimates Committees was that we could not stay on a line, and pursue that matter. We sprang all over the place, because of the very effective tactics of Government members. The member for Newland apparently wants to plant red gums along major highways. Obviously, he is not aware of the danger from falling timber: people in the South-East are aware of that danger.

The Government is getting into trouble over the busway system. There has been a lot of talk about that system. The Government has been in office for two years and, as far as I know, and while I have not yet had the opportunity of inspecting the work that has been done, I believe that a cosmetic exercise is being carried out on a couple of back blocks in Marden where bulldozers are pushing the earth around. We understand that next year will be the big year for O'Bahn. The Government will start to implement its plan, and presumably, it will put down the track through the Torrens Valley. It will be very interesting to see what happens then.

I believe that the Government is beginning to get the message that all is not well with the system, so it is looking around for a scapegoat. Of course, it does not look very far. It looks over here and says that the Labor Party does not have a policy on this matter. The Labor Party has not yet met to consider its policy. It was pointed out earlier this afternoon that the Labor Party will meet in November. It may be that it will change its policy, but perhaps it will not. At the current time, we do not have any different policy than we had previously.

The Minister mentioned that I had spoken to him while he was on radio and that I appeared to favour the l.r.t. If we have a choice between a tested system and an experimental system, certainly I would favour it. The point I was trying to make to the Minister, which the Minister seems to have missed, is the nature of the exercise, namely, that

the Liberal Party latched on to an experimental system in 1979 as an election gimmick in a propaganda campaign for an election it did not think it was going to win.

The Liberals made all sorts of commitments, won the election, and are now stuck with the O'Bahn system. We know from reading that the actual system never came into commercial operation until November 1980. The Minister admitted during the course of the debate that the latest plan by this Government will make the O'Bahn track in South Australia the longest in the world. Of course, that being so, we must expect to find some problems. The Minister makes no bones about that. He accepts that there may be problems, although he told the Committee that enormous safeguards are built into this, namely, the agreement with the companies that will install the system. The Minister said, 'We are not taking it lightly at all.' I said, 'Financial safeguards?' In response, the Minister said, 'We are not just going to give them a contract without any requirements for guarantees. This is simple technology but new technology.' The Minister keeps stressing the simplicity of the system. It will remain for history to show us where the simplicity was or is. It may be that it is a demonstration of the simplicity of mind of those in the Liberal Party in getting tangled up in this situation in the first place.

During the course of the debate the Essen project, which has been quoted often, was referred to. I was looking for this information earlier but could not find it. The Minister is reported as having said, 'I remind the honourable member that this was the first commercial track in operation.' That track went into operation in November 1980. The Minister was touting this system around in 1979, before it was really off the drawing boards, and that, too, is on the record.

So, we have a situation in the north-eastern suburbs where people are not really sure whether or not they will get a system. One thing is certain: had there not been a change of Government, we would have been two years into the construction of a light-rail system. Then, people could see something and would know that they were getting somewhere. However, they are now in the position where all they have got is a few tonnes of top soil pushed around with a bulldozer, and that in a fairly out-of-the-way place.

So, people have not really seen any great changes. They are still forced to rely on the ordinary bus system for transport to the north-eastern suburbs. I can certainly understand their being upset and the problems that the members for Todd and Newland have, because they must answer to their electorates. Many people out there are saying, 'Where is this great system that you promised us?' As I said to the Minister, if the Government proceeds with this highly experimental system, there is no saying that we will not get into an F111 situation, where millions of dollars of South Australian taxpayers' money will be poured into the system to try to overcome the bugs that may surface, and that we will not get an efficient system at all but will be paying for the development of the system for other people.

It is interesting to note that, after taking the most costly of the three options instead of the light-rail system, and saying that it would cost \$114 000 000, that that was an unconscionable amount that could not be tolerated, and that the busway system involved only \$43 000 000, we suddenly find that in one fell swoop the cost has escalated to \$68 000 000 because this cheap trackway is being extended from 2.3 km in length to 12.6 km long, or something of that order.

The figure has increased to \$68 000 000 and there has been what, in the Minister's term, may appear an appropriate escalation of the cost of the l.r.t. He now puts that cost at \$140 000 000. He has to keep doing that to make his original argument, that it is twice as much, stick. He

entirely overlooked the fact that there were two other options, the costs of which were much less than was the cost of the expensive one.

