

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 October 1981

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

## PETITION: HAPPY VALLEY BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 75 residents of Happy Valley praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to reject the proposed extension of the Happy Valley bus service and request that a new route be drawn up to service the residents of Chandlers Hill Estate was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: PRE-SCHOOL OPERATING COSTS

Petitions signed by 294 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 Hons. J. D. Corcoran and Peter Duncan, and Messrs Billard and Crafter.

Petitions received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions raised in the Estimates Committees, as detailed in the schedule which I now table, and a written answer to a question raised in this House, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## HOTEL MILK SALES

In reply to **Mr EVANS** (25 September).

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: I have consulted with the Minister of Health on the question of milk sales in hotels, clubs and restaurants. Although section 27 of the Food and Drugs Act requires the licensing of milk vendors and registration of premises where milk is sold, the Minister informs me that, when milk is mixed with other beverages and supplied as a mixed beverage, the provisions of the Act do not apply. This anomaly has been recognised and it is intended to remove the licensing and registration provisions applicable to milk under the Food and Drugs Act by omitting them from the proposed Uniform Food Bill.

## QUESTION TIME

## POLICE FORCE

**Mr BANNON**: Does the Premier stand by the answer given yesterday in relation to my question concerning the naming by the Chief Secretary of a person who offered to provide information on a confidential basis concerning the police inquiry, particularly that aspect of his answer where he said that the response was ridiculous, and that the question of endangering the life of the person was ridiculous? Does he still stand by that, and will he reconsider the answer given yesterday? When I asked him yesterday whether he would endorse his Chief Secretary's action in recklessly identifying the person whose name had been provided to police as a potential source of information, the

Premier refused to accept that this was, in any case, a bad action. He rejected my proposition that this was gross incompetence and went on to say:

How on earth can he possibly be accused of being in danger because of giving information.

That referred to the prisoner. The Premier continued:

That seems to be an utterly ridiculous and pointless thing to say. Further, he went on to say:

'Endangering his life,' the Leader of the Opposition says. How ridiculous.

An article in today's *Australian* under the headline 'Named informer in peril, says gaol chief' states:

The superintendent of Adelaide's Yatala Gaol, Mr Glen Hughes, said he believed the prisoner, Graham Eason, was in 'real danger' after being named by the Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, as an informer.

Later, after criticising the media—I remind the House it was not the media but the Chief Secretary who published his name—for giving the gaol's 400 inmates access to developments in Parliament, the article goes on:

When asked whether he thought Eason was in danger, Mr Hughes replied: 'Of course he is . . . this is a prison, you know.'

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Yes, I stand by that answer.

## RED HILL SCHOOLHOUSE

**Mr OLSEN**: Will the Premier seek an authorisation from Australian National for the District Council of Red Hill or the school council to undertake the demolition of the Red Hill schoolhouse? The file on this project indicates that in August 1979 the then Premier Dunstan, after a visit to the school, agreed that the premises should be demolished.

**Mr Millhouse**: Corcoran was Premier then.

**Mr OLSEN**: August 1977. I apologise. The school council sought advice in August 1978 as to why the matter had not proceeded. Subsequently, the matter was investigated by the State Transport Authority and the Director of Educational Facilities, who advised that the property had been transferred to Australian National.

Demolition was not proceeded with, as the Teacher Housing Authority then expressed an interest. In March 1979 the T.H.A. advised that it did not want the building and in April 1979 the then Premier Corcoran advised that the building was to be removed. Subsequently, I and the Premier have sought the demolition of the building because of its bad state of repair and the vermin that inhabit the property adjacent to the school proper. Australian National responded on 8 October as follows:

It is advised that our workforce is engaged on project tasks and that the demolition of the subject house will be programmed for the last quarter of the financial year.

This situation has been referred to by many as a saga of bureaucratic bungling and ineptitude by departments and that over four years is far too long for the situation to be yet unresolved.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I do not think there would be anyone in this House who would deny that this is a classic example of bureaucratic bungling. I must say that at the present time it is rather pleasant (using a relative term) in the circumstances to be able to refer to another bureaucratic department other than the State Government's.

The situation is quite intolerable. The agreement was given to have the Red Hill schoolhouse demolished in 1977. It has been the subject of an argument between authorities ever since. I would have thought that with the degree of frustration which is now being shown by the district council it would be quite possible that the council itself would move down and take the schoolhouse apart by hand.

Certainly, Australian National has now given its agreement to the demolition. I must say that when I read the message which was given to me and which the honourable member has quoted that they were prepared to do it by the end of the year, I was somewhat heartened because I thought perhaps this demolition was only a few weeks away. It was not until I got to the next line that I realised it was referring to the end of the financial year, which is in fact more than six months away.

I will certainly do the best I can to get permission for the council to do the demolition. I would have thought there might be other ways of having that demolition completed. I think probably some service organisations in the district would not mind having a go. I will make that suggestion to the Director. I think it was Francis Bacon who said that delay is the most insidious form of obstruction. It is this sort of delay that brings members of various Government departments, both Federal and State, into conflict with the general public. We are doing everything we can, as a State Government, to overcome this problem, with our deregulation unit and our streamlining of procedures. I hope that we will never have any example put up to us of any such action taken by a State Government department.

#### POLICE INQUIRY

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I do not understand the signals I am getting from the Leader of the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has been called for a question.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Yes, and I would like to ask it of the Premier, although normally it would be more appropriately addressed to the Chief Secretary.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**An honourable member:** Get into him, Robin.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has sought leave to ask a question of the Premier. I ask him to come to the question.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The question is as follows: who are now the members of the top level inquiry team into the police, and what role is each playing in that inquiry? As I said, normally this is a question one would address to the Chief Secretary, as the Minister responsible, but I have no confidence that he would have the answer and, as he has been avoiding answering any questions on this topic—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is required to seek leave, and not to comment whilst giving the explanation.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Right. I will go on to the explanation. I remind the Premier of the Ministerial statement that he gave yesterday, it being an adaptation of the statement prepared by the Attorney-General, as is perfectly obvious from the copy of it that I have. In that statement he referred to a top level inquiry team of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Assistant Commissioner Hunt, and a senior Crown Law officer, who we know is Jim Cramond. He went on to say:

A decision was made at the time of establishing the team that, as some parallel inquiries may be appropriate at the Federal police level, the Commissioner should consult with the Federal Commissioner.

We do not know whether a Federal police officer or officers have been included in the team, or what the position is. There was no further reference to the Federal police, nor was any reason given as to why the Federal police should be brought in, whether the Government has no confidence in our own, or what.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** He went on to talk about an investigating team, a high level team, a top level inquiry team, and he said, on page 4:

Senior commissioned officers, in conjunction with a senior Crown Law officer, are engaged in the current investigation. Their inquiries are thorough.

He said there were no limiting terms of reference, and so on. All we have been told so far is that these three men—the Deputy Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner and Mr Cramond—have been appointed. I have not heard any reference yet to the part that Mr Cramond is playing in it. He is a lawyer, a Crown Law officer. I do not know whether he is on it full-time or whether he is just there to advise on knotty problems or what is happening. There has been so much talk, rightly, about the Chief Secretary that the inquiry itself and its terms of reference, which are also a mystery to everyone, have not been canvassed. I want to know what the role of each of these people may be, whether there is Federal intervention in the matter, whether the Federal police are in the team, and we would all like to know when it is likely to report. Despite what the Attorney-General said in his statement—and the Premier echoed it here—there was little doubt in anyone's mind—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** —but that it would be over in about a fortnight.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham that, if he transgresses again in commenting whilst he is explaining a question, I will call upon the Premier to answer the question forthwith.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I was only reminding—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** As part of the explanation, Sir—

**The SPEAKER:** The explanation and nothing else.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Of course. I was only reminding the Premier that the Attorney-General, when he was forced into announcing the inquiry by the report in the *Advertiser*, gave the impression, there is no doubt, that it would be over in about a fortnight, but this statement extends that in a shadowy sort of way—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** —to months.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mitcham will resume his seat. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not know, but I was under the impression that, contrary to his usual practice, the member for Mitcham was in the House yesterday while the Ministerial statement was being made. Not only that: he seems to have read it, because he has given a paraphrase of a good part of it, which answers the questions he has asked. For some reason, he finds some fault with the description of the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner as being high level. I would have thought it unlikely that one could go much higher than that in any Police Force, and I fail to understand what he is on about.

The only part of the long and involved question that does justify any answer at all is his reference to the involvement of the Federal police. There has been contact made with the Federal police because there needs to be a close liaison between the activities which they are undertaking in relation to drug inquiries and the matters that may probably come before this inquiry. The member already knows that there are no terms of reference in any police inquiry, and that is exactly the same with this situation. The Federal police are being liaised with, I think, to make sure that there is no overlapping of any inquiry, and no duplication.

**Mr Millhouse:** Are they having their own?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Millhouse:** Are they having their own inquiry into activities in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The honourable member is very childish; he knows perfectly well that the Drug Squad in South Australia and the appropriate authorities in the Federal police are constantly inquiring into matters relating to the drug scene and, indeed, into any other area of criminal activity. If he does not know that, he does not qualify to practise at the bar.

### EMPLOYMENT

**Dr BILLARD:** Does the Premier have any figures showing the latest situation regarding total employment levels in this State? I ask this question for three reasons. The first is that I note that in the *Australian* today there were figures showing the total employment levels on the national scene and the movement in those levels over the past month and the past year. It was stated that employment, nationally, had grown by 148 000, or 2.2 per cent, over the 12 months to September 1981.

Secondly, the question has significance because comment has been made over quite a time now about the trends in employment levels in this State and, in particular, reference has been made to the decline in total employment levels of over 20 000 in the two years before the change of Government in 1979. Thirdly, the question has significance because of the difficulties that were experienced in the economy in September, nationally, and particularly in this State, because of strike action, which had a depressing effect on business activity.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very pleased indeed to answer the honourable member's question. I know the member's concern for this particular matter, and I think we are all very concerned about it. I am happy to say that the figures for employed persons in South Australia have shown a very marked increase in the period September 1980 to September 1981. Not only that, but the 148 000 people, to which figure the member refers as being quoted in the *Australian*, is also, by comparison with the increase in South Australia, not as good as our increase.

In actual fact, we have had an increase in the past 12 months. The figure as at September 1980 was 552 400, and that has increased to 566 800 in September 1981. That shows a job increase of 14 400 during the past 12 months, from September to September.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Is that right?

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** The Deputy Leader is now questioning the A.B.S. figures.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I understand that the Deputy Leader does not believe in A.B.S. figures.

**Mr Slater:** They juggle them.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Gilles apparently believes that the A.B.S. juggles the figures.

**Mr Slater:** They're not true.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I will repeat the figures for the honourable member and I will take a great deal of pleasure in doing that. If he can then tell me exactly how they may be juggled, I will be very grateful. The figure for September 1980 was 552 400, and September 1981, 566 800. Even the member, I am quite sure, can see that the increase for that period is 14 400.

**Mr Slater:** I can't reply to you now. I'd be out of order if I did.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Gilles will contain himself.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think that may be rather difficult, but I hope he is able to: no-one else can. The increase is particularly significant when one considers that we in South Australia are certainly maintaining more than our share of employment creation in South Australia compared to the rest of Australia, which I think is something else that we can be pleased about. I must say that I am surprised at the attitude of members opposite. I would have thought that the result was pretty good news for South Australia. I am amazed that all members opposite do not share our pleasure at the job creation that is going on in South Australia, as demonstrated by those figures. This reaction is purely and simply just another indication of their miserable (and I cannot think of a better word) approach to South Australia generally. Whenever anything happens in South Australia that either is good for the State or promises good things to come, they are assiduous only in their efforts to rubbish.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Out comes the bucket of cold water.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Out come the doom and gloom and cold water.

**Mr Trainer:** Who called South Australia a leper colony?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the Deputy Leader is going to rise to his feet and say 'We think it is good to have more than 14 000 jobs created in the past 12 months', I will retract some of what I have said, but, on the past track record of members opposite of throwing doom and gloom over every positive achievement, I think it is hardly likely to happen. I thank the member for his question. I am sure that all members on this side of the House, and indeed, all responsible and thinking members of the South Australian community will be pleased indeed that there is an increase in job numbers in this State.

### YATALA PRISONER

**Mr BANNON:** Does the Chief Secretary agree with the statement by a senior officer in his department, namely, Mr Glen Hughes, Superintendent of Yatala Gaol, that the public exposure of a prisoner puts that prisoner in 'real danger', and had necessitated the offer of extra security protection for that prisoner—

*The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Don't coach him, for God's sake; let him answer something himself just for once.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Why don't you pull your head in?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will assist the conduct of the House if he is silent.

**Mr BANNON:** It may be to the good if I repeat the question. Does the Chief Secretary agree with the statement by a senior officer in his department, namely, Mr Glen Hughes, Superintendent of Yatala Gaol, that the public exposure of a prisoner's name puts that prisoner in 'real danger', and necessitated the offer of extra security protection for that prisoner, and, if he does not agree, why not?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Let me tell the blood lusting Leader who is so keen on courting problems in the gaol, keeping the problems going on—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It's no good shushing your people down. You don't like hearing it.

**Mr Millhouse:** Why don't you answer the question, Allan?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I wish you would mind your own business, but I know it is impossible. When we came to office, we inherited the shambles that was left by your

Government. Just put that in your little cap and smoke it. It was a shocking disgrace to penal servitude in this country; I cannot describe it otherwise. A prisoner in a gaol of which I happen to be in charge will be protected, just as I took special steps to look after those people about whom the member for Elizabeth was so worried. They are still alive today. I give my assurance that the prisoner whose name I mentioned (and if it is hurtful to you, I will not repeat it) will be as safe as a bank. What is reported about what my Superintendent says is a matter of a newspaper report, and I will not comment on that. I will give the blood lusting Leader (I could say other things about him; I would like to but I will not) an assurance that we will protect the prisoner about whom you are so concerned. If you are so concerned about things in South Australia, why in the name of fortune did we inherit such a shambles?

### PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Is the Premier able to outline to the House the benefits which will flow from the Cooper Basin liquids pipeline and other resource developments? I, along with many other people, was pleased to see that a South Australian company had won a significant contract in connection with the pipeline construction. Obviously, this will create jobs in the construction industry. The Opposition has continually played down the likely benefits of resource development, and I would be interested to hear the Premier's impressions of the advantages to be enjoyed by South Australians.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very grateful to the member for his question, because I have outlined to the House and publicly on a number of occasions the benefits likely to come in employment and general prosperity for the State and I am very happy to do that again. We have quite a number of prospects, some of them closer than others, but nevertheless prospects of resource developments that will be of immense benefit to the State.

I totally agree with the member that at almost at every conceivable opportunity the Leader of the Opposition has sought to deny these benefits and has called them figments of the Government's imagination. Indeed, I have heard it suggested by them that resource development is of no real value to the people of South Australia. I was very pleased indeed to hear what the Chairman of Santos had to say about resource development and I am sure that this is something with which the Leader will not disagree: at least I would be surprised if he did.

This was a statement by the Chairman of a company that is ultimately going to spend more than \$700 000 000 on this project. That company is putting its money where its mouth is and is expressing confidence in future resource development in South Australia. I think it is worth going through the points that Mr Carmichael, Chairman of Santos, made in a recent speech. He said:

Subject to the environmental impact study being approved, construction of the pipeline will be under full steam within two months.

*Mr Millhouse interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mitcham will be silent, or his services will be dispensed with.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Mr Carmichael also said:

Pipe for the line, costing \$35 000 000 to \$40 000 000, was ordered several months ago. Up to 700 people would be employed on the project, and that is only the tip of the iceberg.

