

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 18 June 1982

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION TIME

EMPLOYMENT

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say what he has done to save the jobs of 220 tooling tradesmen at the Woodville plant of G.M.H. and 97 jobs at Gerard Industries Pty Ltd? Will he, as a matter of urgency, travel to Melbourne to press the management of G.M.H. to save the 220 jobs at Woodville?

Yesterday the Premier claimed that the jobs of 207 persons employed at Roxby Downs to conduct the feasibility study initiated under the previous Labor Government were under threat. The Premier claimed that he would go to Roxby Downs in a bid to save the jobs. On Saturday it was reported that 97 people were being retrenched by Gerard Industries Pty Ltd. Today it has been revealed that 220 long-term permanent jobs will be lost at G.M.H. apart from the 317 jobs to go from G.M.H. and Gerard Industries. It has also been revealed this month that up to 40 jobs will be lost at T.A.A. in Adelaide, and that there are other companies about which there is considerable concern, as well as some public instrumentalities.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would have thought that all the matters raised by the Leader would give even greater weight to the need to save jobs at Roxby Downs. I am amazed that he does not see that.

Mr Bannon: I am asking what you are going to do about it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am telling the Leader that all the things that he has said make it all the more imperative that jobs be created in this State, and how hypocritical can he be? Let me deal with the matters that he has raised. The people employed in the tooling factory of G.M.H. are being retired with early voluntary retirement. The Government is doing everything it can do to find additional work for the tool shop.

The situation at Gerard Industries must be looked at in conjunction with the very real and positive factor of the creation of a new factory in the Barossa Valley for Gerard Industries which is now going ahead and which the Leader does not choose to mention.

While in Singapore recently, I opened an exhibition of Clipsal products. I would say that Gerard Industries is undertaking a most forthright and intensive overseas marketing campaign, which does it great credit, to find other markets. Just because New South Wales is going so badly under a Labor Government is no reason to blame Gerard Industries. The South Australian Government is doing everything it can to modify the effects of the present downturn in jobs. I make the point that we are doing a great deal more than this Opposition is doing to create new jobs in this State. How the Leader can have the effrontery to stand in this House and complain about jobs being lost, when we see something like 1 000 jobs threatened with loss now, and many more potential jobs to be lost in the future, is totally beyond me.

PUBLIC SERVICE

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier now say which positions of permanent head in the State Public

Service his Government intends to fill before the State election? If he will not, why not? Yesterday, the member for Ascot Park asked the Premier for an undertaking not to appoint new permanent heads before the State election, because otherwise the ability of a newly-elected Government to impose its own priorities would be limited. In reply, the Premier said:

There are quite a number of permanent heads retiring at the end of June.

The Premier supplied no information on which positions would become vacant. The only public information that is available is that the Director-General of Further Education is about to retire.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The normal processes of the Public Service will apply.

TRAMS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Transport say whether it is the policy of the State Transport Authority Bus and Tram Division to continue to operate trams in service, carrying passengers, after they have been reported as being faulty? I have been told that on more than one occasion recently, after trams in service on the Glenelg line had been reported with faults such as hot boxes, instructions have been issued that motormen will continue to operate with trams carrying passengers on the line in that condition, even at peak periods.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, it is not the policy to carry that out, but I will get a report on the matter that the honourable member has mentioned.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say what changes in Government policy in relation to Aboriginal heritage have recently been instituted and will such changes issue in the form of legislation? If they will, when? I briefly point out to the Minister that a piece of legislation has been on our Notice Paper since 19 November 1981 and now appears to be destined to be one of the slaughtered innocents.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: A revised Bill will be brought into this House at the beginning of the next session.

AMDEL

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy, in view of his reply to my question on Tuesday, explain what material at Amdel at Thebarton needs to be crushed at night instead of in the day-time, and why?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will get more detail for the honourable member.

STEEL MARKET

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Premier make an appeal to the Prime Minister to have the Federal Government reverse its protection policies in regard to the decline in the B.H.P. company's share of the domestic and export steel market?

I point out to the Premier that, unless the Federal Government shows some realistic reversal of its current policy, B.H.P. has warned that it will retrench a further 1 000 workers. I also point out that, in the case of the domestic market, I understand that B.H.P. is desirous of obtaining a guarantee of approximately 85 per cent of that market,

which I believe could easily be met by reversal of the Federal Government's policy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: My information is (and I have already contacted the Federal Government on this matter) that B.H.P. has already made strenuous representations, which I have supported.

MAWSON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education reconsider the nature of support for the Delta subschool project at the Mawson High School project, and if he will not, will he say why not? The Delta subschool within the Mawson High School has three aims. It aims to concentrate on the personal and social development of the students, to develop their self-motivation, self-discipline, sense of responsibility and ability to make decisions; offer a wider range of courses and activities, both practical and academic. For example, English, maths and physical education are compulsory and students have been able to choose from subjects like motor workshop, agriculture, history, reading, extension maths (including computing), chemistry, environmental science, driver education, community service, and others; and that students are involved in making the decisions about the activities and functioning of Delta.

The subschool has operated from a separate house on the school campus site and a request was made to the Government for funds to help maintain that property. I believe that the funds were needed for a new roof and a heating system and that the request was made for the funds for materials only, not for labour costs; the labour would have been done by students as part of their study programme. The response that was received was that the house was to be dispensed with and it was presumed that the subschool would be incorporated in the main campus. For the information of the Minister, I shall read the pertinent part of a letter that the Premier wrote to the school council of the Mawson High School. It is as follows:

I am sympathetic to the nature of the programme offered to disaffected students at the Mawson High School. However, I accept the advice which has been tendered to me by the Director-General of Education and the Minister of Education that the house is not essential to the success of the programme and that in some ways it represents a liability, e.g. in costs of maintenance, and in representing the school to the total school community in a not altogether favourable light.

I therefore endorse their decision that the house be disposed of and that the programme be conducted from within the school. I accept that some modifications to the facilities offered to the students by the school are desirable to ensure the continuing success of the programme and I am therefore pleased to advise that \$10 000 of the proceeds of the disposal of the house will be available to effect such modifications.

I hope that the staff and students associated with the programme will enter fully into the determination of alternative arrangements for carrying on the programme.

The information that has been put to me is that the success of the Delta subschool was contingent upon its operation as a semi-separate campus within the Mawson High School. The sense of identity that developed within that was put to me as being a critical element in the subschool's success.

Mr Mathwin: You should go and have a look at it.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am, in fact, going to have a look at it.

Mr Mathwin: It is a long way from Salisbury.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It is not a long way from the portfolio of the shadow Minister of Education, though. It has been put to me that, if it were to be subsumed into the main school itself, the programme's success would be in jeopardy.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This is an interesting question and I point out that I certainly have been to the school to

inspect the school itself and the old and very dilapidated accommodation that has been provided for this special project. In fact, I attended the school several months ago with the specific purpose in mind of making a personal assessment of the worth of that project to the young people who are involved. I came away with mixed feelings. I was not absolutely convinced of the worthwhile nature of the project, for a variety of reasons that I do not propose to air in the House. Another reason is that I have had conflicting opinions from the Principal of the school, Mr Geytenbeek, who at various stages has both supported and opposed the retention of that programme.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That is not a reflection on the Principal, is it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We have had correspondence received in the Ministerial office both supporting and opposing. Please do not be silly. This is simply a statement of fact.

It is not a reflection on anyone. I am telling the honourable member that the correspondence received in head office has on different occasions supported and opposed the retention of that building. On a very detailed appraisal and analysis of the project, the Director-General and I were of the firm opinion that the better approach to this problem would be for a sum of money be made available to the school but for the house in question not to be involved in that project. There are a number of reasons for that which I will be quite prepared to make available to the honourable member when he makes his own visit to the school.

So, the recommendation which was made by the Director-General of Education to me, and which was forwarded to the Premier for him to respond to a personally addressed letter from the school council, was the result of a personal visit by both the Director-General and myself, and an examination of the aims, the motives, and the building itself. I am still of the opinion that the better approach would be to relinquish the tenure of the house, to dispose of the house, and to make more appropriate arrangements within the school which does have some extremely fine facilities available but which are considerably under-utilised.

Members of the House may appreciate that this is not an idly considered decision. I have had extreme pressure from members of the Opposition in relation to the Thebarton High School, where facilities almost identical to those of the Mawson High School are available in so far as it was a former technical high school which had so much more to offer to young students in need of extra normal curricula activities. So, the Mawson High School, the Thebarton High School, the Goodwood High School and a number of others we believe are being included in the school-to-work transition educational programme, in a special departmental programme, which is specifically addressing itself to the problems of these young people. If those youngsters cannot assimilate within this specially structured programme, but need to be accommodated in an antiquated, dilapidated house, which under any other circumstances the Minister would be pilloried for maintaining, is rather an eccentric point of view. So, my opinion is that the house should be disposed of and that the youngsters should be brought within the ambit of the upgraded transition educational programme is very firmly and sensibly considered.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the anticipated completion date of the library resource centre at the Cummins Area School? The Minister would be aware of the lack of library resource facilities at the Cummins Area School, which was one of the last schools

constructed before it became a requirement of the department to have the library resource centre incorporated within planning and construction of schools. Whilst on a recent visit to the Cummins school, the Minister had discussions with the Chairman of the school council and the acting principal at the time, and discussions were held in relation to possible alternative solutions to this problem. The Cummins community would be pleased to have confirmed the type of construction of the proposed library resource centre and the estimated time of completion.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member has had a continuing interest and has made representations to me on a number of occasions. On a recent visit to his electorate to open three small school redevelopment projects, I took the opportunity to visit the Cummins Area School. It has two resource centres: one of them accommodated just to the right of the main hall as one enters this building, and another one, a senior resource centre, upstairs in a two-storey building. An original decision was that redevelopment of the resource centre would be deferred, but when I was at the school I informed the Chairman of the school council and the Principal that arrangements were being made by the Education Department to provide a Demac unit, which was to be relocated from a metropolitan school.