Other matters came out in the debate. I questioned the Minister on where the city terminal for the O'Bahn system would be. Strange to say, there is not one at the moment: the Government is still negotiating with the Adelaide City Council to try to work out a scheme to terminate the system in the city. It may be in Light Square, but no-one can be sure. I was under the impression from some of the information that I received that the route would be up Grenfell Street. The Minister has now told me that that is not correct and that he does not know where the buses will enter the city. That is one aspect which, when resolved, may add a few more million dollars to the \$68 000 000.

Another interesting thing that came out of the debate is reference to electrification. One of the latest pieces of information on the O'Bahn system is that a four-bus electrified system has now been developed and buses will run permanently on the track. I presume that that will allow entry of other smaller buses operating on a similar system into the busway itself, but what will be the situation if those buses also are electrified? Either they will be tied to the bus system or it will be necessary to run overhead wires through the streets of the north-eastern suburbs if the buses are to fulfil the function outlined by the Minister and his colleague, namely, that one of the big advantages is that these buses will be able to go off the busway and circulate around the north-eastern suburbs. Rather than have people coming to the buses, the buses will go to the people.

That raises a very interesting question, because some things did come out in this debate. The member for Todd is particularly concerned, as I have said, about this rapid transport system, and he has been arguing strongly for the O'Bahn system to such an extent that some people are beginning to refer to him as the member for Daimler-Benz. Of course, that is not correct: he is the member for Todd. Nevertheless, one complaint that he had was about the speed limits in the State and he has put the proposition that, because of the number of narrow winding truly residential streets in his district, the speed limit should be 25 miles an hour. He is using that figure because he is quoting an American experience.

Regarding his reference to the narrow winding truly residential streets, he knows the size of the buses involved in the plan, and I wonder whether he has visualised those trundling around the narrow winding residential streets in his district. If he ponders on that, he may realise that that may be a reason why many people in his district are not particularly enamoured of the O'Bahn system as outlined by the Party opposite. Unfortunately, my time is running out. I wanted to raise some other matters.

Mr Evans: Have you time to say something now?

Mr O'NEILL: That is an interesting remark by the member for Fisher, who seemed more preoccupied with wasting the time of Estimates Committee B by trying to draw the attention of the Chairman to a remark that I made and trying to place a misinterpretation on it to waste the Committee's time. Nevertheless, I will ignore him now. As far as I am concerned it is very important. I raised objection on the Committee about the time left to consider the Marine and Harbors vote. I did ask some questions. I note that the Minister of Marine is leaving. I wanted to remark on the Premier's assertion that we would have the opportunity, because of the number of people available to the Minister, to elicit information immediately and we would not have to wait to get the answers. I asked a question on the problem of the dredges in the Marine and Harbors Department. The Minister gave me one answer, if one can call it that. I asked another question about the same subject

and the Minister said, 'As this question involves mechanical aspects I will ask Mr Kinnane to comment.' Mr Kinnane is the Deputy Director of Marine and Harbors. Mr Kinnane replied, 'I do not have with me the exact maintenance costs', and so on. He did not have that information. I asked another question and the Minister said, 'As we do not have that detail with us we will obtain that detail for the honourable member.' I asked another question and the Minister said, 'I will ask Mr Kinnane to comment'. I was lucky, as I got four questions in. I asked the Minister another question and he said, 'I will refer that question to Mr Kinnane.'

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr O'NEILL: In deference to the interjection from the Minister of Transport I will get to the point, as I have only three minutes left.

Mr Russack: You are on your final question, too.

Mr O'NEILL: That is an interesting comment from the gentleman who was in the Chair in Committee B. Without casting any aspersions on him I want to say that the record is not correct and I cannot support it. It states, 'Works and Services, Department of Marine and Harbors, \$1 840 000—examination declared complete'. That is a fabrication. There was no examination of that vote. It should say that no examination was possible because of the lack of time. There was another vote of \$760 000. The Chairman said, 'Examination declared complete.' There was no examination of that vote. No examination was possible because of a lack of time.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr O'NEILL: One of the culprits was the member for Fisher, who is interjecting. As a member of Parliament having responsibilities to the people of this State, I could not agree to that going on record in that form.

Mr Russack: It says, 'There being no further time for questions...'

Mr O'NEILL: I am talking about the verbiage in the report. I am talking about what the Chairman said and I am pointing to a fact. It is the truth. If anyone denies it, he is not being truthful. It says, 'Examination declared complete' and it is attributed to the Chairman. There was no examination of that vote because there was not time to consider it. Expenditure of approximately \$12 500 000 of the taxpayers' money was not examined at all.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It is a matter of organising the Committee.

Mr O'NEILL: It is not a matter of organising the Committee. I should have dealt with this matter first. We had the Minister of Transport, the canny tactician—I wrote a letter to the paper on this.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate the opportunity of saying a few words in this debate, particularly having listened to members opposite complain in varying degrees about the manner in which the Budget Committees functioned.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What did you think of the comments of the member for Florey?