Another point was that, with on-going developments and exploration, there ought to be very significant direct employment in South Australia, but more importantly it should act as a catalyst for other things to happen. Once

upon a time, these people would have by-passed us. He also said:

The project can create the right climate for significant developments for South Australia in the 1980s and that there are also direct benefits in terms of royalties.

What this project hopefully will lead to is people in Government, the Public Service and public sector taking the long-term view as an example of how South Australia uses a resources project.

The Cooper Basin is grossly under explored. With the liquids project under way, we will have the cash to explore the Cooper Basin properly.

Those were the points that Mr Carmichael made. They have been made in various ways by members of this Government, particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy, on many occasions. Also, on every possible occasion members of the Opposition have destroyed, or denied or refused to accept that such benefits exist.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Garbage!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yet, now we have the Chairman of one of South Australia's and Australia's biggest companies, Santos, saying exactly the same things. I do not know: perhaps the honourable member will call that garbage, too, but as far as I am concerned, I think it is spot on. Resource development will make the difference between a prosperous South Australia and a depressed South Australia in the 1980s and 1990s. I sincerely hope that the Opposition, which has cast doom and gloom on South Australia's future so assiduously, will now take notice of what this distinguished South Australian company's Chairman has said.

I urge the Opposition to take its head out of the sand and get behind all aspects of resource development instead of persisting with its contrived policy of trying to talk down this State's economic revival. It should realise that resource development has injected wealth into other States, and for the people in other States, particularly in Queensland and Western Australia. It has the potential to do the same for this State, provided that we all get together and let it happen. That is something that I would hope the Opposition, in the interests of all South Australians, would be prepared to do.

### POLICE FORCE

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** In view of the Chief Secretary's answer to the last question, namely, that he would guarantee the safety of the prisoner named by him, will he now admit that his release of that person's name did put his safety at risk, and, if he will not admit that, why not?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I spell out again that the gentleman concerned is not a police informer; no.

### WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr MATHWIN:** Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs investigated delays in many workers compensation cases in the Industrial Court? If he has done that, what action has been taken to overcome these problems?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I have investigated the delays, which were brought to my attention not only by a number of members of this House, but also by the President of the Industrial Commission. I have spoken at length with the President about the nature of the problem. As a result, we have tried to increase judges' availability to hear workers compensation matters. We have appointed a judge to replace the previous judge, who left to join the Family Court. I am delighted that we have now appointed Mr Justice O. Lee.

**Mr Millhouse:** Judge Lee.

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

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Mr Justice Lee is a person who, I believe, has the highest reputation in workers compensation matters in this State. He has been used by a number of outside bodies, and certainly has the confidence of the Government and Opposition in this House. I am pleased to report that the number of cases that have been adjourned because of unavailability of judges has now diminished greatly. I will give the numbers of cases adjourned during this year. In January and February no cases had to be adjourned because of insufficient availability of judges. In March, there were five; in April, six; in May, two; in June, 12; in July, 18; in August, 53; and then in September, owing to our action, it was down to two.

It is a remarkable achievement within one month to reduce that figure from 53 adjourned cases to two. We have also looked at the sorts of delays between a case being first listed and the hearing. I assure honourable members that the President is taking a number of measures, which will take up to six months to implement, that will perhaps even halve the waiting period. The delay and deferral of workers compensation cases in the Industrial Court have, as a result of certain actions taken, now been greatly minimised.

#### POLICE FORCE

**Mr KENEALLY:** In view of the Chief Secretary's answers today, in which he has denied that his release of a prisoner's name has placed that person in danger, what action does he propose to take against Mr Glen Hughes, Superintendent of Yatala Gaol, for making the statement that the prisoner was in real danger and needed the offer of extra security protection?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I do not propose to take any action against Mr Glen Hughes on the newspaper report.

#### ROXBY DOWNS

**Mr EVANS:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy state the status of negotiations with Roxby Management Services regarding the Roxby Downs project?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Government has been negotiating with the operating company, Roxby Management Services, for some months now in relation to the details of an indenture for that development. It was interesting to note the report, which the Premier gave in answer to a question a moment ago, that the other major resource development (the Cooper Basin development) was described by its Chairman (Mr Carmichael) in a lunch-time speech yesterday when he made some comments about the South Australian Government that were faithfully reported in the *Advertiser* this morning. It was pleasing to note that Mr Carmichael saw fit to say that he was pleased indeed by the attitude of the South Australian Government, the negotiating stance taken by the Government, and the fact that the Government was keen to get on with these developments.

As I have reported to the House previously, we have indicated that we have been getting on well with these negotiations. In a speech I made a week ago I mentioned the benefits of this resource development and also paid a tribute to the co-operation of the companies involved in these negotiations, and we are making good progress. The indenture for the Roxby Downs development is well advanced. It would be improper for me to disclose publicly any of the details of that indenture, but I did indicate in

the speech (which, again, was reported well by, I think, John Field of the *Advertiser*) the broad range of matters one would expect to be covered in that indenture.

The credit managers to whom I was speaking were interested in what I had to say and they had a proper appreciation of the importance to the State of that project. The lead article in the supplement on State development in the morning daily press this week also referred to the fact that we are entering a boom period in relation to mining and petroleum activity and exploration, and quite properly the figures quoted indicated that we have significant record levels of exploration. Much interest is being generated in this State as a result of the change of Government and the change of policy. If members of the Opposition particularly and the public generally would only have taken time to look at that level of activity, we would not have had that island of gloom appearing in the middle of that otherwise very optimistic series of articles in that supplement.

The indenture negotiations are well advanced. All of the major items on which we have been negotiating have been settled. Some matters of detail are not yet settled, but I am quite confident that within a matter of weeks that indenture will be ready to be presented to the Parliament.

I hope that, during the intervening period, Opposition members can sort themselves out in relation to the importance of this project to the State. It seems to me that the only people who have not realised its importance are the left wing activists who have the numbers in the Labor Party at present.

**Mr Langley:** What category am I in?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Quite frankly, it is very hard to put a finger on that one.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is difficult indeed to categorise the honourable member. We know perfectly well that there is a sane element—and I say this not with any charity—in the Labor Party. The only problem is that they are greatly outnumbered at the moment. When this Government inherited the carriage of the Roxby Downs matter, it followed in the path laid out in the first instance by Premier Dunstan, and reaffirmed and supported by Premier Corcoran. We reaffirmed the letters of intent and gave the same undertakings, and now matters must be carried further. I know that on occasions this may embarrass the member for Hartley, but it must grieve a man of his calibre, as it must the saner elements who have now departed the scene, to see what is happening to the Party. We had the spectacle yesterday of people of that calibre having to fall into line behind the member for Elizabeth in this charade of an attack on the police. That must grieve—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I can always tell how effective are my replies from the knee jerk reactions opposite. It must have grieved the saner members of the Labor Party out in the wider world to see the Labor Party falling in behind the man who, in his attack on the police, was saying that the Leader was a traitor and guilty of treachery.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question before the Chair is in relation to mining. It is as Minister of Mines and Energy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is as Minister of Mines and Energy that the honourable Deputy Premier has been called.

**Mr Hamilton:** Get out of the gutter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Albert Park.

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And the honourable member for Mitchell.

**Mr Becker:** Name them.

**The SPEAKER:** And the member for Hanson.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** You'll have the whole House named.

**The SPEAKER:** And the member for Elizabeth. Now we will have silence.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In elaborating on the point about the left wing dominance in the Party, perhaps I have hurt a few sensitivities opposite. However, in conclusion, let me say that the Roxby Downs indenture is well advanced. As I said a week ago, we have found the Roxby Downs management services negotiators very satisfactory people with whom to deal, as we have found the Santos negotiators. We expect to be in a position to present both indentures to Parliament certainly during this session and possibly during this calendar year.

#### FIRE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

**Mr ABBOTT:** In the interests of public safety of both life and property, will the Chief Secretary, as Minister responsible for the South Australian Fire Brigade, require the Minister of Industrial Affairs to cease interfering in the wage claim being pursued by the Fire Officers Association? The Fire Officers Association has been trying to negotiate a wage increase since June 1980. I understand that substantial agreement has been reached with the Fire Brigade Board on restoring the relativities sought. I also understand that the board agrees that any increase should be retrospective to October 1980, as in the case of the Fire Officers Association, but that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has decided that the increase is to be \$10 only, and three months retrospectivity is all that will be granted. The Fire Officers Association is a most responsible organisation, with a history of always placing public safety before the pursuit of wage claims through industrial action; they have never withdrawn their labour. However, they believe that the Government is now taking advantage of their unwillingness to strike to deny them wage justice.

Because of the actions of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, work bans and working to rule are being enforced. Strike action is now being contemplated, and none of this would have been necessary and the resolution could have been reached today if the parties were able to negotiate direct.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I rule that the question is out of order, and it is quite clearly so. If the honourable member refers to Erskine May, he will see at page 331, placitum (10):

It is not in order to put to a Minister a question for which another Minister is more directly responsible, or ask one Minister to influence the action of another.

#### MURRAY RIVER

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister of Water Resources give the House and the people of South Australia any information about the higher water level passing down the Murray River at present? As we all know the extent to which we rely upon the Murray River, Australia's greatest river, I wonder whether the Minister can outline for us whether there are any good effects as well as bad effects as a consequence of the present high river level and whether it will mean that some of the other States through which the river passes may begin to forget the problems associated with this great river of ours.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I believe it would be a great pity if the people of Australia were to be lulled into a false

sense of security as a result of the current high river flows in the Murray/Darling system. The flow entering South Australia peaked at 122 000 megalitres per day and that has currently fallen to approximately 107 000 megalitres. So, in fact, the high river is on the decline and the peak is currently in the vicinity of Waikerie. It is anticipated that the locks in the upper reaches of the Murray will commence to be reinstated in the next week or fortnight. Once the first lock goes in, naturally the river will fall out very quickly and we will soon be back to a more regulated flow of the normal full level situation.

There is no doubt that the current high flows in the Murray River and the Murray/Darling system have been an enormous benefit, even if it is in the comparatively short term. Salinity levels have dropped significantly from last summer in the vicinity of a 1 000 e.c. units at Morgan to about 200 or 300, and there is a tremendous benefit as a result of that. As to the environment and ecology of the river, there have been tremendous benefits to vegetation and wildlife. As I said earlier, it would be a great pity if the people of South Australia, in particular, and others in Australia were lulled into a sense of false security and expected that the low flow and high salinity levels experienced last summer had gone for all time. That is certainly not the case.

As such, we should continue with the work that has been commenced, particularly in relation to the headway that was made last Friday where co-operation between the three States and the Commonwealth has led to a significant first step in coming to grips with the overall pollution problem of the total river system. It is only a first step towards a situation that we must continue to strive for now and for many years to come if we are going to ultimately control all pollution factors. As the honourable member said, the Murray is of vital concern to South Australia, being the State's chief source of water supply. Since so many people in South Australia and particularly in the metropolitan area are so vitally dependent on it, then it is up to every one of us to maintain that vigilance and make sure that we continue to make progress similar to that made in the past year or two.

The advent of the Dartmouth Dam in November 1979 has in itself resulted in a significant lowering in the overall salinity level. However, it can be quite clearly identified that, if additional works are not undertaken and pursued as a matter of urgency, the benefits derived from that \$138 000 000 capital works project will be lost over the next 10 years, and there is no way that that can be allowed to happen. As a result of the agreement reached last Friday in Melbourne, I believe that we have taken the first significant step forward in overcoming the problem since the creation of the River Murray Commission.

#### FIRE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

**Mr ABBOTT:** Thank you for the call, Mr Speaker. I will rephrase my earlier question and now direct it to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. In the interests of public safety of both life and property, will the Minister of Industrial Affairs cease interfering in the wage claim currently being pursued by the Fire Officers Association. The explanation—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest, with due regard to the honourable member, that the explanation was heard by the House quite recently.

**Mr Keneally:** It will be incorporated in *Hansard*?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The explanation was given previously. The question was not ruled out of order until after the explanation had been concluded. Unless the honourable member has new information to submit to the House, I

suggest that the explanation to his question just given has already been received.

**Mr ABBOTT:** There is no new information.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The matter concerning what salary is passed on or approved by any board of a statutory authority is a matter for approval by what is called the Co-ordinating Committee on Salaries. This committee was set up under the previous Government by the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is a procedure that this Government has carried forward, and it is a good procedure; it means that there is uniformity and some co-ordination within Government as to what salary increases are granted by any individual statutory authority, ensuring that anomalies do not occur. The Government has carried on that practice. Any wage offer by the South Australian Fire Brigade Board is approved by the co-ordinating committee, which sets a limit based on \$10 a week. I highlight to the honourable member (who may not know the facts here—in fact I think he probably does not, because he would not have asked the question if he did know that—

**Mr Abbott:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I am answering the question. The matter is before the Industrial Commission at present. About two weeks ago Commissioner Cotton set down a fixed procedure, and he gave the parties a week to negotiate. He said that, if they failed to reach agreement, the matter should come back to him for arbitration. The matter went before him last Tuesday and the case is set down for tomorrow. We expect the matter to be finalised in terms of a hearing in the Industrial Commission tomorrow. The honourable member's accusing me of interfering, when the matter is in fact before the Industrial Commission, I think highlights his own ignorance.

I also point out to the honourable member, who is obviously ignorant of some of the other facts as well, that Industrial Commissioner Cotton made a specific request that any bans should be immediately lifted if he was to hear the case. He put that demand to the unions as he put a demand to the Government to come up with an answer or an offer within a certain period, which the Government did. There is no risk to either property or life if the union wishes to abide by the ruling or the order of Commissioner Cotton. It is not my threat or interference that is causing any risk to property or life. The bans have been imposed by the union in direct contradiction of the order granted by Commissioner Cotton.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Are the bans now on or off?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** It is a little difficult to determine whether they are on or off. Commissioner Cotton indicated that he would not hear the case if the bans were on, so on every day that there is due to be a hearing the bans are lifted, but they are imposed again the next day, which I think is a bit irresponsible. The Secretary of the Fire Officers Association himself said (and I think it was a responsible statement from him) that they would now take the matter to the Industrial Commission.

**Mr Keneally:** You won't speak to Mr Buttery. Six times he tried to get to you.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I have spoken to Mr Buttery. My officers have spoken recently to the industrial officer of the South Australian Fire Brigades Board, with whom quite rightly the officers should be negotiating. It is not my interference. It is a matter that has to be approved by the co-ordinating committee. I do not sit on the co-ordinating committee. But it is within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and it is chaired by Mr Max Johnson, the Deputy Director of that department, and that is how it should be. As I pointed out, the Secretary of the union himself said, after we made the offer of \$10 a week,

that they would not accept it; they would now lift the bans and take the matter into the Industrial Commission.

**An honourable member:** Who made the offer? You said 'we'.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I used the word 'we' on behalf of the co-ordinating committee which, after all, comes under my Ministerial responsibility, and there is nothing unusual about that. I stress the point that they said that they would lift the bans and take the matter into the Industrial Court. Several days later they reimposed bans, and then I understand that they lifted them for a hearing yesterday, or the day before, and I understand that they are on again today. To answer the Deputy Leader, one can never be certain whether the bans are on or off. But I do stress the point that, if there is any risk to property or life, it is because of the bans imposed by the union against the order of the Industrial Commission. There is no evidence whatsoever that I have unnecessarily meddled or done anything else with this wage claim.

### GRAIN THEFTS

**Mr BECKER:** Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of any grain thefts in South Australia? I note in an article in the *National Farmer* of 8 October 1981, under the heading 'The Great Harvest Hijack', the following:

This harvest Australian graingrowers will again be plundered of millions of dollars worth of grain. Grain stealing is a growth industry in many areas of the Australian wheat belt. The parcels of grain 'lifted' are usually small—a few tonnes a time—but in total they could add up to tens of thousands of tonnes nationwide.

