LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 4 August 1981

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

GUMERACHA PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

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

Gumeracha Primary School redevelopment.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (The Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Highways Act, 1926-1979—Approvals to lease Highways Department Properties, 1980-1981.

Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Disabled Persons.

Racing Act, 1976-1980—Betting Control Board Rules—Bookmakers' Risks.

Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1980—Regulations—Threshold Rate.

Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Rules of the Supreme Court (Criminal Jurisdiction)—Pre-trial Conference.

Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1981—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (The Hon. C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Spearguns.

Prisons Act, 1936-1981—Regulations—Sentences and Parole.

Second-hand Dealers Act, 1919-1971—Regulations—Batteries.

Corporation of Adelaide—By-law No. 11—Newsboys.

Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—Registration Qualifications.

Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (The Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Director of Mental Health Services—Report for the period 1 October 1979 to 30 June 1980.

South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1980—Flinders Medical Centre—By-laws.

South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1979-1980.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (The Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—

Car seat covers.

Candles.

QUESTIONS

MURDER CASE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the axe death murder case.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On the evening before we last rose, some 10 days ago, the channel 7 news contained a report that the Attorney-General had taken action in relation to some of the media coverage of the axe murder case, including writing to the media and warning of the possibility of contempt of court. First, was that report correct? Secondly, who is responsible for taking action for contempt of court in relation to publications which may prejudice the result of court proceedings? Thirdly, does the Attorney believe that the media were in contempt? If he does, will he say what action he has taken or intends to take in this matter?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I wrote to the various news media organisations on the occasion to which the Leader of the Opposition has referred, because I was concerned that, with the impending release on bail, pending an appeal, of the person who had been convicted of murder, there might be attempts to either inadvertently or deliberately breach the suppression order that had been made in respect of the identity of that woman and her family and any material that might lead to that identification. I was concerned also that, because of the emotional momentum that had gathered in respect to this case, the normally accepted limits might be exceeded. My letter was as follows:

As you know there has been a great deal of publicity on the subject of the woman who has been convicted of murdering her husband with an axe, and sentenced to life imprisonment. It is in the light of this publicity that I have become concerned in several instances at the blatant breach of the suppression order which forbids the publication (which includes broadcasting and televising) of the name of the woman or any details which could lead to the identification of the woman and her family. There are other examples of probable contempt of court.

As you know, this matter is now the subject of an appeal in the South Australian Court of Criminal Appeal and is therefore *sub judice*. I believe that so far a great amount of latitude has been allowed to the media in the handling of this story. However, breaches of the suppression order and other instances of contempt of court cannot be tolerated.

I am writing to all news organisations informing them of the position and advising them that, as part of my professional obligations, I will have no alternative but to investigate any possible breaches which may lead finally to prosecution. I would appreciate your support in these circumstances as I am sure no media organisation would want to be party to any breach of the law. Thank you for your co-operation.

That letter, which was widely circulated to the news media organisations, was well received, because the media recognised their responsibility in these particular circumstances, as well as generally recognising their wider responsibility to the community at large. I was concerned that the media should have attention drawn to the position once the notice of appeal had been lodged, and I reminded the organisations of the suppression order, because I did not want any breaches to occur that might lead to prosecution.

During the week in which this case was highlighted, several actions were taken by the court that drew attention to the limits to which the media may go in respect of the reporting of court cases while the time for appeal has not expired and while suppression orders have been made. I have examined the matters of which I am aware, and at present I have concluded that no good purpose would be served by instituting any proceedings, even if they could be justified.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Is it up to you or the court?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is in the hands of both the court and the Attorney-General. I am satisfied that the emotion that arose in the first few days of this event has subsided and rationality in a wide range of areas is now in operation.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about hospital accreditation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I have received information that at present a patient is occupying a bed in the Royal Adelaide Hospital that is a dental bed and not a medical bed. He is a private patient under the care of a dental officer. According to my information, the man is suffering, among other things, from a fractured skull with cerebrospinal fluid leaking through the fracture site, but he is still not under the care of a qualified medical practitioner.

My question deals with the very important subject of hospital accreditation which exists in a number of private hospitals and in some public hospitals with respect to general practitioners. My concern is that it should also exist in public hospitals in relation to the salaried public staff of those hospitals and in relation to both public and private patients of visiting staff. First, will the Minister ascertain, as a matter of urgency and in the interests of this patient, whether or not the patient is under the primary care of a suitably qualified medical practitioner who has the primary responsibility for management of his case? Secondly, will the Minister state whether the Royal Adelaide Hospital has a system of delineation of privileges as between medically qualified staff within the hospital? Thirdly, what powers of enforcement of quality assurance exist in the case of *(a)* hospital service patients, both medical and dental, *(b)* private patients of medical practitioners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and *(c)* private patients of dental practitioners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place, and ask her to investigate it as a matter of urgency, particularly in relation to the patient concerned. I shall bring back a reply.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the Riverland cannery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I understand that the Attorney-General was in the Riverland some weeks ago and that during an interview he indicated that the intake of the Riverland cannery this year would be about 6 000 tonnes of fruit. It is interesting that the Minister of Industrial Affairs said that the minimum amount needed for viability of the cannery was about 12 000 tonnes of fruit. What is in fact the intake for the cannery in this coming harvest, as I have not been able to find any statement other than the interview that the Attorney-General gave that 6 000 tonnes is the intake for the cannery? When will the cannery inform the growers of their individual quotas for the coming season? Since growers have to make a number of management decisions about the pruning and fertilising of their blocks, until they are told what their individual intakes will be, it is difficult for them to make those decisions. What advice is the Government giving to growers about the surplus production that will arise at the next harvest? Is the Government telling growers to pull out the trees that are surplus to the requirements of the cannery, or is it advising the growers to continue production in spite of the fact that they are unable to sell that surplus? Can any indication be given of what will happen to the surplus fruit in the coming year?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I refer the honourable member to my Ministerial statement of 11 June 1981 at page 4185 of *Hansard* where, amongst other things, I indicated that the third option of the Government included:

> Guarantee to fruitgrowers that their fruit will be processed in the 1981-82 and 1982-83 seasons to the extent of a minimum of 7 100 tonnes in the light of the Australian Canned Fruits Corporation's likely quotas for 1981-82.

That statement is quite clear: that matter is in the hands of the receivers and managers. The matter of information to the growers themselves is one for the receivers and managers, who have the responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the co-operative under their receivership. I will, however, refer the honourable member's question to them for further information.

The honourable member's third question is a matter of some detail, and I will refer it to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Attorney-General has indicated that the minimum intake will therefore be 7 100 tonnes. Is that the actual intake, or will the cannery work at that minimum figure?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: When I answered the honourable member's question initially, I referred to that part of my Ministerial statement and indicated that the management of that part of the option was in the hands of the receivers and managers. I will refer that detail to the receivers and managers and endeavour to obtain a reply from the Minister of Agriculture.