Although I am not aware of the precise date of completion, to the best of my knowledge this work is still in progress, and I will be very pleased to bring down a progress report to the honourable member when Parliament is out of session.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr KENEALLY: Has the Premier calculated the multiplier effect of the 4 000 Public Service jobs that he boasts of having taken away from the South Australian work force? The Premier in this House has often alluded to the multiplier effect of newly created jobs. He has also said in this House that his Government is the only Government in Australia to have effectively reduced the number of Public Service jobs within the State. As newly created jobs have a multiplier effect, jobs taken away from the economy must also have a multiplier effect, and I ask the Premier to explain to the House the extent of the multiplier effect of those 4 000 jobs. Is it two to one, four to one, or maybe five or six to one, as he claims for newly created jobs?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The 4 000 public sector jobs that have been removed have been more than made up for by the number of private sector jobs that have been created.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot really understand the arithmetic of members opposite. The thing which honourable members opposite often ignore (and which the member for Stuart has kindly emphasised for the benefit of the community) is that the taxpayers foot the bill for the jobs in the public sector. I am aware of a booklet that is being put out by the Public Service Association entitled *Are you being served?* I am also aware that the A.L.P. policy requires large public sector employment and, indeed, that in the long term its policy would have the public sector swallow up the private sector altogether. This is quite clearly—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about Government-owned icecream shops?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If an A.L.P. Government thought it could get away with owning icecream shops, I am sure it would try to do that. If I remember rightly, there was once a Bill before the Parliament which threatened to take over the catering, tourist and hospitality industries. That has happened during the time I have been in this place. The multiplier effect is very important indeed in

relation to productive jobs, but when a public sector has been expanded at the expense of the private sector, the multiplier effect does not come into it at all, because it applies equally to those jobs that disappear from the public sector as to those jobs that are created in the private sector. Therefore, it is a constant factor and need not be taken into account. What should be taken into account is that more jobs have been created in the private sector than have been lost in the public sector.

GENERAL MOTORS-HOLDENS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Premier investigate the effects of the proposed loss of 220 jobs at G.M.H., Woodville, and the multiplier effects on the business community in that area? This morning, I have received a number of telephone calls in my office from small business people within my district expressing grave concern at the loss of these 220 jobs. My colleague has pointed out the problem in relation to the multiplier effect within the community. Therefore, will the Premier bring back a detailed report to Parliament on the effect of the loss of these 220 jobs and the multiplier effect on the business community within the Albert Park and associated areas?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me emphasise yet again for the benefit of members opposite, who seem determined to misrepresent the situation, that the loss of jobs referred to involves a voluntary early retirement scheme and not, as he suggests, sackings. Therefore—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no doubt in my mind about the implication that the honourable member intended to convey. It is early voluntary retirement, and I think there will always be changes of occupation. One could equally ask about the new factory being created by Grundfos Pumps. What about the new factory for Raytheon? What has been the positive effect of those new factories? There will always be changes but the important thing is that private sector employment is increasing. The other lesson (and I would have thought that the honourable member would have listened to what I said in answer to the Leader) is that there is no doubt at all that there is the most amazing opportunity for South Australia to create yet more jobs and at least save 1 000 jobs in total, including the multiplier effect, from Roxby Downs now and many other potential jobs in the future if the relevant legislation is supported. Yet the Party opposite has done everything it can to stop that project from coming into operation and indeed, as I said before, if no change occurs, will have voted (and nothing will change the fact that they have voted, regardless of the outcome) to destroy at least 1 000 jobs now and many more in the future.

O'BAHN BUS

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say how many houses owned by the Highways Department are to be or are being demolished for the requirements of the O'Bahn bus system, and how many houses owned by the Highways Department will be sold, in close association with the O'Bahn bus system, as being surplus to the requirements of the department? Many substantial houses in the Klemzig area have been demolished recently, and I believe many houses in the Paradise area are to be demolished soon. The Minister would be aware of the difficulties of tenants occupying these houses in obtaining alternative accommodation. I therefore ask how many houses are to be demolished and how many are surplus to the requirements of the Highways Department. What is the position in relation to the tenants

occupying those houses? Will they receive some priority assistance from the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope that the honourable member will let me have details of anyone he knows who is being disadvantaged in the present situation. I certainly am not aware at the moment of any such cases, but if he will let me know the details I will do everything I can to assist. I cannot give exact figures, but I know that about 30 houses are to be demolished for the whole project. I understand that the State Transport Authority has acquired 20 houses and 10 are still to be acquired, some of which are owned by the St Peters and Walkerville councils. Some are privately owned, so that compulsory acquisition procedures will have to be instituted, and this is always unfortunate. I am unable to give an off-the-cuff figure of the number of houses owned by the Highways Department, but I will get them for the honourable member.

O'BAHN BUS

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Transport make public the study being conducted on certain aspects of the environmental effects of the O'Bahn busway? A 10-page document purporting to be an environmental impact statement was prepared by the Minister's office in 1980, and it appears that this report was never released publicly, nor were comments sought on its contents from the community, nor was it ever evaluated by an independent authority. The copy of the report that I received from the Parliamentary Library contained an additional note which I assume was inserted into that report prior to its being sent to the library indicating that a further report was being prepared by the department on certain changes that had taken place to the route, and other aspects of the O'Bahn busway.

I further understand that authentic environmental impact statements were promised by the Liberal Party in its pre-election policy documents. It has been put to me that there is a degree of urgency in this matter, because of the listing of the Torrens River on the National Heritage Register.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I should make quite plain to the honourable member that when the present Government introduced the north-east busway scheme we provided an environmental impact statement as we promised, and this was based, of course, on the previous environmental impact statement prepared by the former Government, because much of the area was common to the two reports. It was decided, in consultation with the Department of Environment, to produce an addendum to the e.i.s. released by the former Government on the Neaptr scheme.

It is perfectly obvious that, when substantially the same route is being used, many of the items are common. That was the e.i.s. on which the Government's decision to go ahead with the O'Bahn system was based. However, to do justice to the fact that many technical advancements have been made in the past two years, it has been decided to produce an updated e.i.s. for the benefit of members of the community. As soon as I receive that, I will refer it to my colleague the Minister of Environment and Planning, and as soon as that is completed the honourable member will receive a copy.

PORT ADELAIDE CASUALTY

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Health say what is now planned as regards the Port Adelaide Casualty, when will the plan on proposals concerned be implemented? Some two years ago it was suggested that the Port Adelaide Casualty would be closed. At that time there was considerable protest,

because it provides a very real service to Port Adelaide and adjacent areas. At that stage, a Dr Selge was engaged to survey the needs existing at Port Adelaide and to make recommendations on the centre's future. I have seen his report and recommendations, but to date to my knowledge anyway, there has been no concrete plan. I do not know whether the situation has been resolved but, if it has, when will the plan be implemented?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have discussed the report, a copy of which I sent to the honourable member, with the South Australian Health Commission. I will be pleased to seek a report from the commission as to progress of the recommendations and will inform the honourable member.

ALBERTON RAILWAY STATION

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Transport given consideration to leasing part of the Alberton railway station to the Port Adelaide Unemployed Self Help organisation? That body applied to the State Transport Authority some time ago to lease part of the Alberton railway station, to enable it to establish a craft centre to do carpentry and leatherwork, and to carry out various other activities. I am advised that the S.T.A. agreed to lease, for \$1 000 a year, that part of the station required. Further complications have set in, because PUSH was advised that a transformer box had to be relocated at a cost of several thousand dollars. The organisation believes that the transformer box need not be relocated but could be made secure by the addition of a frame, for which it is quite prepared to pay. The Minister may be aware that I wrote him a letter some weeks ago asking for urgent consideration of this matter so that I could advise the organisation whether it could proceed with its application. As yet, I have had no reply. Perhaps the Minister can now give me some information.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I referred the honourable member's correspondence to the State Transport Authority. It slipped my mind that it had not been returned, but I will check on that matter for him immediately.

HOUSING

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Premier outline to the House what initiatives have been taken to assist those people in the community who are finding it extremely difficult to either purchase or rent a home in South Australia? I am sure the Premier will agree that perhaps housing is the most major social problem facing the community today. In 1979 the Liberal Party, in its policy statement on housing, stated that it would ensure that housing information services were upgraded, promoted and made more readily accessible to home seekers; that it would ensure an improvement in the availability of housing finance; provide incentives for people purchasing a home; introduce legislation in support of the home owners protection scheme developed by the building industry; and constantly review provisions of the Residential Tenancies Act to ensure that both tenants and landlords receive a fair deal.

At present there are 27 000 families on the South Australian Housing Trust's accommodation list, and there is now a vacancy rate in the private rental market of .7 per cent, which is the worst in the Commonwealth. The emergency housing offices now face a critical situation, whereby people seeking assistance have to wait 14 days before they can get an interview. Evidence has been given in this House by the member for Brighton about the activities of shark landlords. An investigation was promised by the Premier then, but we

have yet to see the results of that investigation. At present, there is only one organisation in South Australia, 'Shelter', which is funded by the Government and which is attempting to assist home seekers in those categories I have just outlined.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think it is important to recognise that what the honourable member says is quite true: there is a far from satisfactory housing situation in South Australia at present. Therefore, I am pleased to repeat that record sums are being spent on housing this year by this Government. Nevertheless, the honourable member has raised a large number of matters. Stamp duty concessions right down to many other advantages have been provided through the State Bank and the Savings Bank. The subject is of such complexity and, indeed, so much as been done, that I shall be delighted to have a report compiled and circulated to all members, especially for the member for Napier.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr TRAINER: Is the Premier aware that his Minister of Industrial Affairs, by means of an injudicious and inaccurate press release dated 27 May—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr TRAINER:—which has been described in some circles as being injudicious, Mr Speaker, has embarrassed the Public Service Board and led some public servants to believe that a right of appeal that was open to them was in fact not open to them. The origin of my question is a news release issued in the name of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, headed 'Three top P.B.D. positions announced'. I have a copy of that release, which states that the three top jobs within the Public Buildings Department have been decided. These positions were, Director, Client Services; Director of Administration and Finance; and Director, Operations. Yet those who looked at the matter more clearly discovered that the position of Director, Operations had not in fact been finally decided. An engineer had only been nominated for this particular position on 26 May, and it was still subject to appeal. However, the press release concluded with the following remark by the Minister:

These men would represent the top management of the P.B.D.—thus clearly implying that the appointments were official. Press reports accepted that this indeed was the case and that the Director, Operations position was a *fait accompli*. I have since been advised that three people have appealed against this nomination, and I believe that the Public Service Board has officially protested at this announcement having been handled in what has been described as such a clumsy way.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member has obviously been listening either to the Public Service Association or to one of the applicants for the job who was unsuccessful, at least in the initial application that he made, and who may now be one of the appellants for the position. The professional engineers group said that according to newspaper reports I had said that these three people had been appointed to these positions. In fact, I sent back to that professional body a copy of my press release, which I quote as follows:

Mr Ray Power, a senior engineer with the Public Buildings Department, had been nominated for the position of Director, Operations. Mr Power is at present project manager of the Law Courts Project in Victoria Square.