The article goes on:

Recently it was revealed that in one season the New South Wales Grain Elevators Board (now the revamped Grain Handling Authority) 'misplaced' 76 000 tonnes of grain worth some \$12 million. The New South Wales Agriculture Minister Hallam is to call for strictly increased security measures. This year every truck carting wheat will have to carry documents, and any truck will be open to being stopped and the driver interrogated by police. Over the past 10 years, press allegations have suggested that wheat stealing could have accounted for as much as 50 000 tonnes in any year—

That would currently be worth about \$8 000 000 per annum. In view of the possibility of another good grain season and the importance of the rural industry to South Australia's economy, I am most interested in being assured that this type of activity is not being carried on in South Australia.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I am unable to give the member for Hanson an assurance that it is not occurring, but I am aware that thefts of the kind described have occurred in the grain industry in South Australia. In fact, a little over two years ago, there was an incident revealed in the Jamestown region where an agent was found to be stealing grain by what has been described as a fairly devious method. I understand from my colleague representing that district that a successful prosecution followed the revealing of that incident. Since that time I personally have not heard of any specific cases, but it is true that many thousands of tonnes of grain throughout Australia are diverted from time to time, and 50 000 tonnes has been mentioned in the year referred to by the honourable member.

I am also aware that the Hon. Jack Hallam, Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales, has taken very positive steps to tighten up the security system there in the movement of grain from farm to silo and from silo to dispatch port. It may be that if evidence surfaces about these incidents occurring in South Australia we will need to look at tightening up grain transport and the requirement of load orders, and so on, over and above the system that the bulk handling authorities have applied here.

It is worthy to note, bearing in mind our alert and effective Chief Secretary in South Australia, his good relationship with the Police Force and the efficiency of that Police Force, that should any such activities be drawn to our attention they will immediately be stopped. I appreciate the honourable member's raising this subject, and I will examine the article he mentioned in the 8 October issue of the *National Farmer* and discuss the matter with officers of my department and our ex-colleague in this place who represents the bulk handling authorities in this State, the now Chairman, Mr Howard Venning, from Crystal Brook.

### MURRAY RIVER

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Will the Premier tell the House whether the legislation to be introduced in this House, following the conference held last week in Melbourne, is similar to the legislation drawn up in about 1976? Will it contain the power of veto on the part of any State on any decision made by the River Murray Commission in relation to quality? I do not ask this question out of any disrespect for the Minister of Water Resources, as it was the Premier who made the statement on this matter following the conference. Further, have the computer studies to which the Premier referred been in train for some time? Indeed, it was my understanding that the River Murray Commission had been given the extended function, if not the power, to look at matters of quality, as well as quantity, in relation to the Murray River. But I am extremely interested to know whether or not the legislation will contain the power of veto to any State on any matter put forward as a recommendation by the River Murray Commission.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very conscious of the member for Hartley's interest in this matter, and thank him for the question. The meeting last Friday was the culmination of nearly eight years of negotiation, as he would well know, he himself having taken a prominent part in that negotiation until just over two years ago. The agreement that has been reached there, particularly in regard to the one clause which was the sticky point with New South Wales, in particular, now means that the River Murray Commission will have that power to consider water quality. I am not in a position to give details of the exact provisions of the Bill, except that it will be uniform and brought into the Federal House and ratified by the other three State Houses. I would think that the honourable member would have a reasonable idea of its provisions.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It's the power of veto that I am worried about.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think that that will be satisfactorily looked after. The important thing is that, until the officers have finished detailed negotiations, we will not have the final form of the Bill, but the general principles are agreed to. As to the computer studies, it is very likely that the computer-based model will be completed in less than the original two years which was proposed. The Commonwealth Government, particularly, has shown its very great interest and concern in the matter. I understand that it will make it possible for the studies to be conducted not in one section but in two ongoing programmes, one beginning before the first is completed. Hopefully, it will be only 18 months or even less before we get the results of that computer model.

In its submission to the Federal Government, South Australia put forward what has been termed a permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem, which involved a total expenditure of some \$400 000 000. Of all those known points, the Federal Government, and all Governments, admit that there is in principle a good case to be

made. Setting a water quality standard, particularly at the border, is of special interest to South Australia.

Whilst we also put forward a proposal that there should be a moratorium on up-stream development, both in New South Wales and Victoria, we would not insist on that any longer if a satisfactory water quality standard could be set at the border and adhered to. Obviously, the answer to the entire problem lies with the adoption not only of desalination and drainage works but also of the specific micro-irrigation—

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Hartley is interested, even if the member for Stuart is not. The answer obviously lies in the adoption of the micro-irrigation techniques, either by drip or micro-spray, and it was particularly heartening to hear the Prime Minister express, almost in the first stages of that meeting, his commitment to the introduction of new irrigation techniques to avoid the leaching out of salt from the soil and putting it into the river. Agreement has been reached in principle to all the clauses as proposed by the working party. I think the member for Hartley will be well aware of the provisions put forward by that working party. Those provisions will be developed, and I hope that we will see legislation presented in the relatively near future. As to the study, that will come without waiting for the actual legislation to come through, and approval will be given.

### PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

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

That the suggested guidelines regarding appearances of South Australian public servants as witnesses before Parliamentary Committees, set out in Appendix II of the Report of the Committee on Guidelines for Public Servants Appearing before Parliamentary Committees, laid on the table of this House on 29 September 1981, be adopted.

This matter has already been introduced and considered in another place, and in the interests of brevity and expedition I seek leave to have the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation

As members will know, last year the Government tabled in Parliament a set of guidelines (with the emphasis on 'guidelines') to assist public servants required to give evidence before Parliamentary committees. That document was the result of months of extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association. The intention of the Government has been to safeguard the political impartiality of the Public Service without compromising the Government's commitment to strengthen the Parliamentary committee system, or the right of the Parliament to control that system.

The increasing use of the committee system by the Parliament has led to a growing demand being placed upon public servants to provide written and oral evidence. Often, these public servants have had little prior experience of being questioned by Parliamentary committees and are uncertain as to their position and the procedures to follow. Because of the debate (a lot of it misplaced) which that draft set of guidelines caused, the Government established a broadly based committee to review the matter further. We announced that decision in September 1980, and the committee was formally established on 1 December 1980.



The committee comprised Mr Gordon Combe, as independent Chairman, the President and the Speaker, a representative from each of the Government and Opposition, a representative from the Public Service Board, and a representative from the Public Service Association.

The committee was given the following terms of reference:

To advise the Premier as to the necessity for, and content of, a statement of principles and procedures to inform and guide public servants who are called to give evidence to Parliamentary committees.

The committee, in determining the necessity for and desirability of guidelines, received evidence from a number of witnesses. The Chairman of the Public Service Board gave a detailed submission, and the committee interviewed seven public servants from various levels of the Public Service—all but one of them had appeared before Parliamentary committees. Comments were sought on whether or not guidelines were necessary or desirable. A summary of this evidence can be found in the report. In the opinion of most witnesses, some information and advice would be helpful in preparing public servants for Parliamentary appearances.

The committee found that, while problems were not common in South Australia, there had been several unfortunate incidents which should not have occurred. The committee also found that there was general support for guidelines, which succinctly summarised key points of proper practice and existing convention. The committee also found that it was appropriate to recognise that any guidelines should relate not only to the rights and responsibilities of public servants appearing before committees but also should seek to clarify the responsibilities of the committees themselves towards public servants. Information was available to the committee as to practices in the Commonwealth and other States. There is a brief summary of all this information in the report. While it is apparent that practices throughout Australia do vary, guidance is usually provided for public servants where Parliamentary committees are used.

The Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration, for example, made a number of recommendations in its report. It suggested that the Government prepare, for the guidance of officials and for discussion, a statement of the principles and procedures that ought to be followed when public servants appear before Parliamentary committees. The Commonwealth Government agreed in broad terms with the Royal Commission's proposal to issue guidelines to officials, and a set of guidelines, similar to what we have before us now, was tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament in September 1978, and formally issued in 1979.

The South Australian committee prepared the guidelines that have been tabled with several major principles in mind. First, that public servants should not be expected to become embroiled in political controversy. Public servants should be asked questions of fact and not be subject to questions that require expressions of political opinion. The traditional approach of the public servant under the Westminster style of Government must be maintained. Secondly, it is the Government's policy to support a free flow of information through the Parliamentary committees to the public, consistent with that level of confidence required for the good government of the State, and the privacy of individual citizens. Thirdly, that Parliament ultimately has the right to determine its own procedures in relation to Parliamentary committees.

It can be seen that the 10 points in the new guidelines seek to embody these principles as a means of informing not only public servants, but also Parliamentary committee members, and the general public, of existing conventions and fair and proper practice. Guidelines numbers one and

two give general background information on how the Parliamentary committee system works. The third merely reaffirms that public servants should be frank in their answers whilst remaining politically impartial. The fourth guideline highlights the need for fair and balanced reporting by committees where their findings differ from or criticise witnesses. No-one could disagree with that. Guideline number five explains that a Parliamentary committee should define, with reasonable notice, the nature and extent of matters to be raised, so that thorough and appropriate preparations can be made. Instances were given to the committee of witnesses not being given reasonable briefing by a representative of the committee or its secretary on the ambit of the proposed evidence or, having been given an indication of the ambit, undertook preparation only to find that there was limited questioning on this material but extensive questioning on matters for which they had not been prepared, or which was outside their competence or responsibility.

Guideline number six deals with informal discussions between committee members and public servants and notes that witnesses should observe the same standards in informal meetings as would apply to a formal hearing. The seventh guideline says, in part:

Witnesses should not comment, or be expected to comment, on matters beyond their expertise or responsibility, especially where other departments or agencies are involved.

If this guideline had been in operation three years ago, then a senior public servant may have been spared the indignity of being criticised by the Public Accounts Committee, after being led to comment on matters beyond his knowledge and level of responsibility. Indeed, the member for Elizabeth, as the then Minister of Health, wrote to the Public Accounts Committee protesting the embarrassment caused to the public servant concerned.

Guidelines numbers eight and nine deal in broad terms with the duty of public servants to provide information of a factual and background nature whilst not commenting on matters of a Party-political nature or policy. This is again in keeping with the Westminster tradition of a politically independent Public Service. The last guideline refers to cases where a witness, or a committee, believes that certain information or opinions should not be divulged, pending clarification with the Minister or the seeking of further information. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to detract from Parliament's opportunities to acquire information to which it is properly entitled, or to inhibit the legitimate inquiries of Parliamentary committees. On the contrary, the guidelines are reasonable, and should be seen as non-controversial aids to public servants and committees.

The minority reports of the Hon. Mr Sumner and the representative from the Public Service Association assert that there is no established need for the guidelines. The majority of the committee found that guidelines were both desirable and necessary. I am confident that, notwithstanding the minority reports which really focus on the necessity or desirability for the guidelines, the Hon. Mr Sumner and Mr Connelly would be prepared to accept the guidelines as reasonable. The Government supports the majority view of the committee. The guidelines are fair, reasonable and balanced and will provide a codification of existing procedures and principles so that the Parliamentary committee system can operate more efficiently without compromising the position of public servants.

**Mr BANNON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1980. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its purpose is to give effect to one element of the Government's Budget strategy for 1981-82 and to clear up some other matters and bring them more into line with current commercial practice. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Remainder of Explanation

When the 1981-82 Budget was introduced, members were given a detailed rundown of the State's financial position and the prospects for 1981-82. The Government said then that the financial stringency of the Commonwealth Government and the emerging resurgence of excessive wage demands made it necessary for the Government not only to impose severe restraint on its own expenditures, but also to adjust some rates of taxation to bring them more into line with the position in other States. Accordingly, this Bill provides for stamp duty on all cheques to increase from 8 cents to 10 cents from 1 November 1981. It contains provisions to minimise inconvenience to the banking public by allowing cheques which have been issued to customers in the normal course of business prior to the operation of the increased rate to be used without payment of the additional duty.

That increase will bring the rate in South Australia to the same level as is now operating in New South Wales and Queensland and to the reduced level which it is understood will operate in Victoria shortly. It will be well below the rate of 15 cents announced in the 1981-82 Budget of the Tasmanian Government.

This change will bring in about \$600 000 in 1981-82 and about \$1 000 000 in a full year. In proposing this increase on cheques, which attract duty as a form of bill of exchange, the Government is well aware that there are other mechanisms for undertaking financial transactions that do not attract duty even though they fulfil a similar or identical function. At the moment, we believe those mechanisms are replacing the cash transaction rather than the traditional cheque transaction. Nevertheless, the Government will keep the overall situation under review and, if it is found that the present arrangements are unduly discriminatory with regard to cheques, we will take the necessary steps to ensure that the burden of this tax is spread more equitably.

It has been suggested that some cheque users may take advantage of the period to 1 November 1981 to increase their stocks of cheque forms in order to avoid the increased duty. That suggestion would seem to run counter to the Government's experience with banking institutions and business houses in this State. However, if evidence showed that cheques were being issued during this period at a rate which past experience showed as being beyond normal requirements, then the Government would have to consider removing the exemption and, for the future, may have to consider seriously returning to the system under which the amount of duty is printed on each cheque form. The Government is sure that all parties would want to avoid the necessity for such a cumbersome and expensive arrangement.

In addition to this revenue-raising measure, the Bill provides for four other matters.

First, it provides for an exemption from the aggregation provision relating to duty on conveyances of land (section

66ab) in any case where separate parcels of land used for primary production are sold to different purchasers who are buying independently of each other. Legislation introduced in 1975 to forestall duty avoidance provided that the value of land could be aggregated by the Commissioner of Stamps for duty purposes where a property was divided into smaller parcels for the purpose of the sale, thereby avoiding the increased rates of duty payable on the higher value transactions. It has been drawn to the Government's attention that any transaction involving the sale of a single property in separate portions where each sale is contingent upon the other (as frequently happens in sales of rural properties) falls within the current legislation. We do not believe that this was the intention of the legislation, and the proposed amendment excludes those conveyances of land to different purchasers where the land is used wholly or mainly for primary production and where the Commissioner of Stamps is satisfied that each portion of the land will continue to be used for primary production separately and independently from the other.

Secondly, the Bill provides an exemption from stamp duty with respect to odd-lot specialists. Odd lots are marketable securities (or rights thereto) that are offered for sale in quantities which do not constitute a marketable parcel. The purpose of the operation is to buy all odd lots as they become available, accumulate them to a marketable parcel and then sell that parcel. Odd-lot specialists are brokers appointed by a Stock Exchange for the purpose of buying and selling odd lots, and the Stock Exchange of Adelaide has recently appointed such a specialist.

The Stamp Duties Acts of all other States provide for the exemption of odd-lot specialists, in respect to the sale and purchase of odd lots, from duty and from the requirement imposed on other brokers to record and include in their weekly return, which is subject to stamp duty, all sales and purchases of shares. The South Australian Stamp Duties Act contains no provision with respect to odd-lot specialists, probably because none were operating in this State when the legislation was enacted. It is believed that it is appropriate that South Australia should adopt similar practices to other States and grant exemption to odd-lot specialists.

Thirdly, the Bill provides for the repeal of sections 311 and 31p of the Act which are designed to prevent the duty payable on credit or rental business or instalment purchase agreements being passed on to the consumer. Similar provisions do not exist in the corresponding legislation of the other States. The provisions achieve little in practice as it is understood that most lenders in this State cover the duty component of their overheads by adjusting rates of interest. The Government has obtained assurances from credit providers that consumers will not be disadvantaged by the repeal of these provisions. Finally, the Bill provides for a simplified procedure for denoting payment of duty in respect of share transfers arising from a company take-over.