Mr GUNN: I will come to that in a moment.

Mr Hemmings: You can have a say, Graham.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to other colleagues in the House by the name of their electorate.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Sir, I will do that. The honourable members of this esteemed House who were not capable of organising their time, Mr Speaker, now have the audacity to complain that the Committee system is not the most perfect one. If members of this House want to seek genuine information from Ministers, this is a far better system than that which operated for the past 10 years, when we sat in

the Opposition benches and endeavoured to get information from the Ministers; on many occasions we would have one Minister in the House; he would stand up and with a prepared brief and say, 'I will get a report', and sit down. If it got past 10 p.m., one Minister would get very huffy and grumpy and say 'I will get a report'. We had occasions where Ministers would get confused with the lines; the Minister would read a spiel from a prepared file, and a few minutes later would say 'I am very sorry, I am going to correct that; I have turned the wrong page'. And so the nonsense went on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Time after time we had to experience that sort of nonsense.

Mr Keneally: You would never have known—

Mr GUNN: The member for Stuart should not judge others by his own actions. Mr Speaker, members of the Labor Party, it appears from comments made this evening, are of the view that the Government members are not allowed to ask any questions. One or two members have taken the attitude that it is quite wrong for members on this side of the House to raise matters. The Estimates Committee in this House is set up for all members to participate. Because, in Government, members of the Labor Party were not capable, or were not allowed to participate in debates or discussions, that does not mean that under this Government the members on this side are not allowed to raise in the Parliament issues of concern to the electorate. It is about time members opposite realised that Parliament is not just an assembly for the Labor Party members to engage in what were in many cases irresponsible and quite foolish exercises.

We had on the first occasion a motion attempting to censure the Attorney-General. It was such a serious matter that the member for Elizabeth refused to participate. He stood up and walked out, making noises on what he thought of the exercise. When he was called by the Chair he refused to participate. That is what he thought of that exercise. I was not privy to what went on in the other Committees, but I did take the trouble to read the reports, and it would appear that the conduct of certain members was not much better in that Committee.

I think I have said enough in relation to Budget Committees. I believe they are a worthwhile and excellent concept that can be improved. The Standing Orders Committee has examined every proposition put up by members on both sides of the House in an attempt, with the best intentions in the world, to make the system work. I believe it is up to all members to give serious consideration to how they operate this year and I am hopeful that the Standing Orders Committee will have the time to examine the Committees again.

It is obvious that the member for Florey, who has just left the Chamber, either did not read or could not understand the Sessional Orders. He was complaining about there not being enough time. I pointed out it was up to the Committee, and Opposition members obviously were given the lead to set a portion of time, but they did not really desire to do that. There is nothing wrong with the record, because the Chairman, on page 508, said;

There being no time for any further questions, I declare the examination of the debate completed.

The vote was examined. If the honourable member examines the Standing Orders and the Sessional Orders he will know what I am talking about, but that is probably a little too much to expect of the honourable member.

I turn to two other matters, both affecting my electorate. I refer first to the Stony Point development, which is situated in my electorate. The member for Whyalla is on

record as making one or two comments on this matter. It is not often that I agree with the honourable gentleman, but I must say that on this occasion I entirely support what he has had to say. I am most concerned that there is a selfish group of people—

Mr Keneally: You are not saying anything; you are leaving it all to Max Brown.

Mr GUNN: I will come to the member for Stuart in a moment. His silence in this matter has been very noticeable. I would say that he is supporting his Federal Labor Party colleague, Mr West, who has been doing his utmost to undermine the project. I would say that the honourable member in his usual way, is supporting his conservation friends, and impeding the development of this State. There is a very selfish group of short sighted people, who want to deny those unemployed people in Whyalla—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order! It could be that the Speaker will see the member for Stuart before the member for Eyre does!

Mr GUNN: Most appropriate, Mr Speaker. Before I was so rudely interrupted (that is not any reflection on you, Sir; I am entirely referring to the disorderly conduct of the member for Stuart), I was referring to a group of people known as the Whyalla Action Group, headed by Mr A. J. A. Scott, who has been having a considerable amount to say over the past few weeks. It would appear from his comments and activities that he is doing his utmost to prevent the people of Whyalla and this State from benefiting from the Stony Point development. Not only is that unfortunate, but I think it is a very selfish attitude, because many people in Whyalla are looking forward to the development of the project to provide jobs, which are at a premium in that city, as most of us know. All of my constituents with whom I have discussed this project have supported it, and I have discussed the matter with a considerable number of them. I believe the Government should be commended for the approach it has taken on this matter. I hope that this project proceeds as rapidly as possible. Not only will, I hope, this project proceed, but South Australia will benefit from having a refinery built there before long. It is a project that will help make South Australia more self-reliant.