In fact, that is absolutely correct. Mr Power had been nominated, but the fact that the news media decided to change the word 'nominated' to 'appointed' is beyond my control, and surely the honourable member realises that. I have had the matter checked by the Public Service Board, which

agrees that the press release submitted by me was absolutely accurate in that I spelt out exactly what the circumstances were, namely, that Mr Power had been nominated for the position, which is exactly in accordance with the Public Service Act. Therefore, the newspapers decided to insert their own words in place of the ones I had formerly submitted. If the honourable member would like a copy of what I said, I will give it to him.

Mr Trainer: I have it here. The third to last paragraph says 'these appointments'.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There were two appointments: the honourable member needs to realise that there were two appointments. I have referred to three positions: two were outside appointments, which cannot be appealed against, and one was a nomination. I said that the one from within the department was a nomination. I suggest that the honourable member stop listening to someone who is obviously aggrieved because he did not get the position and read the official press release; it is in there in black and white, and it is quite accurate.

WOMEN'S REGISTER

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware of new initiatives announced in May by the Premier aimed at giving women in the community greater access to the power of decision-making, particularly through the establishment of Talent Bank, a register of women? Did the Minister consult the Women's Adviser to the Premier on the question of the appointment of suitable women to the South Australian Institute of Sport? I quote directly from the *Newspaper* No. 6, June 1982—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suspect that the substance of this question is the same as that contained in the question asked by the honourable member for Gilles yesterday. I ask the honourable member to bring her question to the table, and an opportunity will be given for her to raise this matter again if it is in order.

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS UNION

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare in another place, say whether the Government intends to provide funds to the Unemployed Workers Union in the 1982-83 financial year? The Department for Community Welfare withdrew its funding to the Unemployed Workers Union earlier this financial year owing to alleged political activities. However, in a letter to the Speaker yesterday, in which the Unemployed Workers Union strongly objected to a statement made by the Minister of Public Works in this House on 16 June, the organiser of the Unemployed Workers Union (Mr Des Lawrence) said:

The Unemployed Workers Union is an organisation which strongly acts on behalf of the unemployed. Its perspectives are broad, much broader than those of the Minister of Community Welfare, who believes that the thrust of our work should lie in the area of handing out blankets and food parcels. The union does help the unemployed with clothing and furniture and house removals; the cost of food makes this prohibitive. But our activities also extend to educating the community about unemployment, the support of workers fighting the sack, raising unemployment in the political forums of this country, and many more.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will obtain a reply from my colleague.

DISABLED PERSONS

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Health urgently consider establishing or assisting in the establish-

ment of temporary accommodation for disabled persons and others in need of assistance who do not qualify for hospitalisation?

I emphasise the words 'temporary accommodation'. It has been brought to my attention that many disabled people and other people such as the frail aged are required to visit Adelaide for various medical, dental and other treatments. In many instances, they do not qualify for hospitalisation or, for that matter, for a St John Ambulance clinic card for transport. These people are sometimes required to stay in Adelaide overnight, either because of the nature of the treatment or because there is insufficient public transport from their home to Adelaide and return. Extreme hardships can be caused to the disabled or frail aged owing to medical appointments made in Adelaide that do not fit in with public transport time tables and other transport arrangements.

I can give an example of this. A person who had an appointment with a specialist at the Royal Adelaide Hospital lived at Morgan. The bus leaves Morgan for Adelaide, I am told, at about 7 a.m. and leaves Adelaide for the return journey at 6 p.m. Apart from anything else, this would have been an incredibly long day for that frail aged person. Unfortunately, the doctor was late for the late afternoon appointment and, consequently, the patient missed the bus and had to spend the night in Adelaide.

I understand that she eventually stayed at a motel, after the shocking experience of wandering the streets for about two hours. Even the experience of staying in a motel was quite frightening for this elderly person, and it certainly absorbed a large portion of her pension for that week. Apart from that, hotels and motels do not provide the sort of care and attention that is required by the disabled, particularly those in wheelchairs and the frail aged.

There is also the question of inefficiency. I understand that the Royal Adelaide Hospital accommodates people in this category overnight on some occasions by bending the rules and by other means. Quite obviously, this is a humane but inefficient use of hospital resources. I am aware that Bedford Industries has a motel but, apart from the fact that I understand it is frequently fully booked, it is also geographically removed from where most of the public transport terminates and also from where most of the medical and dental services are available in the metropolitan area. I would be grateful if the Minister could arrange to have this matter investigated with a view to establishing suitable residential accommodation in the inner Adelaide area for this purpose.

The Hon. JENNIFFER ADAMSON: I appreciate the importance of the matter that the member for Elizabeth has raised. In fact, some months ago I asked the Health Commission to make investigations and arrangements that are appropriate for such people. Already, some hospitals provide overnight accommodation, quite frequently for parents from country areas who visit their children. It is not hospital accommodation: it is more likely to be excess nurses home accommodation. I can assure the honourable member that the matter is in hand, but I will obtain a report on what is available and how the commission has responded to my request for an investigation, and I will let the honourable member have the details.

WOODVILLE-GRANGE RAILWAY

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport carry out investigations into the alleged over-crowding on the Woodville-Grange railway service? This morning I received correspondence from a constituent (which, unfortunately, I did not bring with me) who complained about over-crowding

on that service. If my memory serves me correctly, my constituent, a Mrs Harris from Third Avenue, Seaton, stated that she travels regularly on this service. She also stated that the trains were over-crowded and the staff could not properly collect all fares. This woman is an elderly citizen and, with many other people, she has experienced difficulty in obtaining seating accommodation on that service.

In the light of my recollection of her letter, will the Minister carry out an investigation into that service, because my constituent informed me that she travels on that service up until 9 p.m.? It would appear that she has been travelling in peak hour traffic. Will the Minister carry out an investigation, perhaps with a view to providing another railcar to overcome that problem?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As the honourable member well knows, a joint union-S.T.A. investigation was made 12 months ago into the alleged overcrowding on that particular line as well as on other lines. That was a costly and thorough investigation and the delegates of the union, Public Service Board and S.T.A. on that committee did an extremely good job. I would be grateful if the honourable member would let me have a copy of Mrs Harris's letter and I assure him I will have it looked at. I am not going to promise him a full investigation but I will look at it and see what substance there is in the claim.

WOMEN'S TALENTBANK

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware of the new initiatives announced in May by the Premier aimed at giving women in the community a greater access to the power of decision-making, particularly through the establishment of Talentbank, a register of women, and did the Premier consult his Women's Adviser on the question of suitable women for appointment to the board of the South Australian Institute of Sport?

I quote directly from *Newspage*, No. 6, of June 1982, issued by the Women's Adviser to the Premier, which states:

Talentbank: A register of women:

In spite of the very great skills and abilities of many South Australian women, they are under-represented on boards, councils and committees of all kinds, both in the Government and the private sector.

Some of these councils required specific skills in their members, while others require good judgment, effectiveness in committee work, wide knowledge of the community, and willingness to devote time and effort. For both kinds of councils and committees, we believe that women are too seldom considered, not through antagonism but rather because their abilities are less widely known.

With Talentbank we hope to help remedy this situation, by providing suggestions of female nominees, backed by a full curriculum vitae, both to Government and to private organisations seeking suggestions.

The Government has agreed, wherever possible, to appoint women with suitable skills, awareness and experience to boards, councils and committees, using Talentbank as a reference base, and will encourage private enterprise to follow suit.

Forms have been devised to record the relevant information, in the same format as is used by the Office of Women's Affairs in Canberra for use in Commonwealth appointments. Women joining the South Australian Talentbank scheme will thus have a choice of also being included on the Commonwealth list.

There is, of course, no guarantee that women who join Talentbank will subsequently be appointed to boards, councils and committees—that decision must always rest with the department or organisations concerned. But at the least, we hope to ensure that the skills and abilities of South Australian women are brought forward for consideration and that the present shortage of women in decision-making positions will thus gradually be remedied.

In conclusion, I would like to stress to the Minister and to the Government that women in South Australia are not satisfied with only being—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not able to suggest, which is by way of comment.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I was stressing, Mr Speaker,

The SPEAKER: Order! The opportunity for a member is to explain the question which must be done by factual information and not as the honourable member then indicated by saying, 'and I suggest to the Minister and the Government'. Does the honourable member wish to continue?

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I did not suggest; I was stressing something that was taking place. I said that I would stress.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the same thing.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: In that case, I will not continue.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I was aware of the Premier's initiative. May I also add that I support it entirely. If the honourable member would like to look at the appointments made within my portfolio, she will see that I have supported it entirely, and I say that unequivocally.

I did not consult the Women's Adviser, because in this particular case the appointments to the board of the institute were appointments to a committee of management of specific people to do a specific job. It is not an advisory committee. I refer the honourable member to the answer I gave yesterday to a question by the member for Gilles for any additional information.