Where a company is taken over, it is usual for a large number of share transfers to be executed (in some cases in excess of 1 000). Under the Act in its present form, each instrument of transfer must be separately assessed and stamped with an impressed stamp. Under the Bill, it is proposed that a single statement may be prepared and accepted for stamping, in which case each separate instrument of transfer will be deemed to have been duly stamped. This change has been requested by parties involved in such situations, and similar provisions apply in other States.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clauses 3 and 4 repeal sections 311 and 31p, respectively. Section 311 provides that a registered person liable to pay stamp duty in respect of a credit or rental transaction

is not to add the amount of the duty or any part of that amount to the amount payable by the other party to the transaction. Section 31p makes a corresponding provision in respect of an instalment purchase transaction by prohibiting the vendor under such a transaction from adding the whole or part of the amount of the duty payable in respect of the transaction to the amount payable by the purchaser under the transaction.

Clause 5 repeals sections 47b, 47c and 47d; this is consequential upon the amendments proposed by clause 5. Clause 6 amends section 48 by removing a reference to eight cents, the existing rate of duty on bills of exchange, etc., and replacing it with a reference to 10 cents, the proposed new rate of duty. Clause 7 amends section 48a, which deals with the payment of duty on cheques. Under the section, a bank, as defined, may obtain a licence authorising it to pay the duty on cheques under a return system that is related to the issue of cheque forms.

Where duty is paid in this way, the cheque forms have printed on them the statement that stamp duty has been paid. The clause amends this section so that it provides that a cheque is duly stamped if it was drawn on a form which was issued by a bank pursuant to a licence under the section, notwithstanding that before the time at which the cheque was drawn the rate of duty increased. Under the clause, this exemption also applies to cheque forms issued by a bank, where duty on cheques drawn on the forms is prepaid by applying impressed stamps to the forms. The clause goes on to provide that these exemptions will not apply to cheques drawn after a day specified by proclamation, in which case the correct amount of duty must be paid by application of an adhesive stamp or an impressed stamp or under an arrangement made with the Commissioner of Stamps.

Clause 8 amends section 66ab of the principal Act; this section provides that, for the purposes of determining *ad valorem* duty on conveyances of land, the amounts by reference to which the duty would otherwise have been calculated shall be aggregated in any case where land is conveyed by separate conveyances which arise from a single contract of sale or together, form, or arise from, substantially one transaction or one series of transactions. The clause inserts a new subsection (1b), which provides that aggregation is not to apply where land used wholly or mainly for primary production is conveyed to different persons by separate conveyances arising from sales made to different persons if the Commissioner is satisfied that the separate parcels conveyed are to be used wholly or mainly for primary production and that no arrangement or understanding exists between the purchasers under which the parcels of land conveyed by the separate conveyances are to be used otherwise than separately and independently from each other.

Clause 9 amends section 90a of the principal Act which sets out certain definitions for the purposes of Part IIIA relating to the duty on sales and purchases of marketable securities by stockbrokers. The clause inserts definitions of 'odd lot' and 'odd-lot specialist'. 'Odd lot' is defined to mean a parcel of marketable securities which is, under the rules of the Stock Exchange on which the sale or purchase is effected, required to be bought or sold through an odd-lot specialist. 'Odd-lot specialist' is defined to mean a broker who is appointed by the Stock Exchange of Adelaide Limited for the purpose of buying and selling odd lots.

Clause 10 amends section 90c of the principal Act which requires each South Australian dealer to keep a record of certain sales and purchases of marketable securities made by the dealer on behalf of another person or on his own account. This record then, under section 90d, forms the basis of a return which is required to be lodged with the

Commissioner on a weekly basis and on which stamp duty is charged. The clause amends section 90c so that a South Australian dealer is not required to include in this record a sale or purchase of an odd lot by an odd-lot specialist, thereby exempting such sales and purchases from the duty charged on the weekly returns lodged under section 90d.

Clause 11 amends section 106a, which prohibits registration of transfers of marketable securities unless each instrument of transfer is duly stamped. The clause amends this section so that it provides that, upon payment of the duty on transfers of marketable securities pursuant to a take-over scheme, the Commissioner may denote payment of the duty on a single written statement instead of by the stamping of each instrument of transfer. The clause goes on to provide that, where payment of duty is denoted on a statement in this way, each instrument of transfer to which the statement relates is then deemed to have been duly stamped.

Clause 12 amends the second schedule to the principal Act by increasing the duty on each bill of exchange (cheque, order, etc.) payable on demand and each coupon and interest warrant from 0.08 cents to 0.10 cents. Duty on each bill of exchange and promissory note drawn or made out of South Australia and duly stamped with *ad valorem* duty under a law of another State is also increased from 0.08 cents to 0.10 cents under this clause.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1978. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

On many occasions over the past two years this Government has reaffirmed its electoral promise to ease the administrative burden placed on industry, and in particular small businesses, by Government regulation. With the presentation of the de-regulation report in August 1980 and more recently the completion of the Report of the Working Party on Small Business Licensing in June this year, the Government now has a firm basis upon which to programme significant changes in this area.

One of the most important recommendations of the working party on Small Business Licensing was the further investigation of the feasibility of a consolidated licensing scheme and common billing cycle in respect of all State Government licensing. Such a study is currently being undertaken by representatives of appropriate departments under the co-ordination of an officer of the Public Service Board. In the interim, the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment has been examining its various registration and licensing procedures in association with bodies representing the interests of businesses affected.

This short Bill provides for amendments to the principal Act, the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1978, designed to facilitate introduction by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment of a system of single annual application and billing for registrations and licences under the various Acts administered by that department.

The phasing in of the new system commenced on 1 October 1981, with the bringing into operation of the registration provisions of the Dangerous Substances Act. The initial registration certificates under that legislation have been issued for the period required to bring the

renewal date into line with the related industrial premises renewal date. However, to enable the new system to be fully implemented it is necessary to make certain legislative amendments. Although most of these changes require amendment only to the relevant regulations, certain minor amendments need to be made to section 24 of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act that deals with registration of industrial premises. The proposed changes will facilitate registration renewal periods of less than one year, with payment of fees on a pro rata basis to enable existing registration expiry dates to have a common renewal date in respect of each business.

The Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment plans to have completed conversion to the new-system single annual registration and billing within 18 months.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 24 of the principal Act, which provides for the registration of industrial premises. The clause amends this section so that it authorises the granting or renewal of registration for a period fixed by the Permanent Head and the fixing of fees that may vary according to the period for which registration is granted or renewed.

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

#### STATUTE REVISION (FRUIT PESTS) BILL

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1978, and to repeal the Oriental Fruit Moth Act, 1962-1978, the Red Scale Control Act, 1962-1978, and the San Jose Scale Control Act, 1962-1978. Read a first time.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** 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 makes extensive amendments to the Fruit Fly Act and repeals the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, the Red Scale Control Act and the San Jose Scale Control Act. With recent developments in biological and integrated control, the need for active committees to deal with oriental fruit moth, red scale, and San Jose scale no longer exists. (It should be noted however that the Waikerie Red Scale Committee will continue on a non-statutory basis and the Government will act to ensure that it retains its current assets for the purpose of its continuing operations.) The three pests are now widely dispersed and there is therefore no present need for concerted containment measures to prevent their spread from property to property. The Government believes that the committees together with the statutory framework under which they operate can now be abolished. Hence, the present Bill provides for the repeal of the Oriental Fruit Moth Act, the Red Scale Control Act and the San Jose Scale Control Act.

The Fruit Fly Compensation Committee has not operated since about 1974 when eradication methods were revised to operate in such a way that very little fruit removal occurs. The committee required a separate compensation Act to be passed each year before it could operate and this was appropriate where a large number of claims were involved. Compensation claims for fruit or damage are now extremely rare and are dealt with by direct Ministerial approval. The present Bill amends the Fruit Fly Act to reflect this altered

position. The principal Act, as amended by the Bill, will provide simply that the Minister may, out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose, pay compensation to any person who suffers loss in consequence of measures taken in pursuance of Statute to control or eradicate fruit fly.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the Fruit Fly Act in the manner outlined above. Clause 4 repeals the Oriental Fruit Moth Act, the Red Scale Control Act and the San Jose Scale Control Act. The assets and liabilities of the statutory committees established under those Acts will vest in the Crown. But in the case of the Waikerie Red Scale Control Committee it is the Government's intention to return the assets to the proposed new non-statutory committee when satisfactory arrangements have been completed.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on 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 21 October. Page 1510.)

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** When this debate was adjourned last evening I was referring to the work of the Budget Estimates Committees. I wish also to comment briefly on the work of the Committees this year. I was somewhat concerned about the attempt by the Government members on these Committees to limit this year the scope of questioning by the Opposition, particularly the comments that were made from time to time about the need to confine questioning to matters of an accounting nature and the criticism resulting from what they alleged were questions relating to policy matters.

**Mr Lewis:** Which Government members?

**Mr CRAFTER:** I suggest that you read the debates of the Committees of which I was a member. The criticisms of asking policy questions are, in my view, totally without foundation. If we on the Opposition benches are to be reduced to asking questions of an accounting nature, there is no role for us as Parliamentarians. We may as well have qualified accountants come here and test the veracity of the financial statements of the Government, department by department.

Our role in these Committees is far different from the role of an accountant. It is very much to test the policies of the Government and the priorities that the Government gives in implementing those policies. In that way, this is one of the few opportunities that we have to challenge the Ministers to express their policies and the priorities that they give to implementing those policies throughout the respective departments of the Government. I want to refer briefly to the comments made by the member for Brighton last evening about the health lines, particularly these comments:

I would like first 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.

I find that an extraordinary statement to be made by a member of the Government Party. Presumably, the member had researched this matter and obtained information from the Minister of Health, who, I think, was present in the Chamber when he made that statement, or at least just prior to that. This involves a sum of money to this State of about \$126 000 000, and it seems to me quite unbelievable that the Treasury officials would not be involved in negotiations on a matter so vital to the economy of this State as the renegotiations of the Commonwealth-State health agreement for the funding of hospitals.

Indeed, I would think it is not the Minister of Health who attends Premiers' Conferences or Loan Council meetings but the Premier and Treasurer. I would be surprised if it was not of concern to the Treasurer that he had his officers involved in a Commonwealth-State negotiation, whether they be in the health area or in any other area. In fact, they form part of the whole Commonwealth-State financial package.

It seems to me that, if the situation has declined to a stage where individual Government instrumentalities and departments are negotiating their own separate agreements without any Treasury involvement or overall financial planning, we must be directing our attention, as an Opposition, to the nature of those financial arrangements. We sought that by way of a briefing by Treasury officials. On the Wednesday of the week prior to the Estimates Committee relating to the health budget, we received, as did all members of Parliament, a blue booklet containing the most valuable information that we had received in relation to health funding. On the following day, the Opposition health committee met, and it was clear that we could not understand the complexities of the Commonwealth-State financial agreement and aspects of its implementation, particularly from the blue booklet, and the other financial documents provided to us.

We sought a briefing, but not from the Health Commission, because I believe that that would have compromised the officers of the commission. They were to come to the Committee a few days hence to be questioned, with their Minister, on that policy. Indeed, their responsibility is to carry out the policy of the Government in relation to the provision of health care in this State. It would have been a difficult position for Health Commission officials to find themselves in prior to the Estimates Committee if we had talked to them on this matter. However, I think it would have been proper for members of the Opposition to have been briefed by Treasury officials on the objective nature of the renegotiated agreement and how it fitted into overall Commonwealth-State financial matters. However, much to our regret, that was denied Opposition members. Instead, we were offered 30 minutes with the Chairman of the Health Commission on the evening prior to the sitting of the Estimates Committee.

I notice that the member for Brighton referred to this as indeed a very generous offer. Because it was rejected, for the reasons I have given, he has said that this will be the first and probably last time such a generous offer will be made to the Opposition. That is a deplorable situation in relation to vital knowledge that should be available to members of Parliament and indeed to the whole community. We are finding that less and less information is being made available to members of Parliament and, indeed, to the whole community on such fundamental financial matters.

At present, negotiations are being carried on between the Commonwealth and the States in a number of important areas of Government activity. First, there is the Railways Agreement, which is still under a cloud. Secondly, there is

the matter of the Land Commission, which was the subject of questions in the Estimates Committees. Once again, that matter is being renegotiated, involving this State in considerable repayments some years before they would have fallen due. Thirdly, there is the area of Commonwealth-State housing finance, a matter which is being criticised right around Australia. The Commonwealth Government's policy on housing, especially welfare housing, expenditure, and the cut-backs in that area has been especially severe in the last six Federal Budgets. Once again, little information is available.

Most disconcerting is the lack of criticism from this Government of the Commonwealth's priorities for funding in this important area. As I have said, there is also the area of health funding, which is of great concern in this State, especially when fundamental changes are taking place in the provision of health insurance and other security, by the general population, against illness. In a specific example of this, I put questions to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Community Welfare about the responses that we could expect from the State Government as a result of Federal Government initiatives in this area. I am concerned that many people will fall through the security net provided by the Government by the means test for health insurance, and that many people will not be able to afford, or will not be in a position to secure for themselves, private health insurance.

In questions during Question Time and in the Estimates Committees, I have raised this matter. The Minister of Health continually reassures me that no person will go to gaol because they cannot afford to pay hospital and medical bills. She has said that this is a matter outside of her jurisdiction, but it is a matter of concern for individual hospital boards and medical practitioners. However, I suggest to the Minister and to the Government that the matter requires the earnest attention of the Government, which must devise some policies for accepting responsibility in this area.

I refer the House to the whole problem of debt collection that now again raises its ugly head with the complete dismantling of Medibank. I refer to a letter that has been circulated to medical practitioners in this State from the Australian Collection Bureau Pty Ltd, a Sydney firm of licensed commercial agents, debt collectors, credit consultants, and so on. I make no criticism of the firm; I know nothing of its activities. However, I think that the letter to medical practitioners indicates that there will be a problem that must be accepted by the Government in the years ahead. The letter states:

Over recent years Medibank has largely eliminated the need to use a collection agency to service medical past due accounts in Australia. Elsewhere in the world the servicing of such accounts is the primary activity of collection agencies.

Today, with the changes in health insurance, Australia appears headed towards similar collection difficulties, but Australian collection agencies are generally not interested in or prepared to service this type of account. They prefer large commercial accounts.

Recognising this emerging need we are anxious to provide a collection service in Australia, based on our many years of overseas experience in collecting medical bad debts.

Our agency offers an exceptional service—especially for the medical profession.

And on it goes. The medical practitioners are told that, if the company fails in its efforts, it will cost them nothing. However, the cost will be paid by the community at large, because the resultant effect will be that people will be put in gaol for their inability to pay their debts. They will be gaoled not at the direction of a medical practitioner or a hospital, but at the direction of the court. As honourable members will know, our archaic debt laws provide that, where there is contempt of a court order, usually a 10-day

gaol order is made, not for failure to pay the debt, but for failure to attend at one of the many court appearances that debtors must make to be examined as to their means. If they fail to appear, a 10-day order is made against them, and they go to gaol; their debt is still owing.

The previous Government tried to redress this matter. It was looked at very thoroughly by the Federal Law Reform Commission, which reported on debts in Australia and looked closely at the South Australian situation; indeed, legislation was passed through this Parliament to provide a better and more humane system of debt repayment. The debts repayment legislation passed into law some years ago, but has never been proclaimed. In the Estimates Committee, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs, within whose responsibility that Act rests, what was the Government's intention in relation to bringing it into operation. The Minister replied:

I have been asked questions in the Legislative Council about that matter. I have made perfectly clear that the Government has no present intention of bringing the Debts Repayment Act into operation. There were some very grave defects in the original form of the Bill that was presented, most of which were cured. The Bill went very much further than it need have done, and indeed it would have been a very grave imposition on industry.

So, we see that the vested interests of industry are winning out over those of debtors in our community. Although the Minister says that the Bill had grave defects and that many of them were cured, he says that the policy of the Bill went too far. So, we see that legislation which has passed through the various forms of the Parliament (and presumably it expresses the will of the people of this State through the forms of the Parliament) has been frustrated at the end where assent is given to it by the Governor in Executive Council.