The other matter that I want to make one or two brief comments about concerns the conduct of the members of the Labor Party in this House in relation to the Police Department of this State. Over the past few days we have witnessed a disgraceful attack on the professionalism of the police in this State. The Labor Party, through its unofficial leader, the member for Elizabeth, who we know was for years aided and abetted by Mr O'Brien, has done everything in its power to undermine the Police Force. One of those two gentlemen was the author of a malicious paper which used to circulate from one of the universities. Over a long period, he used to write articles which were very critical of the police. Now the honourable member stands up in this House and expects us to believe that he is a great supporter of the police and of law and order, and wants to do everything he can to maintain the good name of the South Australian Police Force. All that he has achieved over the past few days is to attempt to undermine the force, and I believe he has been successful in casting grave aspersions upon the character and good name of the force. We all know that it is probably the best Police Force in Australia.

The Labor Party has a fine record; it was responsible for crucifying one of the finest police officers there has ever been in the country, Commissioner Salisbury. It has been aided and abetted in this conspiracy, to undermine the force and create concern in the minds of the public, by some

quite disgraceful journalism, in particular, by one programme known as *Nationwide*. I thought that the Labor Party had two press secretaries; I believe they have now got three. Miss P. Goward would be the third press secretary. Aided and abetted by a producer who is a card carrier of the Labor Party, she has done a very good job in misleading the people of this State by the sort of negative attitude adopted. Those people ought to be ashamed of themselves.

I would have expected an organisation such as the A.B.C., which has operated successfully in this country for a long time, to take a far more objective view, particularly in a programme which sets itself up as making impartial and constructive comments on public affairs. In my view that programme has failed to be objective and constructive in its reporting, not only on this particular matter, but on a number of others. It has acted as a press secretary for the Labor Party in this and on a number of other issues. I make no apology whatsoever for making those comments.

In the time I have left to speak, I want to say that the strategy the Government has adopted in relation to the development of this State is correct. It will have long-term benefits for the people of this State, and I am looking forward to the next important debate in this House when members of the Labor Party, including the members for Stuart and Price, have to cast their vote on whether they will support the people of this State in voting for the indenture Bill for the Olympic Dam site. I support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. Before I deal with the particular areas of responsibility which I had in the Estimates Committee, I would like to make a point about the foolish statement that the member for Eyre made at the start of his usual foolish speech. He claimed that members of the Opposition were saying that Government members had no right to question a Minister. In the Estimates Committee where our hapless Chief Secretary was in control—

Mr Keneally: He was present.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister was present. The member for Fisher was given the task of protecting the Minister, and he did a very good job of it. He managed to save the Minister from much criticism from members of the Opposition. I would like to relate one particular line of questioning he took, and I hope the member for Eyre will listen to this. As reported on page 499 of *Hansard*, the member for Fisher embarked on a line of questioning in relation to salaries and wages. This was very revealing. He quoted figures from the Auditor-General's Report for 1980-81, and then he asked, 'Has the Minister the budgeted amount for each of these institutions for the forthcoming year, or have we taken an overall budgetary figure allowing for some percentage increase?'

The Chief Secretary could not supply the Committee with that answer, so he asked Mr Stewart to supply that information. Mr Stewart then turned to page 58 of the Estimates of Payments and read out that information. The information was there for everyone. Members of the Estimates Committee had it and the member for Fisher had it. Obviously the Chief Secretary did not have that information, because he had to refer the question to Mr Stewart. Mr Stewart said:

The actual salaries and wages budgeted for the various sections of the department during the next year are in relation to administration, which takes into account Parole Board members' fees, Directors' salaries, Assistant Directors (Administration), probation and parole staff, terminal leave payments, and pay-roll tax, a total sum of \$2 833 200.

Mr Whitten: He could have said, 'As printed'.

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, as printed in the Estimates of Payments.

Mr Keneally: What was his reason for doing that? Did Stan say that?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes; the member for Fisher then said:

I think I said at the beginning of that question that this was something I wanted to record in *Hansard*. I know the information was available to me, but it is not available to the rest of the public. I wish to ask a further question of the Minister in relation to staffing.

If that is probing, in-depth questioning by Government members, no wonder the Opposition is disappointed with the way that Estimates Committees have operated last year and this year.