STATE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say why he finds it impossible at this time to find a female or trade unionist who could make a significant contribution to the deliberations of the State Development Council, and when he anticipates being able to do so? The State Development Council is a body appointed by the Premier to advise him on economic and State development matters. In November 1981 it published a report entitled A Preliminary Strategy for South Australia's Economic Future, which was enthusiastically hailed by the Premier as a blueprint for our development and a vindication of his Government's policies.

At the time, it was pointed out that that council did not have as members any women or any representative of the trade union movement and that this could perhaps be seen as a deficiency in the advice that was being considered within the council. No action was taken to change or increase the membership. On 19 March this year, the honorary secretary of the Status of Women Committee of the United Nations Association wrote to the Director of State Development and sent a copy of the letter to both the Premier and me, among others, pointing out that the development council did not have any women on it. She went on to say:

It was also amazing to find the only women pictured in your paper were, we presume, for ornamentation. Could not one female technician or industrial worker have been found? Perhaps you found our comments trivial but the women of this State are just as concerned with its advancement, for we comprise at least 50 per cent of the population. We are prepared to share the responsibility for planning projects to encourage development of this State's potential, particularly in skill areas.

On receipt of that letter, I wrote to the Premier supporting the comments made by the honorary secretary of the Status of Women committee. I pointed out to her that I had raised this matter both publicly and with the State Development Council directly at the time the report was published, and I asked the Premier to take action to rectify the situation. I added that I believed that there should be persons representing the interests of or drawn from the trade union movement on the council and said that the absence of either a woman or someone drawn from that background was a major omission.

The Premier did not see fit to reply to my letter, which was written on 26 March this year, until I wrote him a follow-up letter on 3 June referring to that earlier letter and

asking him whether he could do me the courtesy of replying. On 9 July, that is, over a month after my follow-up letter, and well after 26 March, I finally received a letter from the Premier in which he said that he would not accept my suggestion. He said:

The basis of selection for council membership is the contribution that an individual person can make in advising me on matters of State development as outlined in the council's terms of reference.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: In July?

Mr BANNON: This letter is dated 9 July 1982; I do not know why. It certainly has been pre-dated. I expect it probably means 9 June. That is the date shown on the letter, so it is an incompetence on the part—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Yes, I know. Thank you for the correction. The letter is dated 9 July but I received it on 10 June, so there was extraordinary efficiency displayed! Let me continue by saying that the letter stated what the basis of selection was, and concluded by stating:

Neither women nor officials or members of trade unions are precluded from membership of the council. Either or both could well be appointed at some time in the future. However, as your request suggests selection just on female or trade union status, without any consideration of the ability of the person to make a significant contribution, I find your request inappropriate.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am glad that we have shown such clear evidence that we are so far ahead of the Opposition. The matter that the honourable member has raised is being discussed with the Chairman of the State Development Council and, indeed, several proposals are being considered by the Government at present.

ELECTORATE OFFICES

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Public Works immediately have installed in all electorate offices burglar alarm equipment that will activate on entry to an office. My office was broken into on Wednesday night this week. While it is a little early to establish what has been taken, there has certainly been gross malpractice there. Keys have been taken and cupboards were locked. The office keys were stolen, as was the telephone key and toilet key. My secretary is going through all the files now that we have cabinets reopened. I want to place on record my appreciation, at this stage, of the assistance both from the Public Buildings Department and its workers who have been sent to my office. They have been very active in getting the office mobile again. I also thank the security department.

Mr Mathwin: Did they get into your casino file while they were there?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is probably what they were after. You did not instigate something like this, did you?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not going to develop into a debate.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was placing on record my great appreciation for the assistance given by both the Public Buildings Department and the security department. I do not know whether the Minister has been informed about this. He may have been. It is essential that some sort of activation system be put in our offices. I know that there is a burglar alarm system there, which needs to be activated by being pushed in, but that does not work unless someone is in the office protecting it. I do not know what has happened in the past at other electorate offices. It is vitally important to give all our private information, our private files—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is now starting to comment. I ask him to stay with the explanation or make way for the Minister to answer the question.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was not aware of the problems that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had. I will look into the matter. I stress that I would appreciate it if all members, whilst raising the point (and I will certainly look at this in some detail), would be very careful about talking publicly about what security does apply in those offices. They all know that a certain amount of security applies now and it is important that people outside do not know the extent of it. I appreciate the honourable member's concern. Perhaps if any other members have problems, I would appreciate their highlighting them to me. Information is important so that we can assess the best type of system, but I stress and ask that people not talk about this matter publicly, because that will defeat in part the intention of what we are attempting to achieve in terms of security.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EMPLOYMENT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr HAMILTON: Early in Question Time today I directed a question to the Premier in relation to the reduction of 220 jobs at the G.M.H. plant at Woodville. At no time did I imply or state that there would be any sackings, as was said or suggested by the Premier. I have indicated quite clearly in this Parliament on a number of occasions my concern for small business people in that area. If I may, I would like to read from an article that appeared in the Messenger press.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may do that only if it relates to his position in this matter.

Mr HAMILTON: It is in relation to small businesses, yes. I did express in this article on the front page of the Messenger press publication, in relation to the car industry and that particular plant, my concern about effects on small businesses in that area. At no time have I suggested that there would be sackings at G.M.H., Woodville. I understand, quite clearly, from press reports that there are incentives at that plant for early retirement, not sackings, as the Premier tried to imply that I was suggesting.

An honourable member: What are you on about?

Mr HAMILTON: The stupid statement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

At 12.5 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When honourable members on my right conclude, I will proceed.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the House of Assembly's amendment with the following amendment:

Leave out the name 'P. D. Blacker' and insert in lieu thereof the name 'H. J. Southcott'.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

Briefly, the amendment is contrary to the principle that has been adopted by the Government and, for the benefit of all members who might not have heard what I said yesterday, I will repeat it. A need exists, I believe, to have the views

of Independent members of this House represented at such an important function as the Constitutional Convention. It is the Government's intention that Independent members should be given representation on that committee. Bearing in mind that there are three honourable members who are suitable and qualify as Independent members, I simply say that it would be very difficult indeed—

Mr Keneally: But two sit on the cross benches.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Three sit on the cross benches. It would be very difficult indeed to find any way in which there could be one or other of those members who could be considered for that member's own attributes as better than any other. However, in the past the former member for Mitcham was appointed to that committee, and the Government concluded that, because of his length of Parliamentary service, he was a very right and proper person to be on that committee. The principle has, therefore, been adopted by the Government that the person who is, by virtue of his Parliamentary service, the senior of the three Independent representatives, should be the representative on the Constitutional Committee. Therefore, I disagree with the amendment moved by the Legislative Council and invite honourable members to support the motion.

Mr BANNON: When this matter was before us previously, I spoke on it. My remarks, which were intended to be constructive and to assist the debate and consideration of this matter, were treated with some contempt and derision by people, notably the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the member for Glenelg. I hope that that performance is not repeated on this occasion, because what I intend to say I intend to say seriously and soberly about quite an important matter.

I indicated then that as between the three members that one could call independent members of this House, each had some sort of claim, and it was really a question of the weight to be given to those various claims, and that that was a matter to which we should address ourselves. Presumably, that is what has occurred in the Legislative Council as well, hence this motion that is before us. We disagree with the Premier's motion. I would like to indicate our opposition, because after consideration of those various claims and the weight to be given to them, I believe that the member for Mitcham does have a prior claim.

I anticipate that she will be able to say one or two things herself in defence of that. Let me put it on the basis that the purpose of the Constitutional Convention is to ensure that from each State as many of the strands of political interests as possible can be represented. That means, of course, in terms of the size of delegations, that it is not possible for every House or every political Party to be represented. Therefore, one must look to representation from the significant political forces in the State.

It is quite clear that, in the case of the Government and of the Opposition, those Parties should have the bulk of representation. So, we are talking about one representative from this Lower House. Previously, as has been pointed out, this position was held by the former member for Mitcham (Mr Millhouse). It is certainly true that he could claim some seniority in this area; there is no question about that. He could also claim, of course, that he was the Leader of a Party, the Australian Democrats, albeit a single representative of that Party in this Chamber.

Let me now refer to the current situation. I think it really comes down to the competing claims of two members, the member for Mitcham or the member for Flinders, as to whom the Government must nominate. In the case of the member for Flinders, certainly he has seniority on his side; certainly he is the Leader of a Party, a Party which stands candidates in elections in this State. He is, however, his Party's sole legislative representative in this State, and while

it is true that he is not a member of the Government Party, nonetheless, he takes the Whip. He is a member, for instance, of the Public Works Committee. Also, the member for Flinders is given, if he requests it, a pair on the basis of his relationship with the Government.

So, for all those reasons I would suggest the claim of the member for Flinders, when balanced against the claim of the member for Mitcham, is not superior. I say that because, in the case of the member for Mitcham, not only is she the Leader of a Party in this House, but she is also one of the three Parliamentary representatives from this State (the Legislative Council and the Senate have Australian Democrat representatives from South Australia), and as such I would suggest her Party meets the test of being a significant political Party to a greater extent than the National Country Party.

Of course, if one looks to the electorate at large, the Australian Democrats consistently polls a very much higher percentage of the popular vote than does the National Country Party. Therefore, if our intention is to ensure proper representation of those strands of political opinion, I think on balance we should support the claims of the member for Mitcham. I say that without in any way suggesting that the member for Flinders would not be an able representative on this committee. I say that it is a question of weighing the balance which, in my view, comes down very strongly in support of the argument that in this State of South Australia, on our Constitutional Convention delegation, the Australian Democrats have a right to representation.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: At the outset, I would like to state that I am not debating this as a personal issue; it is a matter of principle, and I hope that the member for Flinders will understand that. I referred briefly during the grievance debate last night to the fact that I had not been consulted about the appointments, that I considered that to be a gross discourtesy, and I also referred to the fact that no notice of the motion was given and that it was introduced under suspension of Standing Orders when I was not in the Chamber. I cannot understand the Government's acting in this way unless it was in order to slip something through in haste at the close of a session when few members were in the House.