I suggest to the House that that is a most unsatisfactory ending to such an important piece of legislation, particularly when one considers the enormous amount of small debtor claims that there will be as a result of the Commonwealth Government's changes to the provision of health insurance in our community and the lack of response forthcoming from the State Government to protect those people who are ill from being imprisoned or in other ways penalised because of their poverty associated with their illness.

I add a comment from the *Southern Cross* newspaper. I believe that this also has been referred to in the official newspaper of the Uniting Church on the subject of family health care. The following appears in the Thursday 10 October edition of the *Southern Cross*:

We ask the Government, as soon as possible, to raise the limit of the basic family income for eligibility for Commonwealth medical benefits from \$160 to \$200 a week. This would relieve families who are experiencing marginal poverty through the stresses and strains of providing adequate medical care for their children.

We would also like to express our concern at the undue haste with which the new health policy was introduced. We feel there is a lack of sensitivity to the plight of specific groups such as people without income who are on social security benefits or low income people who cannot apply, such as under-16-year-olds living away from their parents.

So, we can see that there is, indeed, widespread concern in the community with respect to the means test that has been applied in this area, and I suggest that the responsibilities do rest with the State Government to try to provide, as best it can, some redress and security for people put in that most unenviable position.

I also put this situation to the Minister of Community Welfare. It seems to me that the cuts that have occurred in welfare expenditure in this State are the clearest indication of the priorities of both the Federal and State Liberal Governments. We saw in those lines, as the Minister explained, a reduction of 25 staff members in the delivery of welfare services in this State. I suggested to the Minister that perhaps he should be increasing the number of staff,

given the crisis that there is in welfare housing, the increase in unemployment in our community, particularly the unemployment amongst young people, and the rapidly increasing crime rate, often related to unemployment and poverty. I refer also to the great stresses that will be placed on our welfare system because of the inability of many people to gain access to adequate health care, and so on. The Minister rejected that this was the function of the Community Welfare Department and that no greater stresses would be placed on that department. The Minister went on to say that the reduction of 25 staff members in that department would not in any way lower the morale, in his view, of the officers of that department. I can only see a great deal of stress and strain being placed on that reduced number of officers delivering such important services in our community. And, in the next few years we are going to see greater and greater breakdowns, particularly in the family structures, but also in the health and welfare of many people as a direct result of the Government's priorities that we have seen expressed in this Budget and its inter-relationship with the Commonwealth Government's funding programmes and its priorities. One can only refer honourable members to the Premier's statements prior to the last Federal election, when he joined his Government's policies with those of the Federal Government, explaining to the people of this State that it was in their interests to embrace the policies of the Federal Government.

I want to refer briefly to the area of small business. I realise that this has been well canvassed yesterday in other speeches by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Government's attitude towards pay-roll tax is, I think, deplorable. Its effect in the small business sector is intolerable, and we have had the tradition in this State of maintaining the parity, particularly with Victoria, and as closely as possible to New South Wales.

This is a matter on which I have received numerous representations, and I can only hope that what the member for Rocky River told the House belatedly is correct, namely, that the Government is reconsidering this matter and that that reconsideration takes place in all due haste before much further damage is done, particularly in the area of employment incentives. We see this as the policy of the Government to let matters run until there is a protest against them. Indeed, the Opposition on this occasion raised the protest about the Government's lack of activity in the area of pay-roll tax exemptions. I have seen this in the area of planning laws for retail development, where the Government has been very tardy indeed in bringing down effective planning controls.

The Minister has said on a number of occasions that it is his Government's intention to move out of the field of central planning and to transfer this responsibility to local government. He said that recently when introducing the new Planning and Development Act. Yet we see local government and, indeed, small business people in our community calling out for some degree of central planning, some degree of Government intervention, to make sure that those long-standing small businesses that are an established part of the local community life are preserved. One example is the B.P. Food Plus stores, where obviously the Government supported the introduction of 15 of those stores in this State. It said that any objections to the establishment of those stores should be established at the local level, that is, that local traders, local residents and local councils should take responsibility to bring about planning decisions.

We saw that those groups did join together and challenge the wisdom of establishing such 24-hour supermarket stores which sold food and petrol and which inevitably would replace many small corner stores. On the other hand, we have found that the Government has in statements to the

House changed its attitude towards the trading hours laws. This was the prime source of support for these because it was believed, I suggest to the House, by the B.P. organisation that there was a loophole in the trading hours law whereby they could trade for extended periods of time and also sell petrol along with foodstuffs on the one site. The Minister of Industrial Affairs gave two conflicting opinions as to the effect of that law. I understand that that now is the subject of some clarification by the courts.

We see what I suggest to the House is a tragedy where a large firm is prepared to invest some \$4 500 000 in this State, and I can see a great deal of that money being spent in fighting planning appeals, at both the local level and the State level, and then also trying to clarify the conflicting opinions given by the Minister on the operation of those stores. If there had been some proper central planning and some acceptance of responsibility at the State level, a great deal of frustration, confusion and wasted money would have been avoided. Once again, there is a letting down of the small business people in our community, particularly, as in this case, the small retailers.

Butchers are still in great confusion about whether this Government will or will not allow red meat sales beyond the current trading hours. Despite questions to Ministers in this Parliament and debate in the community, we have had no concise or clear expression by the Government to put the matter to rest. Once again, in Victoria there is agitation by the very large retailers for further extensions of trading hours, particularly on Saturday afternoons. That movement is very active also in this State. I would suggest that that campaign for the extension of trading hours in this State will be stepped up during the months ahead, particularly prior to Christmas. Once again, there is a need for some strong decisive decision making by the Government in this area, particularly to put the minds of small business men at rest.

The matter that probably concerns me most about the Government's policies towards small business is the extent these days to which small business people must look to devices that are on the fringe of the law of this country, particularly with respect to taxation matters, in an endeavour to maintain their profitability and, indeed, often their viability. We see now, more than ever before, the numbers of promoters of schemes to avoid taxation and the indirect taxes that fall upon small business. Quite often I receive in the mail notices from promoters of schemes. The area of sales tax is one that I would have thought would be the most difficult for the small business sector to avoid at the moment. I received a publication only today from a promoter, to which I will refer in part. It states:

'The Small Business Letter' concentrates on three main areas of sales tax planning . . .

Reducing sales tax: in many cases it is possible to cut sales tax by 10 per cent, 20 per cent, 50 per cent, or even 100 per cent. We explain the basic how-to-do-it principles.

Delaying Sales Tax: if you can legally delay the payment of sales tax by one or two months you considerably improve your cash flow. We give you four ways how to do it.

Defeating tax audits . . .

and on it goes. So, we can see that such is the state of activity within the small business sector that such schemes do become attractive because of the marginal profits that are being made by the many pressures that are put on small business in our community. I would have thought that the argument for relief of pay-roll tax and for other supports would be overwhelming. However, we see that the Government has in fact made only very minor cosmetic approaches to the Small Business Advisory Service that exists in this State. I note that the Minister himself has announced that he intends to put out a newsletter to support small businesses, but what we need is not those cosmetic, political

attempts to support small business: we need new policies, and the Government's approach to pay-roll tax is a clear indication that it is not prepared to face up to its responsibilities to small business, because inevitably, as can be seen with planning laws and trading hours, there are very strong vested interests in this area.

Inevitably it is big business that wins out over small business. Having a Government whose policy is to get out of the road of business of any shape, form or size means that it is small business men who suffer. That is of great concern to any person who works in the community and who sees that the role of small business is much greater and more valuable than just serving as a trading or service organisation or as a small manufacturer.

**Mr Millhouse:** Of course every Party pays lip service now to small business, but neither the Liberal Party nor the Labor Party does anything about it. Isn't that a problem?

**Mr CRAFTER:** We need some simple action, but it is not forthcoming. It has only been the Opposition that has provoked some action from the Government with respect to pay-roll tax anomalies.

**Mr Millhouse:** I don't think that is quite right.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CRAFTER:** I call upon the Government to tell us its policy with respect to small business in our community and not to, as the member for Rocky River did, challenge the Opposition about our policies: we are still waiting to hear the Government's policies, and to see whether the Government will back them up with some degree of reality.

**Mr ABBOTT (Spence):** We have emerged from the new system of Estimates Committees for the second year. I think that it is only fair to say that the revised procedure was certainly an improvement on last year's. However, some problems still exist, and if we are to take those seriously it may be that more amendments need to be made. Basically, the improvements were brought about by the fact that we were given more time, although there was still insufficient time for members to complete their questioning in a number of committees. One problem arises where a Minister has several portfolios in which a number of members take an interest. Where changes to Committees are made in these circumstances it can be rather frustrating for members to have to hang around and wait for the completion of a certain area before moving on to another. It is probably just as frustrating for departmental heads and public servants in those circumstances. No doubt many can ill afford the time to be hanging around, especially at a time when so many staff cuts are being made within the Public Service, and when more cuts in the Public Service area are inevitable, according to the Premier.

**Mr Lewis:** No-one has been sacked.

**Mr ABBOTT:** One glaring example of a Minister being responsible for more than one area is the Chief Secretary. The first Committee had to complete matters relating to the Police Department, the Department of Correctional Services, the Auditor-General's Department, other recurrent expenditure areas and then the South Australian Fire Brigades Board before the Committee could deal with lines under the Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine. I understand that very little time was given to the fisheries and marine portfolios, and this, of course, is not good enough. I understand that last year it was exactly the same, that approximately 20 minutes was given to the areas of fisheries and marine and harbors. There is an expenditure of almost \$2 500 000 in the Budget for fisheries and almost \$16 000 000 for marine and harbors, and those departments deserve better than that. These facts need to be taken into account and rectified; perhaps the Chief Secretary should

be allowed two or three days to deal with his areas of responsibility.

One other complaint that I have, and I am sure that this is shared by all members, concerns the lateness of receiving the detailed programme information for the 1981-82 financial year. Whilst it might not be so important for Government Committee members to receive copies of this information earlier, it is very important that Opposition members have them. This was not to be the case, and all members of the Opposition complained bitterly about it.

We had very little time to make a proper study of that detailed information and, as it turned out, we had to work very hard over the weekend on those documents in order to assist with our line of questioning. I think that, if that information can be made available much earlier in future, that would assist the Minister and both sides of the House quite considerably.

Other problems related to the restriction to three questions per member on a certain line. The Chairman would switch to the other side before a member finished his line of questioning.

On most occasions the member of the Opposition would raise a completely different matter and, when one got another turn and came back to the subject previously being pursued, the Minister would get rather niggly at having to return to that particular matter. If questions were necessary on the subject raised by the member opposite, the Minister would again grizzle and in some instances accuse the member of not listening by saying he had just answered a similar question on the particular matter. They were the problems which I saw.

I want to address my remarks to the report of Estimates Committee A, which was the Committee of which I was a member, and I intend to devote time to making remarks on the lines relating to the Minister of Community Welfare. Commenting on the general position in regard to the budget for the Department of Community Welfare, the Minister stated:

There has been no secret that both the Federal and State Governments had found this year a time of budgetary restraint and of maintaining a stand-fast Budget. A study of the total figures related to the Budget, as reflected in the Estimate papers, does not give any satisfactory view of economies that have been made this year.

Economies have been made, the Minister admitted. It seems to me that a lot of juggling around has occurred by way of management decisions rather than Treasury instructions, and I do not blame the department for that one little bit. When the belts are tightened, I am sure the Treasury would not be very selective about where the chop should occur. The Minister of Community Welfare, however, is hopeful that, where increases are required for rates payable for children in foster care, private care, or intensive neighbourhood care, he can apply to Cabinet for an appropriate increase. However, in terms of the way this Government is going, that may be just wishful thinking.

In answer to questions relating to cut-backs in the welfare areas, the Minister said the significant restraints in the Budget are, first, in regard to contingencies. The 4 per cent may not equal some of the costs of increases, particularly in the food items for institutions. This, he said, will mean a very careful use of money that has been allocated for contingencies throughout the department.

I hope he is not going to starve these people. The department must lose, and decisions were taken to cut \$37 600 from contingencies, and \$337 400 is to be deducted from salaries, resulting in 25 staff reductions. The Minister assured the Committee that the policy relating to staff reductions was made to ensure that direct service delivery to the community is not affected. The department does not

anticipate that the delivery of welfare services to the community will be reduced as it has absorbed the constraints elsewhere. It is unfortunate that these decisions have had to be made at all. Downgrading any welfare position, service or facility is a step backwards, in my view. I do not agree with the Minister when he says that the contingency cuts are related to items that may be able to be altered as far as the process is concerned.

For example, in postage there was a \$3 000 cut, and, in private motor vehicle reimbursement, a \$15 000 cut. There was a \$5 000 cut in publicity and \$4 000 in staff development. There was an alteration of the use of residential care homes, which was down by \$6 600. I do not agree that cuts can be made in those areas without affecting the department services. They must, by implication, affect the adequacy of the general philosophy and objectives of the departments. In the report of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on the delivery of community welfare services in South Australia, for example, a great deal of attention was given to the question of publicity. It was reported that, of the respondents in the client contact study relating to where people received their sources of information about the department, 38.6 per cent stated that before they became clients of the department they had no information about the department or did not know that it existed. That figure was similar to the 39 per cent in the community survey who had no knowledge of any services provided by the department.

The four recommendations on publicity contained within the Mann Committee Report were as follows: first, the committee recommended that all the department's pamphlets and forms prepared for public information be designed and tested for consumer readability. Secondly, the committee recommended that the department strengthen its publicity and information services; in particular, publicity should specify services available at each location. Their third recommendation was that a welfare information switchboard be established to provide immediate community access to information about services on a 24-hour basis throughout the State. Their fourth and final recommendation in the area of publicity was that an integrated neighbourhood system be developed to provide welfare information catering for the special characteristics and communication patterns of residents in each neighbourhood.

The problem of gaining access to information and assistance is especially important for elderly and isolated people and for all welfare recipients. So any cut-back in the publicity area will have some effect on the community and the clients of the department. Similarly, private motor vehicles are used in the delivery of welfare services, and if reimbursement for their use is stopped it, too, will mean that normal services cannot be continued or provided. The same applies to staff development and to the alteration to the use of the residential care homes.

This Budget, as it comes out of the Committee stage, reinforces the Opposition's opinion that it will do nothing to meet the growing demand for help made by the people who are battling below the poverty line and against rising levels of unemployment and persistent inflation. The proposed increases in pensions and family allowances for the third child and later children will not be enough to help many thousands of families out of poverty, mainly because the family allowance payments are too small and are certainly not directed at low income families.

Let me give the House just a few examples. By January next year, when the new family allowance rates are payable, a one-income family with two children, earning \$180 a week, will be \$5.76 a week below the poverty line, and such a family with three children will be \$21.86 below it. A year ago, the family with two children would have been \$19.59



above the poverty line, and the one with three children would have been \$3.89 above it. A one-income family earning \$200 a week, with three children, would be \$8.26 below the poverty line, and one with four children will be \$25.26 below it. A year ago the family with three children would have been \$17.50 above the poverty line and the one with four children would have been \$1.80 above it.

A one-income family, with five children, earning \$220 a week, will be \$25.46 a week below the poverty line and, with six children, \$39.66 below it. A year ago the family with five children would have been \$2.30 above the poverty line, and the one with six children would have been \$11.60 below it. A pensioner family with one child will be \$5.40 a week below the poverty line; with two children, \$15.60 a week below it; and with three children, \$22.20 below it. A year ago that family, with one child, was \$5.60 a week above the poverty line; with two children 80 cents below it; and with three children \$6.60 below it.