Dr Billard: The onus is on the Opposition.

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Newland says, 'The onus is on the Opposition.' How many times during the Estimates Committees did Government back-benchers ask Dorothy Dixers?

Mr Schmidt: None.

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Mawson must have rocks in his head. During the Estimates Committee dealing with the Minister of Health, the member for Hanson was actually receiving briefings on what to say. Yet the Government has said that the Estimates Committees work and they give us a chance to find out exactly what is going on. Government back-benchers themselves literally had nothing to say: they were advised by Ministers on what to say. When they did use their own initiative they proved to be failures.

Returning to our hapless Chief Secretary, I do not wish to put the knife in any deeper than my colleagues have already done, but I would like to recall a comment the Premier made in his opening remarks in this debate, when he said:

The Chief Secretary is one of the most experienced members of this Parliament.

They are the Premier's own words. If that is the case, it says little for the rest of this abysmal Cabinet. In all my time in this Parliament, and I must confess that it is only since 1977, I have never seen a situation, despite a series of Ministerial blunders by the Chief Secretary, commencing from day 1 of this Government, that this man has not managed to survive. He has managed to survive time and time again, despite the fact that the ground has been cut from under his feet by his more ruthless colleagues. I would like to name them. They are the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Transport. Yet, despite all that, the Premier refuses to sack the Chief Secretary. We on this side know why the Premier refuses to sack him. The media also knows why. It is because the Chief Secretary carries a big i.o.u. card in his pocket. You, Sir, will recall that, on the night of the long knives, when there was a move to sack the then Leader of the Opposition by an aspirant to the position (the current Minister of Industrial Affairs), the Chief Secretary marshalled the forces to save the Premier.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: When was that supposed to have occurred?

Mr HEMMINGS: We all know that that happened in early 1979.

Dr Billard interjecting:

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Newland would not know. He was not even here.

Dr Billard: How would you know?

Mr HEMMINGS: Because, on that night, we could not find one Liberal member of Parliament, and those whom we saw were walking around with worried looks on their faces. That is why the Chief Secretary will not be sacked by this Premier. However, i.o.u. cards are not sufficient. We are asking that the Premier recognise the Ministerial

incompetence of the Chief Secretary, and have the courage to tear up that i.o.u. card and tell the Chief Secretary exactly where he should go—that is, to be banished to the back benches. The Chief Secretary should be replaced by the member for Rocky River, who, at least, will do a better job than the Chief Secretary has done.

Mr Whitten: What about the member for Hanson? Wouldn't he have a chance?

Mr HEMMINGS: No. There is only one contender, and that is the member for Rocky River. I leave the Chief Secretary at this point.

Mr Whitten: What about the member for Hanson? Wouldn't he have a chance?

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Hanson has been bought off by the big white car. As a member of the Estimates Committee that considered the health budget, I completely refute the Premier's statement that the Opposition failed to understand the implications of the health lines and the Commonwealth-State health agreement. The Minister's press statements contradicted each other. Although I do not have the press statements, it is an established fact that, in regard to the Estimates Committee that considered the health budget, the statements put out by the Minister in regard to the Commonwealth-State health agreement contradicted each other. The Financial Statement that was read out by the Premier on 15 September took a completely different turn. The Opposition, armed with that information, did the only responsible thing it could do. It attempted, in the correct manner (and the member for Playford went through the correct procedure), to try to obtain information from Treasury officials. The Commonwealth-State health agreement was a Treasury matter: it was not a health matter.

As far as we were concerned, we were doing the proper thing. We were dealing with the sum of \$370 000 000, which, after the education vote, is the biggest sum in the State Budget. If we were to be an effective voice on the Estimates Committee, we considered that we needed Treasury advice. I am sure that the member for Hanson would agree with that. Every official to whom the member for Playford spoke agreed that that was necessary, until Friday afternoon. Then, our worthy Premier found out what was happening and decided that in no way would the Opposition be given that information.

Instead, we were offered a half-hour meeting with the Chairman of the Health Commission. That was not sufficient, and quite properly the Opposition refused that offer. If ever a responsible attitude was shown in this case, it was shown by the Opposition. We felt that the health vote was far from satisfactory.

The information given in the Estimates of Payments is totally insufficient. It was proved last year, and this year also, and we wanted advice from the Treasury on the Commonwealth-State agreement. So, that was a responsible attitude. It was the Government that showed a shocking lack of understanding, and it should be condemned.