ROAD MARKING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding road marking.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On 2 June, I asked the Attorney, representing his colleague in another place, a question regarding road marking and some long delays that occur after the reconstruction or fresh sealing of roads. It is a fact that after road sealing and, in some cases, resealing there is on occasion undue delay before the roads are properly marked. Even though there are warning notices, this lack of marking creates some element of danger, and the delays seem to be rather long. Has the Attorney a reply to that question?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Minister of Transport has provided me with the following reply:

> After reconstruction or resealing of roads, some delay occurs before pavement markings can be re-spotted and then re-marked. During this period, warning signs are displayed to advise motorists of the absence of pavement markings.
>
> Delays occur in re-marking some sections of road due to the scheduling of work to maximise the efficiency of pavement marking operations. Delays may also result from inclement weather and plant breakdown. The honourable member may be assured that every effort is made to minimise these delays.

WHYALLA DOCTORS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question that I asked on 10 June regarding Whyalla doctors?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister of Health advises that the situation has been rectified. The fee-for-service payments were reduced from $1 050 946 in 1978-79 to $879 279 during 1979-80, despite a rise in uninsured patients at the hospital from 59 per cent to 63 per cent.

Payments until 31 May 1981 are $958 104. However, the number of uninsured patients has now reached 75 per cent. Controls introduced have caused a substantial reduction in fee-for-service payments. A schedule will be inserted listing payments to visiting specialists at Whyalla for the financial

year 1979-80 and the first eleven months of 1980-81. The 1978-79 figures have also been included so that a valid comparison can be made.

Service charges other than in diagnostic areas have not been introduced, although considerable discussion has taken place at Ministers' conferences and in meetings between State and Commonwealth officials. States have been reluctant to proceed with the introduction of service charges as in the past such costs have been passed on to the patients.

Reduction of modified fee for service and restructuring of the Medical Benefits Schedule is seen as a more preferred option. You will note that this Government has taken steps to ensure effective controls over fee for service payments at Whyalla Hospital. The schedule that I have referred to is statistical and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Schedule of Payments to Visiting Medical Specialists at Whyalla

	1978-1979	1979-1980	Until May 1981
A. J. Benny	57 758.83	55 320.31	59 227.52
G. D. Burns	40 563.62	41 381.05	45 321.30
R. W. Davis	53 579.65	21 435.87	91.15
J. Croall	35 798.60	35 937.10	47 693.35
G. R. Crowe	77 819.28	48 663.05	58 952.00
P. L. Fry	18 154.55	2 302.80	325.00
A. R. Girgis	65 861.80	64 882.55	41 794.40
G. B. Markey	47 259.92	13 889.58	23 562.05
J. T. Mestrov	51 256.10	46 525.40	53 782.89
M. Patkin	82 086.41	58 746.75	62 826.03
J. S. Pradhan	51 254.65	34 482.00	41 282.80
C. Savarirayan	58 847.64	53 554.37	50 291.05
A. Rajapaksa	28 478.59	36 286.00	43 858.80
G. C. Tolstoshev	68 471.29	65 472.49	53 084.75
P. W. Windsor	56 569.10	40 332.95	44 613.20
B. Krishnan	13 269.99		
F. Lim		3 099.80	27 867.20
M. Dowling		18 608.89	62 512.16
P. T. Wickham		36 055.25	36 903.45
K. R. Heng			4 284.63

Dr MESTROV

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Does the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, have a reply to a question I asked on 11 June about Dr Mestrov?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister of Health advises that the answer to the question has been adequately covered in the statement in the Council on 10 June. A legal opinion was obtained from the commission's legal officer who is a senior legal officer on secondment from the Crown Solicitor's Office. Since the matter was raised, a further opinion was sought from the Crown Solicitor's Office and the commission's view was confirmed that it would not be possible to recover moneys for the period commencing October 1976. The Minister of Health has never discussed the matter with Dr Mestrov nor did Dr Mestrov make representations to the Minister at any time.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about council amalgamation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No doubt all honourable members have received a letter from the Munno Para council concerning amalgamation. In part, the letter states:

> At a special meeting held on Thursday 30 July 1981, I was directed by my council to write to you seeking your help in the introduction of, and support for, a Bill establishing a complete moratorium on amalgamation or severance bids against Munno Para for a period of five years. You will be aware that this council has been on the receiving end of continual bids over the last six years for other councils to either take over or annex either the whole or portions of our district.

The letter then lists 10 occasions when what is referred to as 'takeover bids' have been received by the Munno Para council. The letter continues:

> Early in 1978, council wrote to all members of Parliament strongly urging an amendment to the Local Government Act declaring a moratorium on severance and takeover bids against Munno Para for a period of five years. The then Minister of Local Government (Mr Virgo) gave an undertaking to Parliament that he would examine the matters we had raised and see what might be done to protect councils from a constant need to defend their territory. Representatives of the Minister's office had one or two informal talks with us on the subject, but nothing further has been heard. More recently we wrote to the present Minister of Local Government, Mr Murray Hill, M.L.C., making a similar request for a five year moratorium on severance and takeover bids but, unfortunately, the Minister could not see his way clear to presenting such a Bill.

The problem is, as pointed out by the Munno Para council, that it is simply spending too much time and effort on the question of severance arguments when it should be devoting its time to local government matters and the planning and development of its district.

I believe that the council has an argument, because it is impossible for a council to fulfil its role correctly when it is constantly being pressed with severance claims. Although I do not believe that it is possible to introduce a Bill specifically to cover Munno Para, will the Minister investigate the possibility of introducing into the Local Government Act a provision that, when a proposal for severance or amalgamation has been undertaken and rejected by the ratepayers concerned, that closes the issue for a specific period? That would be one way of solving the problem, and I think all honourable members will agree that it is a problem; because constant pressure for severance or amalgamation can upset the operation of a council area.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The proposal that the honourable member has mentioned has, I think, a lot of merit in it: after petitioners have tried to secede, or after an adjacent council has tried to acquire a portion of a council, if those endeavours have been unsuccessful, there is then some merit in the idea that a time period should elapse before the council subjected to that activity need be worried about it again. That is one of the matters that are under consideration in the overall review of the Local Government Act.

The situation at Munno Para is one in relation to which all honourable members would have some sympathy for the council. The present position is that several petitions have been lodged and are under consideration. Unfortunately, we are finding that, with the present machinery, a longer period of time is being taken than should be taken in having the petitions investigated fully. We are finding by experience that, for one reason or another (and I am not casting any reflection on or making any criticism of the Local Government Advisory Commission), the commission is taking a long time to bring down findings, particularly in regard to one petition at Munno Para, and in regard to its work generally. I am looking into that aspect now to see whether that problem can be solved.

At present, Munno Para is subject to attack on four sides—from north, south, east and west. It is unfortunate that the council finds this experience unsettling, and it is possible that, because of the cloud that hangs over that district council, ratepayers in this region cannot receive the normal high standard of local government service that ratepayers receive in this State. I am doing my best to

expedite an answer to the current petitions, so that would at least tend to bring the immediate matters to decision one way or the other so that the council will know with more certainty what its future boundaries and its future generally will be. The overall question of principle that has been raised is worth further consideration, and indeed is under consideration presently.