An unemployed family with two children will be \$17.60 below the poverty line; with three children, \$27.40 a week below it; with four children \$37.50, a week below it. A year ago the family with two children was \$1.12 below the poverty line; with three children \$10.12 a week below it; with four children, \$19.22 below it. A family on a single parent pension is \$12.60 a week below the poverty line if there is one child; \$23.50 below it if there are two; and \$30.10 below it if there are three. A year ago the family with one child was \$2.60 below the poverty line; with two children, \$9.50 a week below it; and with three children, \$15.30 a week below it. A single parent family on unemployment benefit is \$20.60 below the poverty line with one child; \$31.50 below with two children; and \$38.10 with three children. A year ago the family with one child was \$10.60 a week below the poverty line; \$17.50 with two children; and \$23.30 with three children.

Members will see from those examples that people in those categories will be much worse off in the future. There is no doubt that an increasing number of families in South Australia are living with stress, due to financial problems created by decisions and policies of the State and Federal Governments. The increases in home loan interest rates, for example, will make it virtually impossible for many South Australians to keep their homes. Many families have already put their homes on the market, because they can no longer afford to absorb the increased costs, yet the Premier had the audacity to say publicly that not too many cases of hardship have been reported to lending authorities. He must be attempting to soften them up for the next round of interest increases.

There are approximately 160 000 South Australian households currently paying off mortgages. Interest rates have risen so sharply during the past 12 months that many families can no longer cope. Young couples are putting off having children, because they cannot afford to have them, and more families are breaking up as a result. The economic environment for welfare is hostile, and will get worse. This is inevitable, due to the State Government's conservative ideology, rising unemployment and a widening gap between the rich and the poor.

With respect to the 25 staff cuts in the Department for Community Welfare, the Minister is quite satisfied that the cuts will not adversely affect the department, but we will be watching that situation very closely to see what develops. He also denies that morale has dropped among the department's staff. However, from what I and other members have heard, staff morale could not be worse. The Minister should keep his ears open, and perhaps talk to some of his staff. With increased pressure on staff, there is a lot of friction and the morale problem is a big one in the department.

Another Government community welfare initiative that I want to raise is the system of family impact statements. When the Minister announced the introduction of this scheme he said, in an information circular:

The South Australian Government has recently undertaken a major new initiative with respect to family policy by introducing a system of family impact statements, as a means of ensuring that Government action is consistent in supporting and strengthening the traditional roles of the family.

State Government proposals likely to affect families will be subject to assessment for their potential impact on families and proposals prepared for Cabinet or Ministerial consideration must now be accompanied by a family impact statement. In this way, information on family issues will now be considered alongside economic, technical, environmental and other relevant issues in reaching decisions, and the Government will have the advice necessary to ensure that its decisions do not have adverse consequences for families.

Included in the matters to be considered by the new impact statements will be the effect on family, economic and general well-being. It seems that increases in more than 60 State Government charges are the answer to this Government's family economic and general well-being policies. The statistics also will consider reducing the size of the Public Service in all Government departments, and placing more public servants on the unemployment scrap heap.

Family relationships is another matter to be considered. We have record levels of unemployment, resulting in more family break-ups and higher levels of crime abuse. So much for family relationships! Family formation—for example, whether the proposal could influence a decision to have children—is another consideration. Therefore, higher living costs, higher interest charges, and sales tax are the answer to family formation, and whether young married couples can have children.

Another matter is family freedom to make decisions without undue control from outside. That is like the Government's intention to place the Parks Community Centre in the hands of profit-hungry private enterprise, the campaign to make public facilities ineffective and sell off community assets, and the lack of proper funding to child care centres, schools and kindergartens. One could go on and on. The Minister of Community Welfare has stated that family impact statements will mean that proposals such as where a new school should be built or a road constructed will be held up against an impact questionnaire developed by the Family Research Unit within his department and the effect that such proposals may have on families. The Government's simple answer to this is to not build any new schools, and to not construct any new roads. I asked a number of questions on family impact statements in the Committees of which I was a member. These are worth some comment, as the Minister's answers were both conflicting and confusing.

The first committee that I participated in dealt with the lines Local Government and Housing. In answer to my question about whether any staff in the Minister's office prepare family impact statements in conjunction with preparation of Cabinet submissions and in accordance with Government policy, and about how many family impact statements were prepared during the last financial year in local government and housing areas, the Minister replied:

That would take quite a lot of research. As the honourable member said, family impact studies are part and parcel of our Cabinet submissions. Where it is deemed necessary that they be prepared, the departmental officers prepared them, but I would have to check on the total number of Cabinet submissions that we have made in the department, and that would be rather difficult.

I then asked the Minister:

Why has the preparation of family impact statements not been listed in the volume of Programme Estimates as an activity throughout any area of local government and housing, and is no cost involved in preparation of these statements? Family impact

statements were introduced as a world first and were given a lot of publicity. I should like to know what cost is involved.

The Minister replied:

We do not cost our Cabinet submissions by the amount of time taken in their preparation based on the headings within those submissions. Certainly, no extra research or labour has been involved in the preparation of these family impact studies. They are simply part and parcel of the departmental work in preparing the overall Cabinet submissions and, for that reason (because we have not dissected the costs of preparing Cabinet submissions), the studies have not been mentioned under separate headings in the document to which the member refers.

I then asked the Minister:

One activity under the Minister's office spells out research and the preparation of reports and discussion papers, consulting with interested groups, preparing reports and draft Cabinet submissions, assessing draft legislation that has an impact on local government.

The Minister answered:

Because the family impact study work is not specifically related to my departments. All Ministers, in preparing Cabinet submissions, include family impact statements, where they are relevant, with those submissions. Preparation of family impact statements is not an activity solely within the Department of Local Government: it is just part and parcel of Government policy.

The next Committee in which I participated was that examining the Minister of Education. I asked the Minister:

... whether any family impact statements were prepared by the Education Department on the effects that the cuts in staff and education funding would have upon the family, especially where children attend primary, secondary, special or disadvantaged schools in the low socio-economic areas.

The Minister replied as follows:

There is a misconception there surely, because earlier we heard from the Deputy Director-General that the teacher-student ratios would in some cases be improved upon and, in any case, they would not deteriorate, so the reference to cuts in staffing is really an improper one.

I was not satisfied with that answer: in fact, it was not an answer at all and did not relate to my question, so I followed it up by asking the Minister:

The Minister may have misunderstood my question about family impact statements. I was not talking about the teacher-student ratio. It has been Government policy to have family impact statements made in regard to all Government decisions, and some important decisions have been taken in relation to education. Who in the Education Department prepares family impact statements, how many have been prepared and placed before Cabinet by the Education Department, and how many of those statements and decisions have been motivated by Cabinet?

The Minister then replied:

The family impact statements that have been requested by Cabinet generally accompany a specific Cabinet recommendation, and to suggest that family impact statements accompany every single budgetary decision would be incorrect. Quite a massive amount of work would be involved.

I could go on quoting further questions to and non-replies from the Minister of Education. I continued my questioning quite considerably in relation to the Department for Community Welfare on that same matter and I think I made quite clear that the system of family impact statements is not working. They are not made public. That is quite clear when we look at some of the Government decisions that have been taken and the effect those decisions have had upon families throughout South Australia.

I want to comment about cuts in funding made available to child care centres and also to criticise some of the remarks that were made by the member for Henley Beach, who criticised those parents and teachers who brought their children along to the protest rally over cuts in funds to kindergartens. If that member would like to repeat those remarks to some of the kindergartens within my district, then he is quite welcome to go down there and make those remarks rather than make them here in coward's castle. I think that, if the member for Henley Beach should read some of the statements in the teachers *Journal*, he would

then understand the problems with which some of these parents are faced in sending their children to kindergartens.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Mr Speaker, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, or whatever your proper title may be (I am not too sure), the member for Spence started by making a few criticisms about the present system and, by gum, if this debate is any reflection of the system, those criticisms are abundantly justified. When the member for Spence started speaking there were 10 members, including the Deputy Speaker I think it was, in this Chamber and that continued to be the pattern while he was speaking. It can be seen how little interest there is in the jolly debate and if this is the way in which we are to debate the expenditure of some hundreds of millions of dollars in this State, there is something wrong with the system and it might very well be better if we went back to the old system and scrapped these Committees altogether, because this is an absolute waste of time and a hollow farce.

**Mr Mathwin:** We should be here all the time.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** My very word we should. We have two Labor members in the House and a few uninterested members of the Liberal side, including the member for Glenelg, whose prime duty in this place now seems to be to warm a seat to keep the numbers up. That is about all he ever does in this place and he is doing it faithfully this afternoon. Having delivered myself of that, I am glad to see, Mr Speaker, that you are back at least in charge. There will be some decorum now in the place.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Right from the commencement, I would ask the honourable member for Mitcham not to reflect on any decision that has been made by the Chair by either the Speaker or any of his deputies.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I was reflecting on no decision whatever, Mr Speaker. I was just saying that I was glad to see that you were back here, because at least now the place will be well run.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable member for Mitcham not to pursue this line of approach any further.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I would have left it a moment ago if it had not been for your strictures.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will get back to the debate.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** In this debate, there are three matters on which I asked Ministers questions during the Estimates Committees that I want to follow up, and there may be another matter I could mention if I get time. The three matters I propose to raise are, first, the answers that the Minister of Environment and Planning gave me on the Field case and the very obvious cover-up that is going on in his department over that matter; secondly, I want to question the policy of the police and presumably the Government in regard to the arrest of those caught in random breath testing; and, thirdly, the lamentable performance of the Chief Secretary and the Government over the allegations about the conduct of the police. These are the matters that I want to follow up and I will deal with them in that order.

First, on the question of the Minister of Environment and Planning. As members know, ever since I have had an opportunity following the settlement of Mr Field's claim, I have raised in this place the question of what went on in the Department for Environment from the time it was formed in 1972 at least until the sacking of Mr Lyons as the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in 1978. I have not been able to get any satisfactory answers to my questions.

I took this matter up again with the Minister, and may I in a moment come to what I asked him and the questions that remain unanswered. First of all, I say that it seems to

me that when the Labor Party, with a clash of cymbals and a banging of drums, set up the department in 1972, and the then Premier said it was going to be a pacemaker for Australia, or some damned nonsense like that, amongst, hopefully, competent and honourable people, the Government of the day recruited a number of crooks and incompetents to that department, and they soon made their presence felt.

There were two reasons why the Government had to renege on the prosecution of Mr Field and then had to settle his claim for damages in the civil proceedings. First of all, it had no case against him and, secondly, it was frightened, as this Government still is frightened, of what would come out in court if the cases had been fought.

There is no doubt in my mind that those were the two reasons, and that they are covering up what has gone on in that department. The irony is that it did not happen under this Government. If there had been a stronger Minister in charge now, perhaps he would not be toeing the departmental line and covering up what went on. We would have an inquiry into these matters. It is pretty plain that not only were the Government authorities not pursuing the bird smugglers, as they told Mr Field they were going to, but they were very likely working with them. So, while Bert Field thought that he was out to get the smugglers, he, too, was really working with them.

It is a disgraceful state of affairs. It should be brought out into the open and we should know what was happening, because so far not one person has been punished in any way for what went on in those years. I have stated two or three times now the questions which remain unanswered and which should be answered, and I put them again to the Minister in the Committee. They appear on page 307 of *Hansard*. They state:

Why, if the whole idea of getting Field into this was to trace the path the birds took out of this country, was there so little result from it? Why was there not more resulting from what Field was doing, if it were all above board?

The question I did not put on that occasion was one that I want to explain a bit. As you very well know, Mr Speaker, it is not the trapper who gets the money from illegal trapping. He gets something, but the great profits are when there is export overseas, and the multiplier is 40 to 100 times what the trapper is paid for the birds.

**Mr Lewis:** You might be a lawyer but you're not an economist. Don't use the term out of context.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** God, he is a fool, that man. It is no wonder his own Party wants to get rid of him on preselection at the next election. Good luck to you; I hope you succeed.

The fact is that the multiplier is 40 to 100 times what is paid to the trapper, so someone, out of those birds (and Field says about 2 000 birds were trapped in these proceedings), got money running into millions of dollars, and no-one has bothered to explain who it was or how many people shared in it. That is the position, and I cannot for the life of me, except that we have a weak Minister in charge of that department, understand why these matters should not be brought into the open and why people should not be punished.

The member for Elizabeth, in the first part of these proceedings, in the first debate on the Budget, made some critical references to the Auditor-General, and, by gum, in relation to this matter I do, too. If we look at the Auditor-General's Report, there is a mere reference to the fact that \$80 000-odd was paid out to Field in compensation, in costs, in the costs of the birds and the inquiry, and so on—not a word of criticism of the thing. I hope that something more will be done about this. I realise perfectly well that the problem that I have, as a member trying to raise the matter

in this House, is that neither the Labor Party nor the Liberal Party wants to know about it.

It all happened while Labor was in office, and therefore they are tainted, and a number of their Ministers are involved—Mr Broomhill was the first, and then a Mr Simmons, and I cannot remember the others; they have all gone with the wind. Now we have the present Minister. Neither Party wants to know about this, and therefore, in these matters, I am on my own in this place, as I am so often. I hope that I will get some support, because I do not propose to let this matter go. I propose to move—and indeed I do move now:

To insert after the words 'agreed to' in the motion that we are debating first occurring, the words:

Except that the vote Environment and Planning \$14 847 000 be reduced by \$10.

That, of course, is a vote of no confidence in the Minister of Environment and Planning for his lamentable failure to answer my questions or to do anything about these matters. I give notice to the Labor Party that I have moved that as an amendment (I hope the Clerk at the table took it all in), and it is up to them as to whether or not they support me on this. We will be voting on it very soon.

Let me go from that matter to the Chief Secretary. Of course, it was his performance in these Committees that has stirred up a good deal since. I said on a radio station this morning, and I will say it again in this House, that it is not the patronising of the Premier and the way in which he deals with questions on this matter that counts. When one sees the faces of Liberal back-benchers while there is questioning of the Chief Secretary, or of the Premier about him, one sees the real story. I have watched for several days now the faces of honourable members opposite—not only the political accidents, who came in at the last election and who are not likely to stay long, and certainly will not, if this sort of thing goes on, but other Liberal benchers. One could tell that they are jolly worried. They give themselves away every day. Now, of course, the vacant member for Todd is laughing loudly about it, but he does not know, or he did not realise, that I was watching him and his friends on the Liberal side during Question Time today and on other occasions. I know how they feel. They would die rather than admit it, but they should be damn worried about their chances of re-election at the next election; we know that they are.

Before I come to the question of the inquiry into the police, I want to raise one other matter, as I raised it with the Chief Secretary and the Commissioner of Police while they were being questioned. I was not at all pleased with the way in which the Commissioner of Police handled the questions asked of him. It was about random breath testing. May I remind honourable members of what had happened. It was on a Tuesday evening that there was a segment on *Nationwide* in which that nice girl Prue Goward simulated her own arrest for being above .08 and her incarceration in the cells and the experience she had there. There was no doubt at all during that segment—and this was the impression given—that that would be the routine for anyone who was detected in the random breath testing. They would be arrested and placed in the cells, searched, and all that sort of thing, finger-printed, and everything else. There was no doubt about that on that segment.

Next morning there was a seminar. By that time there had been public indignation on the matter. The Commissioner of Police had been asked to go to the seminar, but he did not go, and a man called Furler went in his place. There was a good deal of discussion about what had been seen the night before. Furler said—and I have checked this from two sources—'No, we do not mean to have this intimate body search at all.' There was no suggestion whatever

from Furler on the Wednesday morning at the seminar but that everyone who was detected would be arrested. I am quite confident of that.