Dealing with local government and housing, it is interesting to see how the media viewed the way in which the Minister, the Hon. Murray Hill, performed. I think that Mr Greg Kelton, in his weekly column 'State Politics', when he wrote on the Estimates Committees, was quite correct in what he said about the Minister of Local Government and Housing, as follows:

Under the Committee system, Ministers are accompanied by senior departmental advisers. In the first year, some Ministers took the opportunity of allowing their public servants to provide information to the Committees; others did not. This year, the Opposition was hoping that the public servants would be allowed more opportunities to speak in public, and they were disappointed.

At least one Minister refused to let his public servants answer any questions. The work of that particular hearing was held up for

some time, as the answer to even the simplest non-political questions had to be whispered to the Minister by an adviser so that the Minister could then answer it. It would have saved so much if the adviser had been allowed to give the answers.

That is the way in which the Minister of Local Government and Housing treated the Estimates Committee on that day. There was one occasion, however, when the Minister decided to answer a question off his own bat. It was in reply to a question that I had asked regarding increased responsibility being placed on local government that had not been accompanied by a corresponding allocation of funding. The Minister decided not to ask for advice from those around him but then proceeded to tear into local government generally. Referring to me, the Minister said:

The honourable member, being a former local government representative (and a senior one too)—

he was quite correct on that point—

would know that the grants money from the Commonwealth to local government increased by 16.6 per cent this year, going from \$25 000 000 to \$31 000 000, which came into South Australia for distribution throughout local government.

At the same time, the Federal Treasurer issued a statement, as I recall, that he expected the increase to be nearly 19 per cent next year, so if it is true that local government is still complaining that it has not got enough money after the receipt of funds of that kind, which are untied moneys and can be spent by local government however it wishes, then I must be a little cautious in giving full consideration to the resolution that has just been mentioned.

It is my view that local government should provide more and more local services. I want to see local government accept responsibility for the provision of services at the local level, because, when the total grants cake for the States is cut up in Canberra, this State gets only 8.6 per cent of that sum, whereas on a population basis we should get about 9.2 per cent.

That shows the shocking lack of understanding of untied grants money that comes to local government. The Whitlam Administration in Canberra, when it set up the system of untied grants to local government, put forward the philosophy that that money should be spent on providing services to the community and should also relieve the increased rate burden on ratepayers. To give the Fraser Government credit, it followed the same line.

The idea was to provide community services, yet here we have a Minister, a responsible or a so-called responsible Minister, saying, 'We will give you added responsibility. We say that local government should take on more responsibility. We will not give you any more money from the State Budget. We expect you to spend that untied grants money on providing services'. That is a shocking indictment, and I think the Minister will rue the day he made that statement.

If anything, the Minister should have listened to his advisers, who would have given him a better answer, because he is saying, 'We will abdicate any responsibility to local government in providing additional funding for it to carry on added areas of responsibility that this State Government is giving it and we will let it provide the funding out of untied grants from the Federal Government'. Already I have received indications from local government that it is shocked by the Minister's attitude to this subject.

Another aspect of this State Government's shift of responsibility is where it has taken the area of responsibility from the South Australian Housing Trust and given to local government housing improvement and rent control. The Minister has gone on record as saying that the new arrangements are in line with the Government's philosophy that the local government is best suited to manage local affairs, that the move had the full backing of the Local Government Association, that there would be cost savings to the trust enabling redirection to the needy, and that additional costs could be borne by councils who already had officers equipped to do the work.

That sounds well in a press release, but let us look at what the Minister actually did before making that statement. Did he consult the Housing Trust? He did not. Did he consult the Local Government Association? He did not. From what we have been able to establish (and we have not had any leaked documents), the matter was not even considered by Cabinet.

It was one of Murray Hill's one-off jobs. It was a move to assist his friends in the private rental market, those friends who were complaining. In fact, there was a move by those people who were renting in effect substandard houses in the inner metropolitan area, who were getting annoyed that in the South Australian Housing Trust was being fairly active in that area, and they wanted it stopped. The Minister made a bold statement. We know that he did not consult the Housing Trust or the Local Government Association, although he claims that the Local Government Association backed the move to the hilt.

I believe that, unless the Minister brings legislation into the Parliament, it is impossible for local government to effect control on substandard housing at all, because Part III of the Housing Improvement Act gives the power to local government to declare houses substandard, although it cannot fix the rent. All it can say is that the house is unfit for human habitation and the tenant usually is evicted. The trust can enter the area only under Part VII of the Act, so we have a gap. Under Part III of the Act local government bodies can take action, and under Part VII the Housing Trust can take action, but there is no way that the two in between can marry up that operation.