PASTORAL LANDS REPORT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Lands, a question about the Department of Lands Pastoral Lands Report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It comes as something of a surprise to me to learn that the Pastoral Lands Report was the subject of a time limit, 31 July being the end of the period during which public and community groups could comment on or lodge objections in relation to that report. Last Thursday I sent a letter to the Minister of Lands, with a copy to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, because a community group was complaining that it had not obtained a copy of the report, a memorandum about the report, or a condensed version of the report. In this connection, I refer particularly to Aboriginal groups and organisations in the community, which fear possible encroachment, because of any recommendation in that report that sought to exclude and deny a claim in respect of Aboriginal land rights. One would expect those organisations to request that a copy of the report be made available to them so that it could be subject to some legal form of scrutiny.

Because of the industrial dispute provoked by the Federal Government, one can understand probable postal delays. I have been unable to get a reply from the Minister in relation to an extension of time in this matter. I ask the Minister the following questions: First, is a copy of the South Australian Pastoral Lands Report to be made available to interested community groups? Secondly, if not, has a condensed form of the report been made available to the public and interested parties, particularly Aboriginal people and Aboriginal organisations? Thirdly, is it fact that certain recommendations of the report transfer certain lands to the National Parks and Wildlife Service? Fourthly, if the answer to the third question is 'Yes', will the Minister state to what extent that would exclude or deny to Aborigines their rights of application under land rights? Fifthly, is the Minister aware of the specific references to the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill in this report? What is its meaning towards other Aboriginal groups or groups other than the Pitjantjatjara? Finally, will the Minister extend the time for comment or objection on the report to 1 September 1981?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall be pleased to refer those questions to the Minister of Lands and obtain replies for the Hon. Mr Foster.

ARTS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I wish to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Arts a question about comments made by former Premier Dunstan on the conduct of the Arts portfolio.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The *Sunday Mail* on 2 August included a report by Peter Farrell on an interview with former Premier Dunstan concerning the direction of the Government at large in this State. When referring specifically to the arts in South Australia, Mr Dunstan referred to the fact that, '... once institutions are set up there is a tendency for them to become ossified and lose outgoing initiative.' He stated:

> The proposals now for changing the entrepreneurial role of the Festival Centre seem to be going in that direction—reinforcing a tendency towards a lack of initiative.

He further stated—

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Whose Government was that?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's out of order to interject.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Further in that report Mr Dunstan referred to the community arts and the fact that the regional community arts policies formulated by them were not being extended as they should be. Can the Minister say whether these two statements are correct: is there a lack of initiative in regard to entrepreneurial activity by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, and are there cut-backs in community arts activities?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In accordance with the recent recommendations of the Committee of Investigation into the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the Government has agreed that $500 000 of Loan funds be allocated to the trust for entrepreneurial purposes. This is the largest single allocation in the history of the trust and will mean that the trust will have more funds for entrepreneurial work than at any other time in its history. So much for the claim of Mr Dunstan that there is a lack of initiative by the Government in assisting the trust's entrepreneurial role.

Regarding community arts officers, four were employed at the time of change of Government, and there are now 10. So much for the former Premier's claim that we have cut back in that area!

MR T. K. MADGWICK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about the report for 1980 of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for 1980, the Commissioner, on page 32, stated:

> One used car dealership which had the deplorable total of 132 complaints registered against it in the 12 months under review (an average in excess of one every other working day) was Wheels of Distinction Pty Ltd, which traded as Costless Cars, Kentucky Cars and formerly as Target Car Sales. Because the company had an extremely large turnover, a comparison was made with five other major dealers to put this complaints experience in some sort of context relative to sales. These five dealers had a combined turnover far in excess of Wheels of Distinction Pty Ltd but attracted a total of 48 complaints between them. According to reports received and investigations made, the warranty service of this company is appalling. This was taken up during the year with the Managing Director, Terry Keith Madgwick, who advised that his business was operated on a cost control basis. It was suggested to Mr Madgwick that it was time he paid more attention to quality control and to his statutory warranty obligations.

An advertisement that appeared in the *News* of Wednesday 13 February 1980, prior to the Norwood by-election (which saw the defeat of Mr Webster, incidentally, and the return of Mr Crafter to Parliament)—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Is he the same bloke?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will answer that in a moment. The advertisement stated:

> Just 22 weeks ago, you gave Labor the chop!... Give Labor the double chop in Norwood... Insterted and authorised by T. K. Madgwick, P.O. Box 89, Prospect, S.A.

It appears that the same Mr Madgwick who was actively supporting the Liberal Party is also one of the less reputable

used car dealers in the town. Is the Mr Madgwick who authorised that Liberal Party advertisement the same Mr Madgwick named in the report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs to which I have just referred? Was the Liberal Party aware of the appalling record of Mr Madgwick in the used car business when it accepted his money to support Mr Webster, and, finally, does the report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs prove a strong connection between car dealers who rip off the public and the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have no knowledge, and I have no reason to have any knowledge, as to whether or not the Mr Madgwick referred to in the report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs has supported the Liberal Party. It would appear from what the honourable member has said that the advertisements are not Liberal Party advertisements.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The advertisements were inserted by Mr Madgwick, and I have no knowledge of any connection. Regarding the final question as to any suggestion that the Liberal Party supports used car dealers who rip off the public, I indicate there is no such connection.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish to ask a question supplementary to the question just asked and to the Minister's attempt to answer it. What action does the Minister advise the Liberal Party to take against that person in the community who advertises in the newspaper purporting to support the Liberal Party when, in fact, the Minister is of the opinion that that person has no association with the Party? Will the Minister draw this matter to the attention of the Liberal Party officers on Greenhill Road and ask them whether or not court action should be taken against this person for his misrepresenting himself as a supporter of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If an individual inserts in his own name an advertisement that purports to support the Liberal Party, there is nothing the Liberal Party can do about it.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Water Resources, a question about the South Para Reservoir.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Minister has made a number of public statements recently and we have seen programmes on television relating to flooding of the South Para Reservoir. We have been told of the necessity to open the control gates of the reservoir on a limited basis. We have had an unusually high rainfall this winter and there will be a large run-off for some time to come into the reservoir. The Minister has stated that he is concerned about the Gawler River and no doubt the farmers and the market gardeners are worrying with him. The residents of Gawler who reside along the course of the South Para River have as much cause to worry. The South Para River and the North Para River join together just west of Gawler to form the Gawler River. The North Para River has a large, forceful flow, and when it meets the South Para River, it causes the South Para River to back up. The addition of any large flow down the South Para River from the reservoir could create a very serious flooding problem for householders who live along the South Para River banks right in the centre of Gawler.

A major flood problem was experienced in about 1974, when an inexperienced person had control of the flood gates and just opened them, as was proved, to the detriment of those living along the South Para River in Gawler. Is the Minister aware of the serious flooding that occurred in Gawler along the South Para River the last time the South Para Reservoir gates were opened? Has the strong flow of water down the North Para River been taken into account? Can the Minister state unreservedly that flooding will not take place in Gawler? If not, can the Minister say why the gates of the South Para Reservoir were not opened much earlier to release some of the water that has now become a problem?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Water Resources and bring back a reply.

PIPELINE ROUTE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a reply to the question I asked him on 16 July about the Moomba to Stony Point liquids pipeline?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Minister of Mines and Energy assures me the Moomba to Stony Point liquids pipeline will be underground. However, not all facilities associated with the pipeline will be buried. The pumping stations will be above ground structures with one initially situated at the Moomba plant, and up to three additional intermediate stations are planned for the future.