He talked about Sue Gower—could not even get her name right; it is Prue Goward. He said that there would be no intimate body search, but that people would be taken to the nearest police station and charged. There was no suggestion from that Mr Furler, as there had been no suggestion the night before, that there would be other than an arrest. There was no suggestion that anyone would be dealt with on summons. That is the position, and yet when the Commissioner of Police answered my questions the next day, on the Thursday (and it is at page 469 of *Hansard*) he said:

So far as the department is concerned it was never our intention to arrest every person who passes through a breath testing station and is found to be over the prescribed limits.

I simply do not accept that that is true. I have already asked him and the Chief Secretary whether there had not been a change of policy between the Wednesday and the Thursday, and they denied it; they said there had not been, but obviously there had been, because of the outcry. I have spoken to some of the people involved in that *Nationwide* segment, and I know how it came to be made. Some woman who had approached the A.B.C. and said, 'Heavens, if people knew the treatment they get when they are arrested, nobody would ever take the risk.' That was some months ago, and *Nationwide* approached the police and said, 'Can we film inside the cells?' and they said 'No, you cannot.' The Commissioner himself said, 'No, you might inadvertently film somebody in there—a prisoner—and we do not want that.' They said, 'What about waiting until just before the random breath testing comes in? It will be superb advertising for it; it will be the real deterrent.'

So they waited until the day or a couple of days before random breath testing was to start, and then it was arranged that they go down and film the routine that was to take place. I am told that the filming took place upstairs where there were no prisoners, so that the problem that the Commissioner of Police mentioned would not occur; there could be no inadvertent filming of a genuine prisoner who was there. But during the whole of the filming of that part of the programme there was Chief Superintendent Whitbread standing next to Miss Goward as she was filming. How on earth can it possibly be suggested that at the time of that filming there was other than an intention that people would be arrested if they were caught for random breath testing? It just does not add up. *Nationwide* would not have made that programme, it could not have made that programme, without the co-operation of the police. The police were there throughout, they knew what was being done, and they knew why it was being done, and it was done at their suggestion—to act as a deterrent.

Then there was the outcry, and rightly so. There was a hasty change of policy on the part of the Government and of the police. Why cannot they admit it? Why did the Commissioner say, as his Ministers had said when I raised the matter, that there had never been any intention to arrest everybody?

**Mr Max Brown:** Why the penalties?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** All right, that is a good point, if the member for Whyalla wants to make it. There was the segment on *Nationwide* and the fact that the next morning, when Furler went along to this seminar and tried to explain what had happened, there was no suggestion but that people would be arrested. It was the next morning after that that the Commissioner of Police came along and said what I have already quoted. That does not, and I say this with great respect to Mr Draper, give me much confidence in him—he will come along and say that to a Parliamentary

Committee, because it just cannot wash. It may be that that was a storm in a teacup. It is on a matter which, compared with the inquiry into the police, is of much less importance. It was not last week before the police inquiry fiasco broke, and I will get on to that in a minute; but, whether of itself it is important or not, to me the significance of it here, and when one considers the police, is what was said in the Committee which must be at variance with the facts. If it happens in one matter it may happen in others as well, and I do not like it one little bit. That questioning of the Chief Secretary with the Commissioner of Police present was in the morning. I got 15 minutes in, and then in the afternoon, after I had taken a deputation to the Premier, I came back and found to my surprise that not even then had the question of the inquiry into the police been raised. I said to the Chairman of that Committee, the member for Goyder, that I wanted to raise this. He rather half-heartedly tried to dissuade me. He said that I had had my chop for the day and that maybe I should not get any more, but anyway I managed to get through that, and I got another 10 minutes. He conveniently chopped me off just as I was getting to the denouement.

**Mr Russack:** Rightly so.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I do not know why that is so. I thought that the procedures worked out this year were to allow any member an opportunity to question the Ministers who came and not only members of the Committee. I believe that I was the only non-member of the Committee who was restricted in that way.

**Mr Russack:** Nonsense!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** All right, who else was? Not one answer from the other side. I was the only one who was shut up. I was shut up on this very sensitive matter, and the member for Goyder knows it. He was the one who did it, too. I give full marks to the member for Stuart, who was leading for the Opposition on that occasion. I told him when I came back that afternoon that I proposed to raise the question of the inquiry and offered to allow him or his members to do it before me if they wanted to, and he was good enough to allow me to go first. I appreciated that. I then asked the Chief Secretary what the terms of inquiry might be. As reported at page 483 of *Hansard*, I said:

I now refer to the inquiry that was announced curiously enough not by the Chief Secretary but by his colleague the Attorney-General.

I went on to ask a number of specific questions, and these were the questions that I asked:

Specifically, what I would like to know are the precise terms of reference of this inquiry. Has any police officer been suspended as a result of the allegations made? If not, why not? When is it expected that the inquiry will be completed? What action is contemplated when it has been completed?

And to my great surprise the Chief Secretary said that he did not know anything about the inquiry, yet he is the Minister responsible for the police. He said first of all that the complaints had been made to the Attorney-General and that the two young journalists (very flattering to at least one of them) had not been near him. Then he went on to say:

The portfolio of the Attorney-General does overlap my portfolio. That, of course, is just not right. He forgot that I was Attorney-General for a couple of years, and I know very well that there is no overlap between the duties of the Attorney-General and the duties of the Chief Secretary in relation to the police: it is the Chief Secretary's responsibility alone. I can imagine what would have happened in our day if, with Ren DeGaris as the Chief Secretary, I had started interfering in what happened in the Police Force. There would have been a row in that case. I do not believe there has been any change, that is, except that we have a

weak Chief Secretary who can control neither his department nor his colleagues, apparently. This is what he went on to say:

Investigations are under way, and it is my understanding that they will report to the Attorney-General in the near future. That is as far as I can take it. One cannot say what one does not know.

So not only had the Attorney-General done everything but he had not even bothered to tell the Minister responsible what was going on. Further, on page 483, I asked him, thinking that if he could not answer the questions at least the Commissioner of Police might be able to answer them—

*Mr Russack interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Do not be so absolutely absurd and stupid. I hope the member for Goyder will be quiet, Mr Speaker. I am damned glad you got the job and he did not. This was the question I asked.

Will the Chief Secretary allow the Commissioner to answer some of my specific questions about what are the terms of reference?

He said:

It is not fair to ask the Commissioner to answer those questions. The terms of reference have not been relayed to me.

There was no question at that stage that there were not any; that was something that little Stanley Evans managed to dream up just before afternoon tea time. It was he who suggested, 'Put the question to the Chief Secretary to try to get him out of trouble,' and that there were not any terms of reference. There was no suggestion from the Chief Secretary, when I asked him, that there were not any; all he said was that he did not know what they were.

That is what he said. Then I was shut up by the member for Goyder, who said that I had had another 10 minutes and that he intended to call another member, and that was the end of me. But, Peter Duncan, or the honourable member for Elizabeth I should say, if you are now listening, Mr Speaker. I must be more on my best behaviour than I was a moment ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member can be assured that the Speaker always listens.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I was going to say that he is omnipresent, but I do not know. This is what the Chief Secretary said to the member for Elizabeth, which only reiterated what he said to me: 'I am not able to supply the terms of reference to the honourable member.' That was (and I have used the word several times) a lamentable performance. It showed that he just did not know, because his own colleagues have so little confidence in him, so little regard for him, that they did not even bother to tell him what was going on in his own department, yet now they are tenaciously trying to defend the indefensible, and every day that the questioning of the Chief Secretary goes on, the Government being more and more obstinate about retaining him as a Minister, they get deeper and deeper into the mire and it will be harder and harder for them to get out of it. They know that very well.

If we had a stronger man as Premier and a stronger Government, the Chief Secretary would have gone ages ago; he would have gone even before this all blew up. The only thing he could say this afternoon amidst the name calling of members on this side who had the temerity to ask any questions about the matter (and I noticed that yesterday he called me a scoundrel) was 'Well, look at the mess we inherited.' That may be so, and I am not going to argue that now, but the fact is that this was not a mess that was inherited; these were not things that have done other than develop while he has been Chief Secretary and in charge. Even if they had developed under the former Government, that would not excuse him for not being able to handle the situation.

The matter would be laughable if it were not so serious, but it is serious, because, if the community loses confidence

in the Police Force, if there is any question of that, that is a disaster for the whole community, and this matter should not be fought on political lines. It should not be a matter of whether the Government loses face because it has to get rid of an incompetent Minister and put someone rather more competent in his place if they can find someone. This is far too serious a matter for it to continue.

It is for those reasons that I propose to support the other amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition to the motion we are now debating, because, as I understand it, that deals directly with it. The Labor Party has not been able to get a motion of no confidence going this week, because the Government has blocked it twice. This is the only thing we on this side can do and I certainly propose to support it. I hope that even after that is defeated that we will not have heard the last of the matter.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** I want to speak on this matter very briefly, because I want to provide an opportunity for other members of this House to be included in this debate. I want to take the opportunity to answer some of the allegations made by the member for Mitcham. This matter is of concern to me, the Government and everyone else.

**Mr Millhouse:** Why don't you do something about it?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I will tell the member what we have done about it and what the member for Mitcham could do about it, too.

*Mr Millhouse interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitcham will recall that the warning that was given to him earlier this afternoon still maintains.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The member for Mitcham has constantly brought up the matter of what he sees as problems associated with the National Parks and Wildlife Service and officers involved in that service.

**An honourable member:** Does he have a pecuniary interest in that?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** That is a very interesting point, namely, whether he has a pecuniary interest in it or not, but we will not go into that at this stage, other than to say that it was quite an incredible situation. When this matter of the Field case first raised its head, of course, the member for Mitcham was the legal adviser to Mr Field at that time.

**Mr Randall:** Somebody ought to do some calculations.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It would be quite interesting if those calculations were carried out. On a number of occasions I have said in this House and publicly what the situation is in regard to the investigations that have already been carried out. For the benefit of the Member for Mitcham, I will repeat them, because obviously he is not satisfied with what has been said, or he did not listen, or did not know. I will refer to some of the facts again.

I appreciate that the member for Mitcham has said that all of this happened during the time of the previous Government, and all the rest of it, but I am not particularly interested in that; what I am particularly interested in is the fact that, whenever the member for Mitcham makes these allegations, it brings down another shadow over the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, which concerns me a great deal, particularly when thorough investigations have been carried out in regard to those officers. I have said before and I will say it again, I want this matter

cleared up once and for all. The member for Mitcham has made quite clear again today that he has no intention of letting this matter rest, but I hope that, after I have said what I want to say today, he will understand what the situation is.

In June 1979 the then Minister of Environment arranged for a police investigation of the inspection system of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The investigation team operated under the direction of the Crime Director, Senior Chief Superintendent Lockwood, who is now Assistant Commissioner of Crime. It included also an inspector and five experienced detectives. This investigation was initiated mainly because of public statements by Mr Field after charges against him in relation to his possession of protected birds were withdrawn in the Christies Beach Magistrates Court on 19 June 1979. It is all very well for the member for Mitcham to sit there with a supercilious grin on his face; I guess he is enjoying it, even if no-one else is.

In August 1979, as a result of consultations between the South Australian Police Commissioner, interstate police commissioners and Commonwealth commissioners, a joint task force of State and Commonwealth police was established to assist in the investigation. It can hardly be said that that was a low-key investigation: the investigation was thorough and ranged throughout Australia. In consequence of the facts established, two former officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service were arrested in this State, two customs officers were arrested in Western Australia, and action was commenced against a customs officer in Canberra. These men were charged with having conspired together and with others to take and sell protected animals as defined by the National Parks and Wildlife Act between July 1973 and December 1974. Court proceedings commenced in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 14 April last year.

Until that time, Mr Field had declined, on legal advice provided by the member for Mitcham, to make a statement to the investigators, and therefore, court proceedings were commenced without his evidence being available. Shortly after the proceedings commenced, Mr Field notified his willingness to then make a statement and, accordingly, he was interviewed by the police. During the course of the hearing the police were advised by the Crown Law Office that further information had become available indicating that the facts established by the investigation did not constitute evidence of the commission of an offence by any person. The matter was therefore not taken further before the presiding magistrate, who dismissed the charges, although the Crown had sought an adjournment to enable the Crown to assess the information that was to have flowed from Mr Field's indication of co-operation.

Mr Field had also commenced an action against the Government to recover payment for the services that he claimed he had provided as an agent for the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and to obtain replacements for some birds he said he had used in this work. This matter was settled by agreement in the Supreme Court in April this year, with a denial of any liability.

Mr Field has continued to make statements about his involvement with the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The allegations have been supposedly backed up by the member for Mitcham—allegations of malpractice by persons associated with the National Parks and Wildlife Service and Customs during the time that he claims to have been working as an under-cover agent. Mr Field's main allegations are against former employees of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and persons outside the service. Mr Field, I repeat, has never at any time suggested that present employees of the service may be suspected of having

committed any offence. Indeed, the police have confirmed this situation.

It remains true that even after exhaustive investigation, to which I have already referred, by both police and officers of the Crown Law Office, no evidence has come to light indicating the commission of any criminal offences by staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Certainly, Mr Field has not himself provided any such information.

As I have said time and time again, if Mr Field or the member for Mitcham is possessed of relevant information not previously given to the police, I consider that each has an obligation to communicate this information to the police for appropriate action. This has not happened. These allegations are constantly being made, and even at this time I inform the House that contact has been made by the Crown Law Office with Mr Field. A letter has been written. In fact, discussions were held, I understand, or the advice was sought from the member for Mitcham as to whether this further investigation might take place, or a further contact might take place with Mr Field seeking more information. That contact was made, and no information has come forward.

I believe that since that time a further contact has been made with Mr Field, and still no evidence has come forth. If the member for Mitcham can stand up in this House in the privilege of Parliament and refer to allegations with which he is not prepared to come forward, and if he is not prepared to bring any advice forward to be passed on to the police or the Crown Law Office, I believe he is quite baseless in his allegations. It is humbug.

Finally (because I am aware that other members want to take part in this debate), I make the point that, if the member for Mitcham is able to put any substance behind the allegations that he is making, he has a responsibility to go to the police or to the Crown Law Office. I hope that the member for Mitcham will do that instead of continuing on in the way that he is in this place.

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** Some two or three weeks ago in this House I cited an adage from ancient Greece with respect to this particular Government and the inevitable doom towards which it seems to be heading. I cited Euripides, who said, 'Those whom the gods seek to destroy, they first make mad.' That particular quotation's relevance I think has been further vindicated by some of the eccentric behaviour of the Government in recent days. In particular, I have in mind its mean-minded withdrawal of \$300 000 in grants towards pre-school education. That just shows the poor lack of judgment of this blundering Government, which, of all sections of its Budget, decides to remove \$300 000 from that area. In terms of the total education budget of \$507 000 000, that \$300 000 is less than one-fifteenth of 1 per cent. If the Government wanted to be mean-minded and stupid and pick on an area that would be sure to produce a very strong reaction from a large section of the community, it could not have picked a better area. I think that sort of conduct is so typical of the Government, particularly in recent days, that it is further proof that it is heading towards total annihilation at the next election.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** That is quite correct. The Minister of Transport has tried to keep himself quite clear of all this. If you can keep your head in your portfolio when all those around you seem to be losing theirs, you are doing all right.

**An honourable member:** Are you talking to the Speaker?

**Mr TRAINER:** If I have erred from Parliamentary practice in using the second person instead of the third person in referring to the particular person who interjected, I apologise, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Max Brown:** Would you start again?

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the member for Whyalla not to prolong the debate.

**Mr TRAINER:** In any case, we are here not only to debate the general ineptitude of the Government but also to discuss the Budget Estimates Committees, and the ways in which they have operated. This particular system that we have adopted for examining Government expenditure is ideally suited to a Government, but not so well suited to an Opposition.