Unless the Minister has signalled that legislation will be introduced into this House to give local government greater powers, the whole thing is doomed to fail. We will end up with more and more people being evicted, because local government can use only the Health Act and Part III of the Housing Improvement Act to effect any control on substandard housing.

I am sure, if the Minister had consulted the Housing Trust or the Local Government Association, he would have found that out. In his usual way, when he is hell bent on repealing certain legislation or inflicting his own views on how things should be done in this State, he has not even considered it. Unless the Minister introduces legislation to give local government the power to work right through the Housing Improvement Act, the whole thing is doomed to fail.

If one reads the Act, the only corporate body vested with any powers under the Act is the South Australian Housing Trust. So, if I could give some advice to the Minister (he certainly needs some advice in many areas), I suggest that he gets officers of his department to look at the legislation and introduces amendments to the Housing Improvement Act as soon as possible, so that local government can effectively control substandard housing and exercise some form of rental control.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I would first like to comment on what seemed to be the extraordinary comments made by the member for Napier, particularly in reference to the Commonwealth-State hospitals cost-sharing agreement. That agreement is not a Treasury matter. Indeed, it is an agreement negotiated between the South Australian Hospitals Commission and the Commonwealth Department of Health, and Treasury officials certainly were not involved in any of those negotiations. The Opposition spokesmen seem to be so incompetent that they cannot even grasp who is responsible and, indeed, sought information from a department which could not provide the answers. Also, it is extraordinary that the Opposition should attempt to try to censure the Minister of Health, who actually offered a

briefing, probably the first and probably the last time such a generous offer has been made to an Opposition. Members opposite declined that offer of a briefing.

After spending the past two weeks debating the Budget lines in the Estimates Committee, I am even more convinced now that the Opposition is totally devoid of any common sense approach to the budgeting of the State and to the running of the State's affairs. The criticisms expressed in the Budget sessions, and also in this particular debate, lead to the obvious and clear conclusion that the Labor Party, if it was in power, would prefer to spend and spend. Indeed, I wonder where it would stop spending, because it has advocated that we should spend more and more in each of the public sector services. In looking at the philosophy of how it would raise that money, I was reminded of a comment made by the Federal Leader, Mr Hayden, on *Monday Conference* on 18 September 1978. He said:

We want to make the system work better and to that extent there will be a need for a larger public sector. We are certainly committed to that and I believe there is a need for a large public sector.

The Opposition certainly believes that, and that is what it was trying to espouse at that time. I also noted a comment by Mr Willis, in an address which he gave to Labor economists at a conference in Brisbane back in June 1978. He said that, if Labor did not gain office at the election, by 1983, when it could next hope to gain office, the Labor Party would face a mammoth task in rebuilding the public sector, and perhaps an equally mammoth task in convincing the electorate that it would pay for a higher level of taxation to enable it to do so.

It is very interesting to see that the Labor philosophy also states that the Party believes in higher taxes. Mr Hayden, as far back as 1972, in the *Financial Review*, said, as a purely personal statement, 'I am a high tax man.' Closer to home, the Federal member for Adelaide said:

When it comes to further revenue to fund Governments we will seek to find it in progressive ways.

He referred to indirect taxation. Perhaps that gives us a lead as to why the Opposition feels that we should spend more and more money. I also noted that, a few months after that particular statement by Mr Hurford, their Leader said that Party policy was opposed to indirect taxation. So obviously members opposite do not know one hand from the other. One member says that revenue has to be raised from indirect taxes, and another member says that they do not believe in it. However, the Opposition has never said how it expects to pay for all the additional services and increases on services it propounds. The clue is, as I stated earlier, in relation to indirect taxation.

However, during the past two weeks and during this debate, the Opposition has reverted to criticising the Government's performance in welfare, housing, and in our lack of consideration for the unemployed and the disadvantaged.

I want to refute some of those arguments. During the examination of the Ministry of Housing I was surprised to learn that during the past 12 months some \$12 400 000 was spent on subsidising rents. We also learnt that, of the 43 000 homes that the trust has, 51 per cent of the occupants of those houses are now on rent subsidy schemes. A further subsidy of \$375 000 was spent on emergency housing and a further \$301 000 was spent on lease rent subsidies. The total of subsidies provided amounted to \$13 000 000, which was in fact \$7 000 000 higher than in the preceding year, and some \$10 000 000 higher than what the previous Labor Government provided for those same areas. So, the Government has acknowledged exactly the very obvious problem of housing and it has increased its commitment by over 200 per cent. Let it be noted that the Government has done

more than anyone else in this State in coming to grips with the very real problems, particularly those of the disadvantaged. The Government has also allocated some \$881 000 for subsidies for free and subsidised travel. Therefore, for housing and travel the people of South Australia have paid close to \$14 000 000. It is sheer hypocrisy on the part of the Opposition to say that the Government does not care and that it has not done anything, particularly to aid those who are disadvantaged.