I believe that the Premier, in his comments, misrepresented the situation to Parliament when he stated that the appointment of the former member for Mitcham (Mr Millhouse) as the representative established a precedent whereby the senior member in Parliamentary service of that group is appointed to the committee. At the very least, his comment was taking advantage of the fact that members of the House were not familiar with the original circumstances of the appointment of the former member for Mitcham.

Having read *Hansard* of the times, I can understand that it is a sensitive issue for members of the Government. I refer to comments in *Hansard* which show quite clearly that the reason for the appointment of the former member for Mitcham was that all shades of political opinion should be represented. There is not one word in any of the *Hansard* reports of that time which mentioned the word 'seniority'. I shall quote passages, first, from *Hansard* of 7 August 1973, pages 201 and 202. The then Attorney-General, Hon. L. J. King, stated:

In moving that the House adopt this motion, I wish to stress at the outset that the reasons for its introduction are to bring the composition of the South Australian delegation into conformity with the spirit of this convention as it has developed from its conception to a stage where final preparations are now being made for the first session in Sydney during the week beginning 3 September 1973. In August 1971, Sir George Reid, the then Attorney-General for Victoria, wrote to me setting out initial suggestions for the convention, including proposals that all representatives should be State Parliamentarians, that they be elected by their respective Parliaments, and that their number should be

large enough to reflect all Parties and differing views within the Parties'.

On Friday 25 February 1972, a meeting of State Attorneys-General was held in Melbourne to discuss proposals for the Constitution Convention, at which it was agreed that a recommendation would be made by the Ministers to their respective Governments 'that the delegates (to the convention) should consist of influential members of Parliament that would reflect the complete spectrum of views of their respective Parliaments'. On that occasion I expressed the view, to which I still subscribe, that 'if any proposed change (to the Constitution of the Commonwealth) is to come about, it will have to command the virtual unanimous support not only of the Commonwealth and the States but of all political Parties; history shows there is no prospect of constitutional amendment unless that unanimity is present . . . ; the widest possible point of view must be represented if the convention is to be of any value at all'.

All discussions and events since that meeting in Melbourne have proceeded on the basis of the above recommendation by the State Attorneys-General and the principle behind the recommendation as I expressed it at that meeting. The letters which I sent to the Leader of the Opposition in this House and the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council which initiated the selection of the South Australian delegation contained the following passage:

The Attorneys-General expressed their view that the various Parliaments in making their selections should endeavour to make their delegations representative of the widest possible spectrum within their Parliaments and that the delegations should consist of influential members of Parliament.

The Commonwealth of Australia, Victoria and Queensland have included in their delegations representatives of minority groups in their Parliaments.

In the same debate, it was further stated:

With two members in one group and one member in another group, it seemed that the choice should fall upon a member of the larger of those two minority groups.

Then on 21 August 1973, at pages 422 and 423, the same speaker stated:

The Leader of the Opposition either did not listen to what I said or is misinterpreting it for his own purposes. What I said (and he has the opportunity to check it) is that it was the understanding of the Attorneys-General throughout that the widest possible spectrum of political opinion should be reflected in the delegation to the Constitution Convention. It had nothing to do with occupation, nothing to do with living in the city or in the country. We were speaking of political opinion, and that is clearly expressed in what I said previously.

I want to comment on an interjection yesterday by the member for Glenelg to the Leader of the Opposition on the point that the Government at that time had not consulted with the three so-called Independent members about who should represent them. It is clearly stated in *Hansard* of 7 August 1973 at page 202 that:

The Government takes the view that it is its responsibility, in these circumstances, to do what it can to ensure that the whole political spectrum in this House is reflected so far as possible in the delegation to the convention. There being, of course, two minority groups on the Opposition side, a further problem is obviously raised. I took the opportunity of discussing with both the member for Goyder and the member for Flinders, and indeed the member for Mitcham, the situation that arose in an effort to see whether those members could themselves agree upon a representative to replace one of the Liberal and Country League members of the delegation. Unfortunately, they were not able to agree and it therefore fell to the Government once again to make a decision in the matter.

On this occasion the Government did not extend the courtesy to the members involved to meet together and see whether a resolution could be made of who should be the representative.

I would now like to state my claims to representation, which I claim on the following grounds. After the Government and the Opposition Parties, the Australian Democrats obtained the highest percentage of votes at the last State election. On the basis of an overall vote of higher than 10 per cent (I have not had time to check the figures overnight), it is only natural justice that one of the representatives in a group of 12 should represent the Australian Democrats. Additionally, we have representation in both Houses of the

Parliament of South Australia. Also, although I may be new to this Parliament, I am not new to politics, either the State or Federal scene, and I have taken a particular interest in constitutional matters over the years. The Australian Democrats do have distinctive policies in this area which should be expressed at this conference.

In conclusion I would like to reiterate in the strongest terms my objections to the manner in which this matter has been handled, by attempting to rush it through in the last stages of a session when other matters of major importance to the State were preoccupying minds of most members.

Mr PETERSON: As one of the so-called three Independents in this State, I suppose I have some say—perhaps not 'say', but something to say. I am the only Independent, if the case comes to a point; the other two are members of Parties. I would like to make it clear, I am sure people will anyway—and I am not a minority, either! I was a bit disappointed also, as was the member for Mitcham, that there was no consultation. I knew nothing of this matter until it was decided. I will say at this stage that although I fully support the member for Flinders as the representative, I knew nothing of the matter until it had been decided in this House.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Yes; I think that not to let people know that a decision like this is to be made, especially when one is one of the group that is supposed to be represented, was definitely in bad taste. I support the member for Flinders being the representative, not because it is a Liberal thing, as it definitely is—

Mr Mathwin: The first time—

Mr PETERSON: I am not supporting the honourable member. I am not doing it because it is a Liberal movement, but because of the member. I believe he is a very capable man. He has been here nearly 10 years and has proven his ability in this House. I think he is probably one of the most respected members in the House and that his knowledge of the Parliament and the constitutional system is probably equal to that of anyone in the place.

I listened closely to what the member for Mitcham said and, if we take the line that was taken by the Liberals quoted there, that means that people like myself are doomed for ever never to be represented on those committees. The whole significant point is—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I think that is right. I don't think you've been here long enough.

Mr PETERSON: Well, it could be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would draw to the attention of the honourable member for Semaphore the terms of the motion, and point out to him also that interjections are out of order.

Mr PETERSON: I did not make any, Sir.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I listened closely to what the member for Mitcham said and what she quoted. As I say, that dooms forever people who stand as Independents, whether on the Liberal side or Labor side, or whatever, and win a seat through the vote of the people. Let us not kid ourselves about how we get here. I get only one vote in my electorate the same as every other member; we are here because the people of our electorate want us here. We are representing a point of view that is supported by at least that many people in this State, or a majority in that area. Let us not lose sight of that.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: What about the interjection? It would also be true that if I had somebody in the Upper House who could put forward an objection such as this and get it

carried, I could be the one who wanted to be on that committee. To me it is a bit of a political ploy and I am disappointed, but that is how it is. I am disappointed about what was said in the quote read by the member for Mitcham that minority people, unless represented in the Upper House, have no hope of ever being on that committee. Laying aside comments that may be made about my future on the committees (and I would like a bet on it), unless we have someone in the Upper House to represent us we will not be there. I support the member selected not because it is a Government motion but because of the man, and I stand by that selection.

Mr BLACKER: I do not very often find myself in such a controversial position. Nevertheless, I would like to thank the House for the nomination put forward, and I am pleased to see it go forward. I will be even more pleased if the House and Parliament recommends that nomination to the ultimate end. I do not wish to say much more other than that in my perusal of the Constitution the word 'Parties' is not mentioned anywhere. We are 47 members representing the House of Assembly and representing this State in Parliament, 47 individuals, and the fact that certain individuals choose to band together to form political Parties is immaterial in the eyes of the Constitution. That being so, I believe, as one member, that the member for Semaphore, the member for Mitcham, or any other member has equal right to representation on that committee. However, if this House sees fit to support my nomination I would be pleased to accept that position.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would like to say to the member for Semaphore that, although I did not agree with 100 per cent of what he said, I think 99 per cent of what he said was very much to the point and answered all of the other matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham. May I say, yet again, that this is no reflection upon the capabilities of either of the other two Independent members.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thought that up until now we conducted the debate in a fairly reasonable, sensible and non-vindictive way, Mr Speaker, but the member for Ascot Park seems very virulent. Let me say again that it is no reflection at all on either of the other two Independent members of this House, the member for Semaphore and the member for Mitcham. I take the member for Semaphore's point that he is, indeed, the only true Independent here, although there are occasions when I wish he would exercise his independence a little more our way! Nevertheless, Mr Speaker, he is gradually seeing the light and the contributions he makes in this House are, I think all honourable members would agree, first class.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure that he will be able to use that in his campaign literature. The point is, as honourable members know full well, that the Constitutional Convention is something that requires quite a depth of experience in Parliamentary procedure and in matters affecting the Constitution and Parliament. While I understand and accept that the member for Mitcham has taken a great interest in constitutional matters (nobody would deny that; her contribution to the State constitutional meeting was quite considerable), but it is true nevertheless that the member for Flinders is the senior of those members in Parliamentary service. He has had wide experience in this House and would be a very worthy representative to put forward as the other member of the Constitutional Convention delegation.

I do not think there is anything more to be said on the matter. I sympathise with the member for Mitcham, and understand that her interest in this would be very great. I do think that, under the circumstances, it is the depth of Parliamentary experience which really will govern (and should govern) the whole proceedings and selection of the delegation. As far as her interest is concerned, may I suggest to her that it is possible for observers to go to the Constitutional Convention and take an interest in the proceedings. I would very much recommend that she does that because, if she takes that course of action, I can undertake (I think I speak on behalf of all members of the delegation) that she certainly would have entry to the discussions with the members of the delegation on any points of view and any contribution she might like to put forward in respect of any matter would be welcomed.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Olsen, Oswald, Peterson, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Payne, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Goldsworthy, Lewis, and Mathwin. Noes—Messrs Langley, McRae, and O'Neill.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

MOUNT GAMBIER PLANNING REGULATIONS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to allow Notices of Motion: Other Business Nos 1, 2 and 3 to be proceeded with forthwith.