Mainline valves will be incorporated approximately every 32 kilometres and, although the valve itself will be buried, the controls and small bypass pipework will be located above ground. Another above-ground fixture to be incorporated on the pipeline will be small single post test points situated at 1.5 kilometres intervals, these being necessary for the cathodic protection system.

MR T. K. MADGWICK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I wish to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs a supplementary question about Mr T. K. Madgwick. Have any proceedings been considered by the Department of Consumer Affairs against the Liberal Party's supporter, Mr Madgwick, and, if not, how does a person with such an appalling record of ripping off the public get away with that type of behaviour unless he has some type of political protection?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not aware of whether or not Mr Madgwick is a Liberal Party supporter. There is no reason why I should know. I do not know whether or not there are any prosecutions against him. I do know that he did apply for a secondhand motor vehicle dealer's licence in his own right. However, my department, the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, with my knowledge and support, opposed the application, which was subsequently withdrawn.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of 2 June on the indigenous people's conference?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The World Council of Indigenous People's Conference held in Canberra during April/May this year was hosted by the National Aboriginal Conference. The N.A.C. was responsible for the organisational costs within Australia, and received a grant towards this from

the Commonwealth Government. It then approached the State Governments for assistance. South Australia responded with a grant of $11 000. I am informed that we are the only State which has agreed to make such a grant to what was surely an important cultural and educational experience, both for Aboriginal people and for this nation.

None of that grant was used for expenses of the four Aboriginal public servants who attended the conference. In each case, their costs were met by their respective departments. There was no official South Australian delegation as such, and the four Government employees attended as observers. Other Aboriginal people from this State, both from Adelaide and from country areas, attended the conference in a similar capacity, so that there was a wide representation of this State's Aboriginal people. These arrangements were made on their own initiative, and the State Government had no responsibility for arranging any form of official delegation.

SCHOOL PREMISES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question, first asked on 4 June and repeated on 23 July, on school premises?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The practice of 10 per cent of school premises hiring charges being returned to the Government is nothing new. Prior to 1973 all revenue received from the hire of school facilities was remitted to the Education Department. Following amendments to the education regulations in February 1973, schools were required to remit 10 per cent or $1 (whichever was greater) to the department from each hire to cover additional running costs such as heating, lighting and cleaning. Even when existing regulation 12 relating to the use of school facilities came into effect in 1976, the Director-General, as part of the conditions determining hire, continued to require the 10 per cent remission of hiring fees. Thus the suggestion that the 10 per cent remission is a new requirement is not correct.

With reference to the honourable member's statement that charges will increase considerably as a result of this measure, it is rather beyond me to understand how increasing charges in this way will result in greater community use, as fewer groups will be able to afford such charges. It is advised that, whilst hire fees may increase in some particular circumstances, the removal of a fixed scale of charges and the fact that school principals and school councils can now determine hiring fees appropriate to local situations mean that schools can be more sensitive to local community needs and have the flexibility to allow freer access to school facilities by senior citizens, unemployed groups or community groups.

The honourable member poses three questions regarding the rights of religious organisations. In answer to these, we would simply reiterate that the present Government is following previous Governments in so far as it has been a long-standing arrangement with the Education Department. Prior to 1974, a nominal fee was payable for this use, although there was provision for even this nominal fee to be waived by the Director-General of Education. In July 1974, the then Minister of Education approved the waiving of fees for the use of classrooms by religious organisations for religious purposes. However, as part of that approval it was clearly stated that it was the responsibility of the hiring organisation, even when fees were waived, to arrange for satisfactory cleaning or to pay the costs thereof if it was necessary for the school to arrange such. In addition, any hirer of school premises will be responsible to indemnify the Minister against any damage to assets or injury to persons (to be covered by public risk insurance) arising from their use of the premises.

In response to the honourable member's final questions, the principle of concessions to religious groups is embodied in other areas of the Legislature such as the Local Government Act and the Income Tax Assessment Act. The policy of hiring school premises has been in existence for many years, and there are no immediate plans to alter that policy. Non-religious groups may negotiate the use of school facilities with individual principals who, in consultation with their school councils, will determine the terms and conditions of hire appropriate to the particular circumstances.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: By way of supplementary question, whilst I have not had a chance to peruse the reply, am I to understand that, if a school wishes to charge a religious organisation exactly the same fee that it would charge any other organisation, it is at liberty to do so?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As I understood the reply that my colleague has given, it is entirely in the hands of the principal in consultation with his council. The point that concerns the honourable member is that preference might be given to a group that has religious affiliations over a group that has not. If that is her worry, no special consideration will be given, as I understand the reply, to either one group or the other.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: As I mentioned last week, some school councils wish to charge the same amount to religious bodies as they charge to other bodies. Am I to understand from the Minister's reply that they are free to charge religious bodies exactly the same fees that they would charge other bodies?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understood that that is so but I will refer the matter to the Minister in another place to ensure that my reply is correct.

MATRICULATION STANDARDS

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question on Matriculation standards in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: In the *News* on Friday 17 July an article headed 'Our top students' English shocking' stated:

> The standard of literacy of medical students was lashed today by a professor who teaches them.
>
> Professor Andrew Rogers of the Flinders School of Medicine described the standard as appalling.
>
> Medical students are selected from the top 8 per cent of South Australia's Matriculants.
>
> Professor Rogers said: 'One would expect these students to be the brightest and most intelligent of our secondary students, yet many cannot write a sensible paragraph.'
>
> Professor Rogers, an instructor for first to fourth year students, added: 'I am continually appalled at the low standard of expression of these students—whether in writing or speaking.'

The article continues:

> Matriculation is an important issue to everyone in the State.
>
> The issue was raised publicly last year. All that has happened since then is that the PEB has lost some chief examiners with the experience and the courage to speak out.

Also in the *News* of the same evening an article headed 'Desperate need for change' stated:

> A desperate need exists for schools and South Australia's Public Examination Board to develop more sophisticated means of assessment among school students, it is claimed.
>
> Adelaide University's outspoken Matriculation examination critic, Mr Peter Moss, says this could assist educational planning.
>
> Mr Moss says an improved method of assessment, provided it was not over one or two days work, would provide a valuable basis for educational analysis.

He described South Australia's only existing method of public assessment—the Matriculation exam—as a 'trial by ordeal'.

The article goes on in much the same vein and suggests that changes should be made so that standards will be better. In light of reports by Mr Peter Moss and Professor Andrew Rogers, will the Minister state whether he considers that an inquiry into the matter is warranted? If not, why not, and what are his views on the comments of these two persons?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

24-HOUR FOOD OUTLETS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question regarding 24-hour food outlets.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: One of my colleagues may already have asked this question. If he has done so, I hope that that honourable member receives an answer before I do, as I have not received a reply to any of the questions that I have asked this session, about which I am not surprised.

I am concerned about 24-hour food outlets. I believe that in Melbourne all these outlets are not just converted petrol stations but are joint operations, where petrol is served by people and, only a couple of metres away, practically in the same area, food, coffee and drinks are also being served by the same people. That is certainly a health risk.