Mr Langley: You have gone broke and you know it.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Nothing the Opposition has said has any credibility and I believe the public will soon realise this. The past two weeks were taken up by a series of weak questioning by Opposition members and their using the system in an attempt to castigate Ministers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GLAZBROOK: I refer particularly to what we have heard during the last two weeks concerning the Chief Secretary. It is a charade of politics from the Opposition. I want to reiterate some of the things that I said in a previous speech concerning the Budget. Members might remember that I asked whether previous Governments had been totally prudent in the way in which they spent money in trying to get things that they could not pay for at the time. I pointed out that the State's deficit on the Loan Account was about \$2.672 billion. I also pointed out that during the 10 years of the Labor Government that amount was increased by \$1 billion. The State is now suffering the consequences because it has to pay \$214 875 000 in interest—interest on money that was borrowed for those projects. During the time of spending that billion dollars that Government took up the cudgels of addressing itself to many other issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GLAZBROOK: I do not think the Opposition is fully cognisant of the fact that it has put this State into a terrible position. Why is this State the way it is? It is because of maladministration by the previous Government. Do members opposite know where the money goes? Members opposite had two weeks to find out, but presumably they do not know. An expenditure of 31.2 per cent of the money of this State goes in education. Do members opposite know what is the next highest allocation of money? It is 17.5 per cent of this State's income which goes on interest on borrowed money.

Mr Langley interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: If the honourable member thinks that the State could have kept going the way it was going, then he is way off beam. Health takes up 12.4 per cent. Police, prisons and the Auditor-General's Department take up 6.9 per cent. Transport, highways and recreation and sport take up 6.1 per cent. Water resources and irrigation take up 5.2 per cent. Public works take up 3.3 per cent. The Treasury takes up 3.1 per cent. Community welfare takes up 2.9 per cent. That totals 88.6 per cent of the total income.

Mr Abbott: You didn't ask any questions on community welfare.

Mr GLAZBROOK: If you look in the book, you will find that I asked many questions on community welfare. The interesting point is that only 11.4 per cent is left to run these departments: the Legislature, the Premier's Office, State Development, Ethnic Affairs, The Deputy Premier's Office, Mines and Energy, Attorney-General's, Corporate

Affairs, Industrial Affairs, Fisheries, Marine, Local Government, Housing, Arts, Agriculture, Forests, Environment, Planning, Consumer Affairs, Tourism, Lands, and Repatriation. It takes less money to run those departments than the sum we have to pay for the interest on money borrowed. The time has come when the people of this State have to say that we cannot keep spending money. We have to be cognisant of the fact that there is only one other way to raise money, and that is from the pockets of the people, and they are not prepared for that. This means we have to curtail many of the schemes of the past by being practical, and 'practical' means at least being sensible about where the money is spent. The Opposition cannot do what it wants to do. Where will the money come from to spend more and more?

The Labor Party has a philosophy of where it comes from; that is spelt out in some of the speeches of members of that party. It is to come from indirect taxation; it will come from the people. Who will suffer? This Government is responsible and is trying to address the problems in a responsible way. It is saying to the people of South Australia that the time has come when we cannot keep spending money that we do not have. The Opposition failed miserably in not recognising that fact during the Budget Estimate debates. The Opposition needs to wake up to itself and realise that it cannot keep promising things, but has to be realistic with what it is doing.

Mr Kenneally interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: The Budget was a responsible Budget brought down for the benefit of the State. If the honourable member looks at benefits to the State that will come from mining and from the development of our resources, he will realise that, unless his Party backs that sort of venture, this State will go down. We need the development of resources—mines, minerals, energy—and development of the industrial and commercial base. We cannot do it on one level alone; it has to be the State collectively going forward.

The prophets of doom on the other side keep saying that we must spend more of what we do not have. You have to earn first; before you can take money out, you have to put some in. That is something the previous administration never did. It kept spending and never put anything in. It sold everything—the railways, the lot. I support the motion, and I am totally against the Opposition's amendment.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I preface my remarks this evening by saying that I believe that it is an interesting experience to be in Opposition and have to work under a committee system such as we have experienced in the past two years in the Budget debate. I think it is worth while persevering with the committee system, albeit with its many faults. I agree with those members who have expressed their belief that the committee system was a vast improvement this year over last year, which was the first time we had worked under such a system to examine the Budget lines. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 22 October at 2 p.m.