Motion carried.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That the Corporation of Mount Gambier planning regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, relating to the South-East Planning Area Development Plan—Zoning (amendment), made on 11 March 1982 and laid on the table of this House on 23 March 1982, be disallowed.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member seeking a cognate debate on the three motions?

Mr EVANS: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I appreciate that the honourable member will move those motions separately, but, if leave is granted, the debate may range over the three. Is leave granted for that action to be taken?

Leave granted.

Mr EVANS: The three regulations are of a similar nature and pick up the same point that was raised by Mr Justice Wells in a judgment *Jurkovic v. The City of Port Adelaide, 1979*. The regulations to which I refer all relate to land use and existing land use. This matter involves changes to the regulations of the Planning and Development Act, and involves 28 metropolitan councils, the Port Pirie zoning area, and Mount Gambier, in the South-East. Mr Justice Wells, in regard to section 37 of that Act, in an addendum to his judgment (because he had some difficulty in arriving at a decision), stated:

If anyone can bring himself within the provisions of that section, more especially paragraph (a) of subsection 1, then he simply rests on the section, and he does not have to think about anything else. He has got a use which is lawful, and which he is carrying on, and that is all there is to it. He simply rests on section 37.

Quite clearly, when the Bill was introduced originally in 1967 by the then Attorney-General (Mr Dunstan), in regard to the intent of section 37 (from page 3793 of *Hansard* of 3 February 1966), the Attorney-General stated:

Clause 37 safeguards the existing use of any land or building.

The intent was quite clear: to safeguard existing use. Mr Justice Wells had some difficulty in establishing that under the present regulation, and so this set of regulations was sent to us. Mr Justice Wells went further in his submission and, when suggesting that the regulations should be made simpler, stated:

But it seems to me that the remedy ought to be much simpler and comprehensible than that, and I would think that the simplest way, without in any way departing from the policies that are incorporated in regulation 33, would be simply to add another subregulation (to all the appropriate zoning regulations that have adopted this regulation) that simply says something to this effect (in place of the present subregulation (3) and speaking of subregulations (1) and (2)): that such and such an application shall be made within a period of six calendar months from the date of the discontinuance of the existing use. If 'discontinuance' is used in the way in which it should be used, namely, as meaning the final termination of the use in question, then that should cause, to my way of thinking, no difficulty at all.

That was his suggestion about how to overcome the problem in a simple way.

The involvement of the Subordinate Legislation Committee in this matter goes much further than that and it does not simplify the situation; in fact, it complicates it. Anyone who reads it will see just how complicated it is. I will read part of it to show how difficult it is to interpret. The committee heard evidence from a person operating in a field of the law who said that it was difficult to interpret and could be a revenue raiser for the legal profession. The first part, in relation to the Planning and Development Act amendment to regulations, states:

The principal regulations set out in paragraph (a) of the schedule are varied by deleting from each of those regulations regulation 33 (3) and by substituting the following subregulation:

(3) Subject to subregulation (4) of this regulation, where in the case of a use or uses of land which would not be permitted under regulation 7 of these regulations, if such use or uses of land were sought to be commenced by any person on or after the day these regulations took effect, and where either—

(a) any existing activity—

that is the first mention of 'activity'—

which would be essential or integral to the existing use of the land; or

(b) in the case of land used for two or more activities, the greater part or number of such essential or integral activities,

has or have been discontinued for a period of six calendar months and that any acts or works as may be remaining and constituting the activity or activities are trivial or nominal, then such use or uses of land shall thereafter be deemed no longer to be an existing use for the purposes of this regulation.

For the first time it is stated that an activity can be eliminated because it happens to be trivial or nominal or is not a major part of the operations being carried out on the property. The Act does not say 'may', it says 'shall'. Automatically those activities will then become a non-existing permitted use. That was not the intention of the Act. In relation to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, Standing Order 26 of the other place provides:

The Committee shall with respect to any regulations consider—

(a) Whether the regulations are in accordance with the general objects of the Act, pursuant to which they were made;

It is clear on that point that one could argue that they are not. Secondly, it provides:

(b) Whether the regulations unduly trespass on right previously established by law;

Again, it could be argued strongly that they do trespass on rights, because in 1967 this Parliament was told that the intention of section 37 was to protect the existing rights of

individuals where they had use of that land for a particular purpose or purposes. Standing Order 26 further provides:

- (c) Whether the regulations unduly makes rights dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions;

I think that is arguable and a point in which I will not involve myself at this moment. Finally, the Standing Order provides:

- (d) Whether the regulations contain matter which, in the opinion of the committee should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament.

That is also a grey area and one on which I will not argue. It could be argued that, since Parliament decided in 1967 that the policy should be that the existing use continue, which was the intent of section 37, then Parliament and the political Parties should decide whether they want to now give councils the power to eliminate existing use. We believe that political Parties ought to look at that now.

In 1966 in the Committee stages (page 2668 of *Hansard* of 1 November 1966), the then Attorney-General, when introducing clause 37, made a deliberate attempt to clarify the situation by amending the clause, because at that time the Bill as introduced had these words in it: 'unless others expressly provided by'. It was saying that, if there was another area in the Act which provided for taking away the non-conforming existing use, that was the first intention of the Bill, but the Attorney-General amended that by inserting the words, 'Notwithstanding anything contained in section 36 or any other section of', adding the following subclause; in other words, the Attorney-General and the Parliament agreed that no other section of the Act should be taken into consideration in relation to existing uses. In other words, they should be protected. The then Attorney-General said:

This amendment is designed to see to it that people are not unduly hampered by the provisions of town plans, and that unless the authority is going to acquire property or do something of this kind where non-conforming uses exist, they may continue to exist, provided those non-conforming uses have already been authorised under provisions of by-laws or regulations under the Building Act. This gives real protection. It is a matter that was raised as one of the serious objections to the provisions of this Bill originally by chambers of manufacturers and commerce, and it is an amendment the Government thought was necessary in order to give protection to people in these circumstances.

It is quite clear that the Attorney-General (Mr Dunstan) wanted to protect existing uses. When it went to a vote there was no division on that amendment to that part of the Bill which became the present Act. However, in 1972 Parliament took the action to amend clause 37 in this way (and I refer only to part of the amendment):

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 36 or any other section of this Act, no provision of any planning regulation shall be construed as—

- (a) preventing the continued use, subject to and in accordance with all existing conditions (if any) attached to that use, of any land or any building for the purposes for which that land or building was lawfully being used at the time the planning regulation took effect;

In 1977 we again amended the Act to strengthen the point that existing use was to be preserved, whether it be of a minor or major existing use, whether it took up a major or a minor part of the land, whether it was trivial or nominal.

The regulations before us go much further than the intent of the Act, the intent of the debates that took place on both of those occasions; therefore, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has recommended disallowance. The committee believes that the matter should be clarified and that there is an opportunity to do that now that a new Planning Act will be proclaimed about 1 August. In that interim period the matter should be resolved by consultation and discussion between the groups. The committee is conscious that the councils have spent some time in arriving at what they have but, if Parliament allows that power to go to councils, it is in effect allowing local government to

gradually phase out existing uses and owners will be in a difficult position to stop it happening in many cases. If Parliament wants to give that power to local government at this stage without further consideration it would vote against the committee's recommendation. I am asking the Parliament to support its recommendation on the basis that Parliament has in existence a set of regulations that covers the situation.

On 4 June 1979, Mr Justice Wells gave a decision covering the situation for the time being. Of course, a considerable time has elapsed since then. The old regulations operated until the new ones came in on 11 March this year. Here, on behalf of the committee, I believe that an apology may be due, and as Chairman I think I should take the major part of the blame. I think that Parliament has the right to ask why the Subordinate Legislation Committee did not take action earlier. I will read to the House the letter from the State Planning Authority, and members can decide whether it represents a truly accurate explanation. We made an error in not looking at the regulations and finalising the matter before the end of this session. Indeed, I made the mistake of not recommending that the committee do this. So we apologise that this matter has come before Parliament on the last day of the session. We would have attempted to take action yesterday but, once we learnt yesterday afternoon what was happening, we did not have to worry then. We are taking this action, knowing no harm will be done if the regulations are disallowed. The State Planning Authority said in its letter (the usual letter of explanation that is attached to all regulations):

These regulation amendments have been made under section 38, Planning and Development Act, to meet a request made by Mr Justice Wells in his judgment on the Supreme Court case of *Jurkovic and another v. Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide*.

That part is quite accurate, and it continues:

Briefly, His Honour requested planning authorities to clarify the basis on which the existing use rights of non-conforming land uses are to lapse under regulation 33 of council zoning regulations.

He was saying that he wanted the matter clarified; he was not suggesting an extension of local government power. I believe that that is not full detail to the committee. If the authority had attached Mr Justice Wells's addendum to his judgment, explaining how to overcome the difficulties, the committee would have realised earlier that there was a problem with the regulation. In future, we would like to see this sort of situation rectified and any details available to the committee sent to it. The letter continues:

The State Planning Authority and the 28 affected councils have considered the two alternative bases suggested by the judge and have agreed that the six-month period of discontinuance is to be related to the activities associated with a land use and not the land use itself.

I do not think that we can object to that. There the authority is saying that it is looking at actual activities. That should be considered as being the critical point but, just because it is a minor activity, we should not give the power until Parliament decides its policy of making that an unlawful use.

I want to apologise to the 28 councils and the State Planning Authority, bearing in mind the work they have done thus far, but we find ourselves in the position of having to recommend disallowance. We ask them to consider that it is not a total disallowance for all time. They have a set of regulations on which to work, and it gives Parliament, other people and the committee an opportunity to investigate the matter properly when a new set of regulations are forthcoming under the new Act. We strongly believe that that should happen. In further explanation, the State Planning Authority's letter stated:

Though the number of cases that may become involved in this matter is not great, each is very important to the landowner and

often to adjoining residents who may have been affected adversely by the previous operations of a non-conforming use.