My main concern involves the poor, unfortunate business men who got together and supported the Liberal Party's 'Stop the Job Rot' campaign. Bearing in mind what has happened, I should feel no concern for those people. However, I do feel concerned about the people who must work at these establishments, as this practice is continued 24 hours a day; these are not normal business operations.

Honourable members will realise that I participated in the debate on the shopping hours legislation. I see that the Hon. Mr Carnie is leaving the Chamber. The honourable member usually goes for this sort of thing. I can foresee a great disruption occurring in the community. Every day, one hears the police stating, as a result of rapes that have occurred, that women should not be walking on the streets after dark.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: That's irrelevant.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That is a stupid thing for the Minister to say. The Attorney-General, who knows about the rapes and violence that occur, ought to have more common sense and more respect for members on this side of the Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The little arse hole.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Mr President, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that objectionable remark.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dunford has been asked to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is hard for me to do so, Sir, as he is the worst class of bloke that I have ever met. However, I will withdraw the remark.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: And apologise.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Like hell I will.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should continue with his explanation, which was getting a long way from the subject matter of his question. I ask the honourable member to explain his question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I was trying to do so, Sir, when I was so rudely interrupted. If 24-hour outlets were condoned by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, they would involve all sorts of people in much trouble. That is one of the reasons why Queensland has axed this proposition. Also, there have been proposals in some areas regarding this matter.

Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs take the necessary action to stop BP Australia or any of the oil companies commencing operations in South Australia by opening up Food Plus stores in converted petrol stations so as to safeguard employment and protect the viability of small business men? Secondly, is the Minister aware of two proposed 24-hour Food Plus stores in the eastern suburbs? Thirdly, is the Minister aware that the St Peters and Burnside councils are currently considering applications by BP Australia Limited to convert petrol stations to 24-hour Food Plus stores?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Prospect, too.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: As the Leader of the Opposition says, it also involves Prospect. As there is strong resident storekeeper reaction, what action, if any, does the Minister intend to take in this regard?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Irrespective of whether this question has been asked before, I, like the Minister of Industrial Affairs, am a tolerant person. I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I should like to ask a supplementary question regarding this matter.

The PRESIDENT: Order! As the time has expired, the honourable member must ask his question tomorrow.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Very well.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 23 July. Page 173.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In speaking to this debate, I wish first to say a few words about abortion anomalies that apply in this State at present. I am referring not to the law relating to abortions but to its administration in the hospitals of this State. I feel that the public should be made aware of the various anomalies and indicate with great clarity that there is a responsibility on the Minister of Health to see that these anomalies are removed and corrected.

I have spoken elsewhere on the distribution of the termination of pregnancies between hospitals in this State. From the Mallen Committee reports we know that in 1979 76 per cent of abortions were done in public hospitals, that 17 per cent were done in private hospitals, and that 7 per cent were done in country hospitals.

We know from an answer to a question asked in this Council that the Minister of Health, after 15 months of questioning, said that among the public hospitals in this State 40 per cent of the abortions are done at the Queen Victoria Hospital, 33 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 16 per cent at Flinders Medical Centre, and that only 6 per cent are done at Modbury Hospital and 5 per cent at Royal Adelaide Hospital.

I certainly await with great interest the 1980 report in order to see whether the figures are given for each hospital for that year and whether the position has improved, although, from what one hears, it seems that it has not improved but, rather, has got worse.

We know for sure that the Queen Victoria Hospital limits itself to 21 abortions a week as a maximum, that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital limits itself to a maximum of 18 a week, and that Flinders Medical Centre is limited to a maximum of six terminations a week.

Flinders Medical Centre used to do eight terminations a week, but it has cut back this year to a maximum of six per week and, like the other hospitals to which I have referred, this hospital has said that it is unable to cope with more terminations because of a lack of facilities and resources.

At Modbury Hospital and Royal Adelaide Hospital there are no separate clinics for abortion, and patients are fitted into a general gynaecological out-patients clinic, which I feel is not fair to the women concerned or to the other patients in the same clinic. However, as I have stated, those two hospitals do very few abortions, anyway, and do not wish to, or are unable to, cater for abortion patients adequately.

The fact that some public hospitals are not catering for the abortion needs of their localities is illustrated by an analysis done recently of Health Commission data for 1979. First, the catchment areas of various hospitals were defined as the local government areas that contributed at least 5 per cent of the number of patients at the hospitals. For example, for Modbury Hospital, the catchment area was found to be the local government areas of Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury, Enfield, and Campbelltown. For Flinders Medical Centre, the catchment area involved the local government areas of Noarlunga, Marion, Mitcham, Brighton, and Meadows.

For the Queen Elizabeth Hospital it was Woodville, Port Adelaide and Enfield. Secondly, a comparison was made between the distribution of all patients from a catchment area compared to the distribution of the abortion patients of the same catchment area according to the hospital at which they were treated. The results are quite startling. For the Modbury catchment area, 44 per cent of all patients were treated at Modbury Hospital, 19 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth and 5 per cent at the Queen Victoria. However, for abortion patients from the same geographical area, only 17 per cent went to their own local hospital of Modbury, with 28 per cent going to the Queen Elizabeth and 38 per cent to the Queen Victoria. For the Flinders catchment area, 67 per cent of all patients from that area went to the Flinders Medical Centre, 8 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth and 4 per cent to the Queen Victoria. However, for the abortion patients from the same area, only 48 per cent went to the Flinders Medical Centre, 14 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth and 25 per cent to the Queen Victoria. They are very different proportions for the abortion patients compared to the general patients from the same area.

In the Queen Elizabeth Hospital catchment area, 65 per cent of all patients went to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 22 per cent went to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and 5 per cent to the Queen Victoria Hospital. However, for the abortion patients from the same geographical locality, 60 per cent went to the Queen Elizabeth, only 5 per cent to the Royal Adelaide and 30 per cent to the Queen Victoria—again, very different proportions from those applying to the general patients. For the Queen Victoria Hospital catchment area, 8 per cent of all patients went to the Queen Victoria Hospital, 29 per cent to the Royal Adelaide and 32 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. However, for abortion patients from the same area, 42 per cent went to the Queen Victoria Hospital, only 5 per cent to the Royal Adelaide and 31 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Finally, for the Royal Adelaide Hospital catchment area, 34 per cent of all patients went to the Royal Adelaide, 20 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth and 8 per cent to the Queen Victoria. However, of the abortion patients from that same area, only 5 per cent went to the Royal Adelaide, 29 per cent went to the Queen Elizabeth and 44 per cent to the Queen Victoria Hospital. The figures are even more startling if we look at individual local government areas. The Health Commission data indicates that 81 per cent of general patients from Tea Tree Gully were serviced at Modbury Hospital, but only 36 per cent of abortion patients from the same area went to their local hospital, with 44 per cent of them going to the Queen Victoria Hospital.

The local government area of St Peters should be mainly served by the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In fact, 55 per cent of general patients from St Peters went to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, 29 per cent to the Queen Victoria and 8 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth. However, for abortion patients from the same area, 50 per cent went to the Queen Victoria Hospital, 38 per cent to the Queen Elizabeth and none at all to the local hospital, the Royal Adelaide. Other examples from different local government areas could be quoted, but I am sure that the data I have referred to clearly indicates that several of our public hospitals are not servicing the needs of their area with regard to abortion, although they are quite adequately catering for all other patient requirements in their areas.