It is a system that will reduce the work load on individual Ministers. It also serves to protect weak Ministers from probing questions. We are not likely to suffer from weak Ministers when we are in Government after the next election. We will be quite happy, I am sure, in some respects to continue with this system, because it would certainly suit us as a Government. As I said, it is a system that is suited to Governments and not so well suited to Oppositions.

The traditional method of analysing expenditure had certain disadvantages. As we can all recall, it could lead to all-night sittings. We could have a session come to its conclusion before some Ministers could be questioned. If my memory serves me correctly, the Minister of Health escaped being questioned in 1979. A further disadvantage is that those three Ministers who come from the Legislative Council could not, under the old system, be questioned at all by members of the governing House of Assembly. There were also, however, advantages to the old system. For example, every member had ready access to all those Ministers who did not escape, either because they were Legislative Councillors, or because time ran out before certain Ministers could be dealt with. Under the previous system there was less incentive for Government back-benchers to ask Dorothy Dix questions, because under those circumstances those questions would merely have prolonged the agony for particular Ministers and kept them here until the early hours of the morning, or later.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** Under the old system, as the member has pointed out, the Opposition had better opportunities.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** I had an hour's questioning on the whole of my portfolio, and the Minister of Health did not have any. That is ridiculous, isn't it? At least under this system we had 11 hours each or whatever it was.

**Mr TRAINER:** I am pleased to have provided the opportunity for the comment of the Minister of Transport to be included in the debate. We have lost some of the advantages and kept some of the disadvantages. We have gained, in so far as Ministers who are members of the Legislative Council are now available for questioning by members of this House.

**Mr Millhouse:** Of course, there shouldn't be Ministers in the Legislative Council.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen):** Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park has the call.

**Mr TRAINER:** Although out of order, I could not help but welcome those interjections, because they contained a grain of truth, certainly as far as some people see it. One disadvantage, however, is that those shadow Ministers who are not members of this House but are members of the Legislative Council are unable to participate in the proceedings except, so to speak, through proxies. Furthermore, if the Minister whom they shadow is a member of the House of Assembly it means that they never can directly confront that person in a Parliamentary forum, not even during the Budget Estimates Committees.

Another disadvantage is that there is a fixed time for each Minister, and that that time is pretty well the same, regardless of the Minister's calibre or the importance of his or her portfolio. That means, for example, that the same number of hours will be allocated to the Budget line for environment and planning, and the \$15 000 000 that it

covers, as is given to education, with its Budget line of \$507 000 000 for that particular Minister.

That means that as much time is available for a portfolio covering one-third of the State Budget as is available for one that covers only 1 per cent of the State's Budget. Furthermore, the type of guillotine that is involved with a set cut-off time for the conclusion of questioning leads to filibustering and time wasting. We saw, for example, the Minister of Arts use his departmental advisers in order to slow down the question and answer process. When a question was directed to the Minister he would turn, repeat the question to a departmental head, and the departmental head would repeat that question to an assistant departmental head, who would then whisper a reply back to the departmental head, who would then whisper it to the Minister, and the Minister would then slowly rephrase the answer for the benefit of the Committee in his own inimitable style. I would like to comment on that inimitable style because it would seem that that Minister was able to use every grammatical pause to take up time; a comma was good for about ten seconds and colon or full stop was good for a minute or more.

We had similar examples of time wasting in the little homilies that we received from the Minister of Education in his lengthy answers. We had long boring questions from Government back-benchers that seemed to be pretty obviously Dorothy Dixers.

A comparison of the number of questions asked on that Committee will show that Opposition members and Government members asked about the same number, but an examination of the number of column inches that appear in the *Hansard* coverage of that debate shows that Opposition members in general attempted to ask fairly concise brief questions. There were exceptions to that, and on one particular topic I asked a fairly lengthy question. I will not attempt to evade any accusation that I asked a long question, but it was only one long question, and every other question that I attempted to get in I kept brief. However, Government back-benchers took as long as they possibly could, and an examination of the column inches in *Hansard* given to members of the Opposition compared to members of the Government should prove exactly what I have just said. It was quite obvious that they were trying to waste time on that particular Budget line and to protect the Minister from any sort of probing questioning. It is significant that they thought that that Minister needed such protection. Indeed, it was obvious that that Minister was in a lot of trouble.

Opposition members of that Committee offered to let the Minister be released in some way from his commitments to that Committee by offering to adjourn so that he could attend the rally that was being held at that time on the steps of Parliament House to protest at cuts to pre-school education. Opposition members moved that at 2 p.m. the Committee should adjourn for a few minutes to provide the Minister with that opportunity, so that he would have the same access to that rally outside as had Opposition members of the Committee (or, for that matter, back-bench Government members), but the Minister did not seem to want that opportunity.

When the Opposition moved that the Committee should adjourn, the Minister looked absolutely flummoxed. The Chairman of the Committee looked to him for some sort of guidance as to his eagerness to go along with the motion or not. Presumably, the Chairman was trying to ensure that there was some sort of consensus among the Committee that an adjournment should be granted. Not receiving any appropriate signal from the Minister, the Chairman announced that he would consider it during the recess and he did so. On coming back he advised us that it was

inappropriate that the Committee should be adjourned in order to give the Minister access to that group of people outside who wished to hear his reasons why he had been so mean-minded as to cut in half the allocation for pre-school education. Having seen the mood of those parents outside, it is no wonder that the Minister did not want to go.

One of the worst features of the Estimates Committees is that two Committees meet simultaneously. Although this has one benefit, in that what would otherwise take four weeks is accomplished in two weeks, there are also disadvantages for individual members that did not occur under the old system. Under that system, provided a member was present when the Estimates were dealt with, he had access to question any Minister, other than Ministers in the Legislative Council, who were immune from the questioning process.

Now, each ordinary member must make a choice. On any one day, a member must choose one of two Ministers in regard to the examination of Budget lines. I was one of those chosen by my Party to be a member of the Committee that considered the education budget, that being a subject in which I have some interest, as a former teacher. However, on that day the Minister of Health was being questioned about the health budget. I had particular interest in various educational matters: in fact, I had interest in just about every educational matter that was raised on that day, and I wanted to consider certain aspects in particular, such as the Women's Studies Resource Centre and the threat under which it is being put. However, I would also have liked an opportunity to direct a question or two to the Minister of Health, who was being questioned by Estimates Committee B at the same time as consideration of the education budget was taking place.

I wanted to question the Minister of Health about the on-going scandal at the Windana Nursing Home, where, for a couple of years, 90 beds have been sitting unoccupied. Those beds are urgently required for the aged and the senile, but are still in their original plastic covering after two years. Yet 130 people are on the waiting list for admission to that home. I continually receive approaches from relatives of elderly people who urgently require accommodation at Windana, and all I can detect in the way of any sort of Government activity that could lead to the provision of beds is a pea and thimble trick being played by the Minister with the allocation of one dozen or two dozen beds at the Magill Home. I would have liked to ask the Minister how the provision of these beds would help alleviate the waiting list for Windana. Unfortunately, because both education and health were being considered at the one time, I was unable to do so.

I would have liked to direct a question or two to the Minister of Consumer Affairs about a personal matter that has concerned me recently, but I was distracted by the fact that the Chief Secretary was indulging in an orgy of self-destruction in Committee B at that time.

**Mr Millhouse:** It was good entertainment, wasn't it?

**Mr TRAINER:** That was why it was easy for one to be distracted from the other Committee. The matter to which I refer is a strange trading practice that has recently come to my attention in the motor industry as a result of a personal experience with an inertia reel seat belt on a not very old Ford, a seat belt that jammed and would not come out of its reel. That happened on 19 September. I would have thought that such a vital item of safety equipment, indeed one that is particularly vital since, in this case, it was the driver's seat belt that jammed, would be readily obtainable as a replacement.

In the case of this item, it was not only dangerous to not have a seat belt but also illegal to drive the vehicle without one. I would have thought that such a vital item of safety

equipment would be readily available. The inertia reel cannot be repaired. A person from the R.A.A. attended and attempted to repair it, but it is in a sealed unit, which cannot easily be opened to repair the components inside. The cost is over \$60 for that part, because not only the entire take-up reel but also the seat belt must be replaced.

When I made inquiries about the availability of the replacement component, I was told that this particular vital safety item is not kept in stock at a single Ford dealer in Adelaide and that a replacement part would have to come from Melbourne. Because of an industrial dispute, none could be released from Ford in Melbourne. I have been waiting five weeks for this vital item which is not in stock in Adelaide. I have been able to force the reel open and move the internal cogs tooth by tooth until I could get enough seatbelt out to wear, and I then put a clip on it to stop it rolling back into the inertia reel. Technically, I have a seatbelt that would meet the legal requirements, but it is of dubious quality, although it is better than nothing at all.

I would like to have asked a few questions of the Minister of Consumer Affairs about this. I would like to know, if I was injured in an accident or charged by the police for not wearing the seatbelt, as the result of the Ford motor company's perhaps negligent action in not supplying a replacement for this vital item of safety equipment, whether I would be able to press charges against this company for its sloppy policy. I would like to know whether there is any obligation on a company to have stock on hand for such vital safety equipment; there may not be. However, I am assured that Mitsubishi have a slightly different approach to that followed by the Ford Motor Company on this particular item.

I would like to know how vehicle manufacturers can justify a 300 per cent or 400 per cent mark-up on spare parts in these circumstances. The rationale given for a mark-up on spare parts of 300 per cent or 400 per cent is that it is very hard to maintain a wide range of spares and have them on hand with dealers all around Australia, but they do not seem to be doing that. The rationale they offer for the 300 per cent or 400 per cent mark-up is not carried into practice. Instead, it seems that they keep a very large percentage of their components in a central location such as Melbourne, in the case of Ford, and they draw on that central stock when any of those parts are required. There are problems as a result of that. Air freight is often charged to a customer on top of the 300 per cent or 400 per cent mark-up. There are delays in the delivery of these items, even with the air freight, and the delivery is subject to transport break-downs, industrial disputes, and so on. I have been waiting five weeks and it looks like going on even longer. Above all, it is wrong that a consumer should pay such a huge mark-up to cover the cost of parts being on stock at local dealers, when they are not there.

I would like to have asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question or two as to his attitude on these practices and whether he has any power to rectify that situation. Instead, I was distracted by the alternative of watching the Chief Secretary.

I would like to mention some comments made by the Premier, not in relation to his defence of the Chief Secretary but in his rejection of criticism and his inability, now that he is Premier, to accept the role of the Opposition of offering constructive criticism. Today, he referred to the 'doom and gloom so assiduously spread', as he said, by the Opposition. He referred to us as 'talking down' the State and said that any criticism is the criticism of a knocker. It was different when he was in Opposition. The *Hansard* report of 7 March 1978 indicates his getting quite heated about a then record deficit of \$26 000 000 and complaining about State charges that might go up. He also complained



about small industries closing their doors and about what he called an industrial down-turn. In the *News* of the same date, there is reference to what he called a breath of fresh air; presumably, by that he meant one of that paper's typical anti-Labor stories. He was rather pleased by the statements then of some businessmen. He said:

I find it refreshing that these men should have such a love for their State that they are willing to say what exactly is going on and what is wrong.

Yet, members of the Opposition, out of their loyalty to the State, do that and he protests. Consider some of the words the Premier used when he was in Opposition. He said:

The day that South Australia could be called a leper colony I thought would never come, yet this is what it has been termed; indeed that is exactly how people in other States see us.

Whatever members of the Opposition, in their criticism of Government policies, may have said, we have never called South Australia a leper colony. I think those words should hang around the Premier's neck for all time—the man who condemns South Australia as a leper colony, the Molokai of the south, presumably with the Premier as Father Damien.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I oppose the amendment. I thought it quite remarkable that it should have been moved by the member for Mitcham. I also reject the criticism implied in that. It is a futile and thinly disguised attempt on the part of the Opposition to discredit the integrity and high standing of the South Australian Police Force and the action that has been taken in that respect. I do not intend to go into that matter, other than to reiterate the Government's complete support for the police and the Chief Secretary, and to place on record that inquiries have now shown that the statements attributed to Mr Hughes, which were widely quoted in this House this afternoon, are without foundation.

**Mr Millhouse:** Didn't he say that?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No.

**Mr Millhouse:** What did he say?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He did not make any such comment.

**Mr Millhouse:** No comment at all?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not in possession of that fact. The member for Mitcham may laugh, but I think he should treat the truth with a little more respect.

**Mr Millhouse:** I am only asking.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not intend to go into that matter any further. The question has been more than adequately covered. I believe the performance of the Opposition in this debate has been a major disappointment. This Government's initiative in introducing the Estimates Committee procedure has provided honourable members with four times the previously allocated time for debating the Budget. The only conclusion I can reach in view of all the complaints made is that the Opposition did not use the time effectively or constructively. That was my impression during the time I appeared before the Committee. More often than not, they turned what should have been serious debate into a political slanging match.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I suggest that the honourable member do his sums. Even he should be able to add up. Either they had to do this to fill up the extra time or they considered making political points and political point scoring more important than eliciting information. Either way, Opposition members have no reason to complain. Members opposite have not done their homework. The results were quite clear. The complaints about not having enough time and not having their questions answered, with lists of

hundreds of questions that they did not have time to put to the Ministers, ring very hollow.

In the general debate also the Opposition made quite clear that it has no policies, no alternatives, and no constructive criticism. The Leader spent some time attacking the cost of programme and performance budgeting. Never before in the history of the State has a Government been prepared to be more accountable to the Parliament and the people. Members have been presented with a detailed analysis of the Government's programmes—not only financial and manpower information, but explanations of what the programmes were about and information about the Government's plans for the current financial year. It is ludicrous for the Opposition to complain that the yellow books were confusing and deficient. I would have thought that the Opposition should have been much more organised, so that each spokesman could analyse the information in detail and make his points in detail.

*Members interjecting:*

If they knew what their jobs were about (they were given ample information) they could easily have analysed it and questioned the Ministers concerned. The whole point is that, if they were left with lists of questions, it is their own fault; they were simply not able to cope with the opportunity. There are very serious deficiencies right along the Opposition front bench, and this whole exercise has revealed them very clearly indeed.

I do not intend to go through the old hackneyed points which the Leader of the Opposition seems to regurgitate like a broken record. He has not come up with anything new. In fact, his debate on economic matters has canvassed the same issues over and over again with nothing new or positive to offer. Indeed, no matter how often he has been proved to be wrong, the Leader does not seem to be able to get to the truth of the matter at all.

I oppose the amendments that have been moved. There seems to be no basis at all for any criticism of the Minister of Environment and Planning. Nothing was said in any way by the member for Mitcham. He has an old score to settle, and I believe that he should keep his professional business out of this House. He should certainly not use this venue and the privilege of this place to further his professional activities. I have no doubt that he has received a handsome fee for activities that he undertook outside the House in respect of this matter. I believe that the member for Mitcham has very curious standards indeed.

**Mr Ashenden:** He has none.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That is another way of putting it. As far as the Chief Secretary is concerned, this matter has been more than adequately canvassed. I have already put on notice the fact that the statements made this afternoon about statements attributed to Mr Hughes are inaccurate and without foundation at all. I therefore oppose both the amendments and support the motion.

The House divided on Mr Bannon's amendment:

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.

Amendment thus negated.

The House divided on Mr Millhouse's amendment:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton,

Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse (teller), 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.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NEWSPAPER REPORT

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary):** I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I refer to a report in this morning's *Australian* newspaper which formed the basis for some questions this afternoon by members of the Opposition. The Director of Correctional Services, Mr Stewart, has discussed this report with the officer named in the newspaper, Mr Hughes. Mr Hughes has stated that he did not comment to the *Australian* that prisoner Easom was in any danger as a result of statements I made in this House on Tuesday. I again emphasise that prisoner Easom is not a police informer. He has not supplied any information to the police, despite being approached to do so at the suggestion of the member for Elizabeth.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 27 October at 2 p.m.