I agree that it does affect the occupier of the land and neighbours. Councils admit that there are very few cases of this type, so it is unlikely that there will be many in the next two-month period while the matter is being resolved. I have taken the opportunity to speak to one or two councillors, and they are unaware of the sort of power involved in these regulations. It is not something that they as individuals wanted, and they were surprised that that was their full effect.

Motion carried.

PORT PIRIE PLANNING REGULATIONS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That the Corporation of Port Pirie Planning Regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, relating to the Mid-North Planning Area Development Plan—Zoning (amendment), made on 11 March 1982 and laid on the table of this House on 23 March 1982, be disallowed.

Motion carried.

NON-CONFORMING USE REGULATIONS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, relating to non-conforming use, made on 11 March 1982 and laid on the table of this House on 23 March 1982, be disallowed.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable those Orders of the Day: Other Business where debate has ensued to be taken into consideration forthwith, and each question to be put forthwith without further debate.

Motion carried.

SMALL BUSINESS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J. W. Olsen:

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

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

which the Hon. J. D. Wright has moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word 'That' and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

this House is of the opinion that the failure of the Government to adjust the exemption level for the payment of pay-roll tax will mean that many South Australian small businesses will now be liable to pay-roll tax for the first time and that South Australian small business as a whole will be disadvantaged in relation to its competitors in other States and calls on the Government to immediately raise the exemption level so that it corresponds with that applying in Victoria.

(Continued from 9 December. Page 2532.)

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Langley, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Goldsworthy, Mathwin, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

ZONING REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D. J. Hopgood:

That the Corporation of Noarlunga Planning Regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980, relating to the Metropolitan Development Plan—Zoning, made on 30 April 1981 and laid on the table of this House on 2 June 1981, be disallowed.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2248.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Wilson and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Langley, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Goldsworthy, Mathwin, and Tonkin.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

[Sitting suspended from 1.13 to 2.30 p.m.]

CRIMINAL COURT COSTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, costs should be payable to a successful defendant in the Criminal Court in the same way as they are payable to a successful defendant in a court of summary jurisdiction and calls on the Government to introduce legislation to give effect to this opinion.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2249.)

Motion negated.

BIRD SMUGGLING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should investigate the allegations made by the member for Mitcham when speaking in the Address in Reply debate relating to bird smuggling and concerning the actions in which officers of the Department of Environment and Conservation and officers of the Federal Department of Customs and others were involved from 1972 to 1978.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2254.)

Motion negated.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should immediately institute an independent inquiry into the policies and activities of the Public Examinations Board with special reference to the methods used by it in the assessment of the results of the Matriculation examination.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2256.)

Motion negated.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on 2 December. Page 2257.)

The House divided on the second reading:

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is only one member on the side of the Ayes. The motion therefore passes in the negative. Second reading thus negated.

A.L.P. CONVENTION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Mathwin:

That this House condemns the resolution passed by the Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party which reads: 'That this convention endorses the 35-hour week campaign being conducted by the A.C.T.U. and calls for the State Parliamentary Labor Party and endorsed Labor candidates to conduct a supportive campaign throughout the community'.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2258.)

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'Aye'. Those against say 'No'. I believe the Ayes have it.

Honourable members: Divide.

Mr Mathwin: Divide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg places the Chair and the House in a very embarrassing position. The vote has been given in his favour. The motion was introduced to the House by the honourable member for Glenelg, and, a division having been called on my left, the honourable member will be permitted to vote as he would wish, but members who call can be required to vote for the side that is in the negative, or the side that has been deemed to have lost the vote.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin (teller), Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (17)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Ashenden, Chapman, Gunn, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs Crafter, Langley, McRae, and O'Neill.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

CASINO

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Slater:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a joint select committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the impli-

cations of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect and potential a casino may have on the tourist industry in this State—

which Mr McRae had moved to amend by leaving out the words ', pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a joint select committee' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'a select committee of this House'.

(Continued from 30 September. Page 1305.)

Amendment negated; motion negated.

MARKET GARDENING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lynn Arnold:

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

- (a) wholesaling and retailing of produce, including the question of growers' markets; and
- (b) the need for technical assistance to the industry, including the proposal for a vegetable research institute.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 1476.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, Blacker, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Becker, D. C. Brown, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Crafter, Langley, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Billard, Chapman, Randall, and Rodda.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

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

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1675.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Max Brown, Crafter, Langley, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Billard, Chapman, Gunn, and Rodda.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

INCOME TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

That, in the opinion of the House, a select committee should either be appointed to consider and report on the various methods, either in use or proposed for consideration, of apportioning income tax between the Commonwealth and the States, in particular this State, and to advise the Government on the various effects which may be induced by the 'New Federalism'.

(Continued from 28 October 1981. Page 1675.)

Motion negatived.

FIREARMS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

That, in the opinion of the House, a select committee should be appointed to investigate the increase of firearms in crimes of violence, advise on the suitability of the regulations on obtaining and keeping guns, and advise generally on what steps should be taken to control this problem.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Max Brown, Crafter, Langley, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Billard, Chapman, Gunn, and Rodda.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on 28 October 1981. Page 1677.)

Second reading negatived.

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday 8 July at 2 p.m.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): It is customary at this time to make a few remarks about the very many excellent people who have done so much to help us in this place. It is also appropriate to welcome the member for Mitcham, because this is really the first opportunity that we have had to do so, under somewhat unusual circumstances, and to pay a tribute to the great service that was rendered to this House by her predecessor, now Mr Justice Millhouse.

Robin Millhouse is someone I know very well indeed, having been associated with him from school days. But I think probably there are not very many members who have served the Parliament for such a long time; in fact, I am tempted to say, Mr Speaker, he was here for years and years! Nevertheless, he had a distinguished career in this House, if a somewhat chequered one. He served as a Minister, as Attorney-General, in an earlier Liberal Government. I will remember the cartoon that appeared at the time with the Premier of the day, Sir Thomas Playford, introducing this small schoolboy dressed figure into the Cabinet. But Robin Millhouse, I think everyone must accept, was a most accomplished politician. I am quite certain now that his elevation to the bench will provide that body with the great learning and expertise which he undoubtedly has.

All members of this House will be very much aware of the service which is given to us by members of the staff. It is now becoming almost impossible to mention any of them by name without having to mention all of them by name, which would take a very long time. They are simply the officers at the table, members of the *Hansard* staff, the messengers who serve us so well, the Library officers, from the Librarian down to the research officers, the members of the Joint House Committee staff who, basically, I think most people would consider to be absolutely essential to our well-being in this place, members of the maintenance staff, the caretakers, cleaners, the police officers who look after us from time to time particularly well, and I think probably those two forgotten people whom we take very much for granted, Margaret and Claudette, who work on the switchboard for very long hours, and who are always cheerful and happy; indeed, I have never heard them answer the telephone with other than a smile in their voice. That, I think, is something for which we can be very grateful indeed.

It has been, in many ways, a marathon session. It has indeed been a momentous session, and today has been a momentous day and one that will go down in South Australia's history. I very much hope that honourable members will have an opportunity to rest, relax and to refresh themselves for the session to come. I can assure honourable members that it will be no less onerous than the session we have just finished.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to second the Premier's remarks. As he said in his concluding comments, it has been a marathon session, involving many sitting days and some very long nights. There have been times, of course, when temperatures and emotions have risen, yet nonetheless I think we can preserve that basic identity of purpose that allows the Parliament to function. Long may it continue. I am happy to second this motion of behalf of the Opposition.

The Premier referred to the change in this Chamber which, of course, was the elevation of Mr Millhouse to the bench. Like all aspects of his career that, in itself, was controversial and interesting, as his presence in this Chamber has been over a long period of time.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

Mr BANNON: That is true, and I still think that on the occasion when the declaration of the poll occurred in the Mitcham electorate, the person laughing most heartily of all was probably the learned judge himself. However, that ended a very long and vital career in Parliament of the father of the House. I will say no more. Certainly, I join the Premier in welcoming formally the member for Mitcham to the ranks of the Parliament.

Because my offices are here, naturally, I and my staff on a day-to-day basis need the services and assistance of all those whom the Premier has mentioned in relation to the

House: those officers serving under you, Mr Speaker: the clerks, who have done a fantastic job with the high volume of business; the *Hansard* staff, still performing their extraordinary task of making sense of what we say; the messengers, always willing to assist us; and the Library staff and the research services which they provide. I think that any Opposition staff finds those services absolutely vital to performing its functions. I mention, too, the Joint House staff and the girls in the refreshment room. Of course, we miss Miss Stengert, who presided there for so long, but the service has continued in the same cheerful and efficient way as always. To all those other persons who work here (the maintenance people, care-takers, cleaners, police, the girls on the switch-board) we give our thanks for helping the workings of Parliament.

This session has been a long one. I guess that some of us anticipated that with some turn of events it may indeed have been the last of the current Parliament. It looks at the moment (and I notice the Premier vigorously shaking his head), that we will be resuming again for a further session which definitely will be the last, I imagine, of the current Parliament, so we are certainly going to need a break before we come back in here to do battle.

One final word. I mentioned changes in this Chamber. I would not like to let this occasion pass without yet another reference to the fact that one of our honourable members in another place, the Hon. J. E. Dunford, is no longer with us in Parliament House. We certainly regret his passing and miss him. I would like that to be recorded, as this session, the last in which he participated, has ended.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I add my remarks to those of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition and thank members of the staff of this House, the domestic staff, Library staff, messengers, and all concerned in making this House operate in the way that it has done. Mention was made of the former member for Mitcham, Mr Robin Millhouse. During virtually all my time in this House I have sat within a few metres of the honourable member, and I have been able to watch the way he carried out his role as a member of Parliament. On many occasions I was perhaps very annoyed with the honourable member and, at times, quite frustrated. But, by the same token, his political astuteness was to be commended in many ways. Time and time again, he was the very first to pick up a political point when it should occur in this House. That fact should not be overlooked. Nevertheless, I add my welcome to the new member for Mitcham, and trust that she enjoys the privileges of this House, as we all have done.