These hospitals cannot pretend that the demand is not there, because it is obvious that abortion patients from their catchment areas are travelling long distances to other hospitals. One can only conclude that these hospitals are neglecting this aspect of health care in their neighborhoods to the detriment and inconvenience of the residents. This situation is likely to get worse in the next few years as the expected growth in the population of women in the age group 15 years to 45 years will occur largely in the catchment areas for the Modbury Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. This is the main age group which may require abortion facilities, and even if the abortion rate remains unaltered the absolute numbers requiring abortions will increase in the outer suburbs due to the increase in the number of women of the appropriate age group.

Demographic data clearly indicates that the pressure for facilities will increase most severely in the areas which currently are far from coping with the needs of the adjoining population. Other data from the Health Commission indicates how the various hospitals differ in the time for which a patient is kept in hospital for an abortion. Several hospitals perform abortions without an overnight stay, and therefore record such patients as spending only one day in hospital. However, other hospitals insist on at least one night in hospital, so that the patient is recorded as having spent at least two days in hospital. I understand that the 1979 data for all hospitals in this State indicates that the average stay for an abortion at the Lyell McEwin Hospital was 2.4 days; for Modbury Hospital 2.2 days; for the Flinders Medical Centre 1.3 days; for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital 1.2 days; for the Queen Victoria Hospital 1.4 days; and for the Royal Adelaide Hospital a surprisingly high 3.1 days. For country hospitals it was 2.8 days at Mount Gambier and 2.1 days at Whyalla. I certainly cannot understand, nor can many other people, why such vastly different times in hospital should occur for the same surgical procedure. No-one suggests that the care and attention at the Flinders Medical Centre, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or the Queen Victoria Hospital are in any way inferior or in any way deleterious for patients. Therefore, one must conclude that the hospitals with high average times could improve matters considerably and cater for far more patients and considerably reduce their costs if they adopted the same practice as those hospitals with low average times. The hospitals with high average hospitalisation times are precisely those which are not catering for the needs of their surrounding

communities and are performing very few abortions (as indicated by my earlier figures).

I strongly suggest that the Minister and the Health Commission look into this matter and see whether administrative procedures could be changed at some hospitals so that the time in hospital for an abortion is reduced: that would lead to cost cutting and a better and more adequate service for local communities. One other matter in relation to abortion services in this State which concerns me greatly is the matter of waiting time. Two of the major referral agencies in this State have collected data on the patients they have referred to various hospitals for terminations over a six-month period late last year. Together, they give a total sample of 240 women. These data have been examined to determine the time that each patient must wait from the day she is referred until the day the operation is carried out. I seek leave to have a statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Percentage of women waiting various number of days

Referred to	<7	7-9	10-14	15-18	19-21	>21	Average wait (days)
Queen Victoria Hospital	3	8	22	19	27	22	18
Flinders Medical Centre	8	28	40	4	4	16	12
Queen Elizabeth Hospital	5	8	36	32	13	6	15
Royal Adelaide Hospital	21	21	36	—	7	14	10
Modbury	—	—	—	—	50	50	21
Total Public patients	6	12	30	20	18	16	15
Private patients	61	29	10	—	—	—	5
Total	19	16	25	15	13	12	13

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: We can see from this table that for public patients the average waiting time is 15 days, while for private patients it is reduced to 5 days. Such a significant difference between the public and private sector is one which should not be tolerated in a civilised community, and is further evidence, if needed, of how the public sector is not utilising sufficient resources to be able to cope with the demands upon it. Everyone knows that the sooner an abortion is done, the better—the earlier the procedure is carried out, the simpler it is, the less the risk of complications or traumas to the patient, and the better it is psychologically for both the patient and the staff involved. So lengthy waiting times will increase the complication rate and be deleterious to the physical health of the women concerned, quite apart from the psychological damage of having to wait a long time once detailed counselling has taken place and a decision for a termination been made.

From the table one can see that for public patients only 6 per cent of abortions occur within a week of referral, while for private patients, 61 per cent occur within a week of referral. For public patients, only 18 per cent of the operations are performed in fewer than 10 days from referral, while for private patients 90 per cent occur within 10 days from the decision being made. We can also see that for public patients, 54 per cent have to wait more than two weeks for their operation, that is, a majority of them, while no private patients at all had to wait more than two weeks. A figure of 34 per cent of public patients—a third of them—had to wait more than 18 days, and 16 per cent of public patients—a sixth of the total—had to wait more than three weeks. This, to me, is scandalous—that anyone should have to wait two to three weeks, or even longer, for their operation, after the decision has been made to perform an abortion. The difference between public and private patients is a clear indication of two standards of health care in South Australia today, a much better one for those who can afford it, and an inferior one for those who are less well off. The responsible authorities should be roundly condemned, and urgent measures undertaken to improve the situation.

The difference between public and private patients that I have mentioned is further reflected in the average gestation time at the time the termination is performed. Again, according to the sample of referrals from the two agencies over a six-month period late last year, for private patients the average (median) gestation time was 7.5 weeks at the date of operation, whereas for public patients it was 9.5 weeks. For the subsample which had terminations at more than 11 weeks gestation, the private patients had an average wait of five days, while the public patients had an average wait of 17 days. I realise some individuals may present late, or delay their decision until later than desirable, but it is clear from these figures that a large number of women in the public sector are having later terminations owing to long waiting times at the hospitals, and not owing to late presentation. I repeat that, in the interests of public health, terminations should be performed as soon as possible, and long waiting times for public patients is a scandal which the Minister of Health must eliminate. Clearly, more resources for terminations need to be provided at many of our public hospitals, so that these delays are reduced to those in the private sector, and the responsibility for seeing such resources are provided is with the Minister of Health. I sincerely hope she lives up to her responsibilities in this area, for the sake of the women of this State.

I now turn to a less serious issue, which may however be of interest to members in this Council, or perhaps to the public. On 3 June, in reply to a series of Questions on Notice from the Hon. Frank Blevins, answers were given in this Chamber as to the membership of various boards and commissions of statutory authorities in the State. Details of names, terms of appointment and remuneration were presented for members of 61 different bodies. I thought we had about 250 Qangos in this State, so I am not clear why only this sample of 61 was detailed—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Out of 400?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Only 61 were detailed in this Council. Perhaps the Minister will comment on the 'missing' 200 Qangos.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you say that Cabinet was a statutory authority? It is difficult to define.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure that there are more than the 61 that were detailed in this Council. I have analysed the answers given for the sex ratio of members of these 61 boards, in some cases having to obtain further information from the Ministers involved as the reply in *Hansard* did not indicate the sex of the member by use of given names. I seek leave to have a statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Membership of Boards and Commissions of Statutory Authorities

Type of Membership	No. of boards, etc.	Total No. of members	Total No. of women	Percentage of women	Appointed since 15.9.79 No. of members	No. of women	Percentage of women
Voluntary	11	84	14	17	59	10	17
Sitting fees	16	115	23	20	61	21	34
Annual fees	34	206	12	6	98	9	9
Total	61	405	49	12	218	40	18

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Honourable members can see that there are 405 members of the 61 various boards, of whom 49 (12 per cent) are women. Further, 218 of these people have been appointed or reappointed since the change of Government in September 1979; the remainder are still occupying positions to which they were appointed by the previous Government. Of these 218 appointees by the Tonkin Government, 40 (18 per cent) are women. I am certainly pleased to see that the Government does seem to be making an effort to increase the representation of women in various public positions, though there is obviously still a long way to go before equality of opportunity is achieved.

However, the table also shows these members divided into three categories: those who serve on a voluntary basis, those who receive sitting fees (usually of the order of $35-$55 each time they meet), and those who receive an annual honorarium. The sitting fees received would probably amount to a few hundred dollars each year, depending on the number of meetings held, but are most unlikely to reach the annual honoraria which frequently are of the order of $4 000 to $6 000 per year. I doubt whether any board meets 100 times a year, as would be necessary if sitting fees were to amount to as much as the honoraria of the boards where honoraria are provided.

We see from the table that, of members who have been appointed since the new Government came into office, 17 per cent of members serving in a voluntary capacity are women, and 34 per cent of members who receive sitting fees are women, but only 9 per cent of those who receive an honorarium are women. I am left to wonder whether the policy of appointing more women to boards is limited to those cases where little or nothing is paid to the members and whether the more valuable positions, in a monetary sense, are being kept for men.

Before anyone tells me that there has been an apparent increase in the number of women appointed to boards that pay annual honoraria, I point out that, as nine of the 12 such women in the State have been appointed or reappointed by the Tonkin Government, I have done a statistical analysis on these data and there has been no significant increase in the proportion of women appointed to these boards. Statistical analysis shows a significant increase in the proportion of women on the boards that pay daily sitting fees but not on those that pay a large honorarium. I suggest that the Government give more attention to the membership of those boards and commissions which pay a higher honoraria and which presumably reflect a greater responsibility and power to see whether the number of women can be increased in this area also and not only on those bodies that presumably have less power and influence, as reflected in a lower or no remuneration.

Finally, I wish to say a few words about that extraordinary document called *Into the 80s*, which was produced by the Education Department of this State to outline the aims and purposes of our schools for the next decade. I do not wish to go into great detail about this document, but I point out that it is extraordinary, more for its omissions than for what it says. I would be surprised if anyone could disagree with any of the statements it makes, and I certainly welcome some of the educational philosophy that it expounds. I read this document from beginning to end, from page 1 to page 43, and I found not one single reference to women or girls and their place in our educational system. Not one reference! It certainly gives support to and appreciation for the ethnic groups and their different cultural backgrounds. At page 11, it states:

> Schools should encourage, in this multicultural society, the understanding and appreciation of different cultures and ethnic groups.

Furthermore, on page 30 it is stated:

> There are many reasons—cultural, geographical, economic and human, to name several—why understanding and acceptance of all groups in our society will have positive benefits and also present challenges.

This is in relation to people with different backgrounds. The document mentions social courses and pressures that affect our schools owing to changes occurring in our society. On page 13, it is stated:

> During the 1970s schools were strongly influenced by new social pressures. The appointment of counsellors in secondary schools and the introduction of new courses in road safety, health and religious education for all levels were indicators of the response of the education system.

Honourable members should note that there is no mention, in discussing social courses, of the changing role of women and the response of our schools to that. It is stated on page 16:

> Social changes, some of them caused by changes in technology, will alter patterns of living and working. Shorter working hours, periods of unemployment, retraining for new jobs requiring different skills, and an ageing population all have implications for school programmes.

I do not deny a word of this, but it seems to be extraordinary for the document to discuss social changes that are occurring in our community without mentioning the social changes that are affecting women in particular and how our schools should respond to that.

There is also mention of religion. On page 22, under the curriculum area, the document mentions that one of the aims is to develop an awareness and understanding of various value and belief systems, including the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Space is given to the more trivial matters of joining clubs and social organisations. On page 27, under the space devoted to skills for living, it is stated:

> Students should be advised how to establish links with social organisations of many kinds such as clubs, churches, and community agencies.

It cannot be said that the broad sweep of the document did not leave space for more mundane matters. I am really surprised that there is no mention whatsoever in this document of the changing role of women in our society and the response to this that our schools should and must have. To this extent, this document is misleading, or else it is an indication that the Education Department is burying its head in the sand and not noticing or caring about this aspect of change in our society. I would imagine that the equal opportunities officer of the Education Department was not consulted in the preparation of this document; I would certainly like to know whether she was consulted and, if not, why she was not consulted.

I would also suggest that this document be revised so that it is more embracing and sensitive to the current needs

of our society. I would like reassurance that, despite this document, the programme for eliminating sexism from our schools and encouraging equal opportunities for girls is not about to be halted. I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I wish to consider some of the matters referred to in His Excellency's Speech and to support the policy of this Government in placing this State, once again, in a condition of progress, which is slowly but surely taking place. First, I thank His Excellency for the speech with which he opened Parliament. I hasten to reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and I join, I feel sure, with all honourable members in expressing best wishes to the Prince and Princess of Wales for their future life together. The unifying influence of the Royal Family, far removed from Party politics, is something for which we should all be thankful.

I referred recently to the death of the late Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, G.C.M.G., and I do not intend to repeat what I said but merely to express once again the loss which I and, I am sure, many other members feel at the passing of this great South Australian from our midst, and to express gratitude for all that he did for the State he loved.

I also wish to join with other honourable members in congratulating the Hon. Ren DeGaris, A.M., M.L.C., on the award by Her Majesty the Queen of the honour of being a member of the Order of Australia. Mr DeGaris has had an outstanding career in this Parliament and, when in full flight, he is one of the best debaters Parliament has seen in the past 20 years. I do not always agree with the honourable member: in fact, I shall proceed to disagree with him quite forcefully later today, but I congratulate him as a recipient of a well-deserved honour.

I am pleased to refer now to water resources, the improvement of the supply and quality of water resources and the preservation of the Murray River. I am very glad to know of the initiatives taken with regard to the improvement of water quality in the major northern cities and also in other areas. I am pleased to endorse the action taken with regard to the Morgan-Whyalla and Swan Reach to Stockwell pipelines and also the Morgan water filtration plant. I also note with approval the progress being made on the metropolitan Adelaide water filtration programme. Whilst all of these projects are good—and most necessary—in themselves they do not begin to deal with the problem of water quality in the Murray River and also water quantity available from that source.

The recent scarcity of water in that river, the lack of river flows and the rising salt levels have provided a most timely opportunity for raising the matters of both quality and quantity with the Commonwealth and other States with the object of providing the River Murray Commission with some more powers, particularly over quality, which, of course, is directly related to quantity having regard to the necessity for the flushing through of the river from time to time and the need to maintain a regular flow downstream. The River Murray Commission should properly have some real control over the whole system—the Murray itself together with the Darling, Murrumbidgee and Lachlan Rivers and probably one or two of the main tributaries in Victoria—as to quality as well as quantity.