To you, Mr Speaker, I add my thanks for the manner in which you have conducted the proceedings of this House. I believe it has been your role that has contributed to the fair and proper conduct of the proceedings we are completing.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support absolutely the comments made by previous speakers relating to the people who work (I will not say the staff), in Parliament House. I know I have said it before. I will not repeat my Christmas speech, but they are wonderful people.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I felt so strongly at that time that I had to re-emphasise it. I would like to congratulate the member for Mitcham on her taking a seat in this House. A funny little series of events brought it about, but she is here and I wish her well.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Yes, I would like to make a comment about my promotion. I notice that my seat here is only slightly below yours, Sir, and I wonder whether there is any significance in that. It is a very nice seat. I believe that

many prominent people have sat here, and I hope that I do not disgrace the seat. I want to make a comment about the former member for Mitcham. I know that some people here were not too happy with Robin Millhouse, but I always speak as I find people, and I always found Robin Millhouse—

An honourable member: Absent!

Mr PETERSON: He was at times, but he was extremely helpful to me, and he gave me a hand with problems when I had no-one else to turn to at that stage and I thank him for that. He helped me, and I speak as I find.

Along those lines, I also support the comments made about Jim Dunford. Although I am not a member of the Party to which he belonged (as everyone knows), I knew Jimmy Dunford, in passing, for a long time. He treated me decently. He spoke to me straight when I came here; there were no secrets with Jimmy Dunford; he was a gentleman and I am sad about his passing away. I think the Parliament is the lesser for it.

I thank members on both sides who have helped me in the later stages. I will not name them, because it could be the end of their political career, but on both sides there have been people who had helped me and for that I thank them. As the new member for Mitcham will find, one does not find one's way around this place without some help, and I appreciate the help that I have been given.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the help and advice you have given me at times; I think it might have put my feet on the right track, and I appreciate that. I wish all members well for the break, and I hope that they all come back fresh and ready for the new session.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): I would like to support the comments that have already been made, particularly about the staff, who have been so helpful to me on my coming in at such an unusual time: I do not think I could have picked a harder time to come into Parliament with three major issues before it; the Casino Bill, the Pastoral Act Amendment Bill, and Roxby Downs. The staff have been most co-operative and helpful, and I would like to pass on my thanks to them.

I want to thank members on both sides who have helped me; they will know who they are, so I will not embarrass them by naming them. After listening to the comments that have been made about the expertise of the former member for Mitcham, my only comment is that I wish I had been here to watch so that I would not have made quite so many mistakes. Finally, I would like to bring honourable members the good news that the sign writing that is necessary is under way on the Mitcham electorate office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the opportunity to rise on this occasion to respond on behalf of the members of the staff. I am fully appreciative of the efforts that they put into making the House function and of their genuine desire to assist members wherever they can. I want to make just a brief mention of the blooding of yet a new table officer. Members will appreciate that for the past two weeks we have had the company in the Chamber of Mr Wayne Cuthbert. I welcome him, although he is not here today, to the ranks of the staff. I know that he has appreciated the help that he has received from members and that he has appreciated the experience of sitting in the Chamber over the past two weeks.

It would be wrong of me not to comment and thank each and every member for their assistance with the Review Committee which has moved a long way towards finalising its report which will in due course be made available as a final document to all members of the House. I believe that there has been a very clear identification of difficulties which exist within the South Australian Parliamentary sys-

tem, and that by the endeavours and goodwill of members on both sides of the House, here and in another House, the difficulties will be overcome and the Parliamentary system in South Australia will be the better for that.

Arising out of the evidence taken by that review is a clear indication that members and staff find some considerable difficulty with the accommodation which is available to them in the House. One recognises without difficulty that really the only two purpose-built buildings associated directly with the members of the Parliament are this Chamber and the other Chamber, and that the passage of time has seen the other facilities available to members in their role as members of Parliament move a long way down the track, leaving the facilities in a great deal of disarray and causing some concern. I am certain that those matters will also be able to be addressed during the passage of time.

Mention has been made of the loss from another place of the Hon. Mr Dunford, as indicated on the occasion when this House rose in silence in his memory. I have now passed on to his widow, Mrs Dunford, the motion which was passed in this House, and I commend the members of the late Mr Dunford's Caucus who collected together and made arrangements for the debate in another place and in this place to be put into a very presentable form as a paper. Mrs Dunford, together with the other members of the family, will now have that material available to them.

On this occasion I must wish, on behalf of all members of the Chamber, Mr Howard O'Neill, the member for Florey, a speedy recovery. It is unfortunate that he cannot be with us today and has been unable to be with us for a great deal of the current Parliamentary session. I believe that all members would join with me in conveying to him the best wishes of the members and staff of Parliament House, which in some sense can be looked upon as being his second home.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment to the resolution relating to the Constitutional Convention to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

LIBRARIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 June. Page 4747.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I now continue and in fact conclude my remarks on the Libraries Bill. When I was speaking yesterday, I indicated some concern about the fact that we did not have before us the printed text of the second reading explanation, the notice of the amendments that had been moved in another place, or any other details, which made debate, except in broad generalities, somewhat difficult. Since then I have had the opportunity to obtain all those things, and I have also had the advantage of departmental briefing on some matters contained in the Bill. With the exception of the amendments that I wish to move, I indicate the Opposition's broad approval.

One substantive amendment was moved by the Hon. Miss Levy and was accepted and incorporated in the Bill. I do not know what the intention of the Government is here, but I understand that it will be acceptable, too. There are, of course, two further amendments to be moved by the Minister dealing with financial matters, to which I take no exception.

As to the substance of the Bill, I think that, in view of the time and the fact that the session is drawing to a close, the best I might do is to refer members to the contributions made in another place, particularly by my colleagues the Hon. Miss Levy and the Hon. C. J. Sumner, who did canvass problems in the Library and broad issues of concern which should be highlighted in the context of this Bill.

I do not intend to retrace through that material at this stage. Suffice it to say that the consolidated Bill as it comes before us, despite the fact that the Parliament was not accorded the proper opportunity to study it, does seem to be adequate, except in those respects, one of which has been accepted and the other of which I intend to move in the Committee stage. With those remarks, Sir, I commend the Bill to the House, indicating our support on the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Membership of the Board.'

Mr BANNON: I move:

Page 4, lines 5 to 7—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

(2) Of the members of the Board—

- (a) three shall be members or officers of councils and of these two shall be nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia; and
- (b) one shall be an officer or employee of the Crown engaged in work related to the operation of libraries and chosen at an election conducted in accordance with the regulations in which all officers and employees of the Crown engaged in such work are entitled to vote.

The amendment to clause 10, which is also being circulated, is consequential on this amendment, which was moved in another place and was not supported. I do not intend to go into the argument in great length, because I think it was covered adequately in another place. Suffice to say that we believe, as a matter of principle, that a member of the staff of the library should be a member of the board. I think it is important for those who are employed in any institution or organisation to have some access or direct say in the management decisions that are made surrounding it. It can only be conducive to good relations within an organisation. It improves communication; it ensures that there is, I believe, greater confidence in a board and its deliberations.

It has been the practice of some boards, where formal statutory membership is not provided, to admit staff observers to the procedures of a board. That is a step that can be adopted, but I would suggest that it is far better if an individual or individuals, have been elected in their own right as board members. It does not mean necessarily that they are representatives of that body. They represent the interests of the group who selected them, but they are full board members in their own right. It is working in a number of other areas, in Government and private industry, so there is no reason we believe why it cannot be incorporated here. The board is an eight-member board and the amendment adds, while preserving three members who are members or officers of councils, two nominated by the Local Government Association (which we support), and adds one who shall be an officer or employee of the Crown engaged in work related to the operation of libraries and chosen at an election conducted in accordance with the regulations in which all officers and employees of the Crown engaged in such work are entitled to vote.

I do not wish to elaborate any more on the amendment but to commend it to the Committee and say that this is something we feel strongly about, and we believe that there is strong support from the staff of the library itself for it and that, if the Committee approves this amendment, it

can only be to the benefit of the efficient running of that organisation.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government does not support this amendment. We have made it quite clear in this Chamber on previous occasions that it is not Government policy that staff representation on boards be set down in legislation. I believe the Leader would recognise that in the case we are referring to here with this board that there is at present and has been for some years an elected staff member on the Libraries Board, and it is not the intention of the Government to support this amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Payne, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Crafter, Langley, McRae and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Chapman, Goldsworthy, Olsen, Rodda, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Borrowings.'

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

Page 7—Insert clause as follows:

19. (1) The board may, with the consent of the Treasurer, borrow moneys for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The obligations of the board under any loan contracted under subsection (1) are guaranteed by the Treasurer.

(3) Any moneys required to be paid in pursuance of a guarantee under subsection (2) shall be paid out of the general revenue of the State which is appropriated to the necessary extent.

This is a money clause and, therefore, it could not be inserted in the Legislative Council. It is important to the successful working of the Bill that this clause be inserted.

Clause inserted.

Clauses 20 to 29 passed.

Clause 30—'Exemption from land tax.'

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

Page 10—Insert clause as follows:

30. No land held by, or on behalf of, an institute and used by the institute for the purposes of the institute shall be liable to land tax.

The purpose of inserting this clause is the same as that involved in the previous clause that I moved to insert.

Clause inserted.

Clause 31—'Deposit of public records.'

Mr BANNON: I referred to this clause in the second reading debate in relation to archive collections. Will the Minister indicate when the Government intends to produce a revised and comprehensive archives Act and do something about the archives situation in South Australia, which has been left untended for so long?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am not able to give a direct reply to the Leader in that regard, but I can inform him that work has already started, and I understand that it is planned to be completed about the end of the year. A considerable amount of work has already been done.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (32 to 43), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIBRARIES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 July 1982 at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of *God Save The Queen*.