The irresponsible initiatives of the New South Wales Government with regard to the Darling River should only be undertaken in the future if the Queensland Government were brought into the act and a new 'Snowy scheme' were instituted by diversion of some fast-flowing streams into the Barwon River. The waters flowing to the sea in Southern Queensland could be put to use. However, the expansion at present envisaged for northern New South Wales with no surety of supply (such as may possibly be guaranteed in the future by such a scheme) and no flow through to the lower reaches of the Darling and into the Murray is nothing short of foolhardy action by New South Wales and completely lacking in appreciation of the needs of Australia as a whole, and particularly, of course, of the needs of this State.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Of course the diversion of the Clarence River or other rivers into the Murray-Darling system may be some distance away, but it is an option which must be considered in the long term. Those who have been associated with the Murray River for many years, such as the Minister, the Hon. Peter Arnold (and I too have had more than a nodding acquaintance with the river for 40 years), realise that these seasonal problems, such as we have just had with droughts in the Eastern States causing, and highlighting, the problems of this river, go in cycles and that it is quite possible that within a relatively short space of time we may be dealing with the problems of a very high river and even a flood. Even now, as I speak, I am informed that Echuca is flooded. These things have happened before and will doubtless happen again. Nevertheless, it is the recurring periods of very serious shortage, with the absence of flow and the silting up of the mouth, for which we must provide, and I commend the Minister for his efforts to obtain a much more satisfactory agreement for this State and for Australia generally. I wish him well at the conference to be held later this month at Albury.

The reduction of the salt content of the river is a matter of very high priority indeed and one which is highlighted in a period such as we have just experienced. A great deal of drainage water, containing a high salt content, finds its way back into the rivers, particularly in the Eastern States, where profligate methods of irrigation have been used. I am glad to see that some attention, although not enough, is being given to this matter. South Australia, of course, is not without fault in this regard. Some evaporation basins containing highly saline water have been located (for reasons of economy no doubt in earlier years when the concentration of drainage water was not so great) far too close to the river and, on the advent of larger flows of this drainage water and consequent higher levels, have caused undue leakage of saline waters back into the river.

This Government has instituted schemes of removal of this water after due investigation from the Rufus River which, although over the border, directly affects this State, and also from the Upper Murray irrigation areas adjacent to Berri and Renmark, to the Noora Drainage Basin now being constructed some 20 kilometres from the river. These schemes are very important and deserve commendation—they will reduce very significantly the return of saline water to the river—but more remains to be done, in due course, in other locations on the river. The Government deserves support in its effort to overcome the salinity problems of the Murray River and, in the long term, to be able to continue to supply quite adequate amounts of water of improved quality for the people of this State, both in urban and rural areas.

I refer to comments made by Mr K. M. Sawers, Vice Chairman of the South Australian Water Resources Council, at the United Farmers and Stockowners Association State Conference. The report of Mr Sawer's comments states:

> . . . there was an urgent necessity to obtain legislatively supported minimum standards for Murray River water quality. The system of management for the total Murray River catchment area should be vested in a federally based authority with adequate powers, funds and technical facilities. Whether this was the Murray River

Commission with wider powers or an alternative body was not important.

I possibly take issue with that comment, because I believe the Murray River Commission should be the authority to deal with the river. The report continues:

A catchment management plan developed from a computer model was essential. Mr Sawers proposed that the authority would—

- determine water quality standards.
- determine flows and storages to ensure equitable distribution and maintenance of quality standards.
- develop storage on the Murray system to support flow management.
- allocate Federal and State funds to all States to encourage improved irrigation practices.

That is very important for the States of New South Wales and Victoria, where a lot of wasteful irrigation still occurs. It further states:

States should declare a moratorium on all projects associated with the Murray River and its tributaries in the catchment areas, other than salinity control projects, to enable establishment of the authority and computer assessments. Mr Sawers said the whole Murray River issue needed to be comprehensively investigated and this would best be done by a Royal Commission with the commissioner or commissioners coming from States without a direct interest in the Murray system.

As well the question of diverting water from the Clarence River into the Murray system needed a detailed study. Mr Sawers said the Federal Government and Eastern States should be made aware that South Australia had a very limited capacity to control the quality of water entering this State. However, every effort had been made to manage the water received by a freeze on approvals for new or increased allotments since 1967; some allotments reductions in 1979 and implementation of a salinity control programme in 1980-81.

To my mind that is an interesting comment, from a prominent gentleman who is actively involved with the Water Resources Council and with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. Whether or not we agree with what is said, it highlights the fact that the matter is an important one in the minds of the public generally.

As a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, I have been concerned with the problems of providing public buildings and services to this State as well as dealing with other matters to which I have just referred and which are both functional and adequate (and I stress 'adequate'), but at the same time being not ostentatious or lavish. Unfortunately, there has been far too great a tendency for some public utilities to fall into the latter category. This means that there is plenty, or more than enough, for some while others must wait. That is what it really means: other facilities that are crying out for replacement must wait if we tend to build facilities that are too elaborate.

I refer to school buildings in particular, and that is only one section of the committee's work. I could mention quite a number of new schools, both large and small, that have tended to be lavish (I use 'lavish' advisedly) in their facilities and appointments. It is all very well to be lavish and to provide everything that opens and shuts if there is plenty of money and if there is no-one in dire distress (as some schools most certainly are) to be kept waiting for an unduly long period as a result. Certainly, some schools are in that category: they are waiting, and have been waiting for far too long.

Recently, the Public Buildings Department made what I considered to be a mistake on its part (nevertheless I thank the department sincerely for it) of showing to members of the Public Works Committee some smaller schools that do not normally come under the committee's inspection and, by so doing, provided examples of unnecessary and wasteful expenditure of public money, even in the small school sector, which means that other schools crying out for replacement must wait still longer.

I have had drawn to my attention since then several smaller schools that are similar to those which we saw, and it makes one wonder whether the Public Works Standing Committee should not have its sights lowered rather than raised; that is, it should be required to look at projects of less than $500 000 value instead of the limit being raised, as previously proposed. However, the Government can now, in the present situation, refer projects worth under $500 000 value to the committee if it deems it necessary to do so.

One of the last public acts of the late Honourable Sir Thomas Playford was to open the new Norton Summit school. As I understand it, Sir Thomas remarked to the member for the district, who is the Deputy Premier, 'Very nice, but too lavish, Roger.' I believe that Sir Thomas was right, as so often he was right. As I said earlier, it would be all very well to be lavish (and I know that the Public Buildings Department does not like the word 'lavish') if others were not waiting and if money was plentiful. However, I do not believe in keeping other projects that are crying out for attention waiting because money has been spent unwisely. This message must be conveyed clearly to departments generally.

I have mentioned the Education Department only, as it provides some prime examples. This message must also be conveyed to Public Buildings Department architects, who have perhaps all too often allowed their imagination to soar without sufficient regard to cost. This speech was written some time ago, and it is a coincidence if it now comes to a common conclusion with other representations made recently on this matter. Let me stress once more that I believe in adequate provisions being made in these cases. I do not wish to short-change a project of its necessities, but I do not go along with other very important public works being held up because of unwise use of public money.

I said earlier, in commending the Hon. Mr DeGaris on his well merited award in the Queen's Birthday Honours, that I do not always agree with him, and I propose to disagree with him this afternoon. During the course of his speech, the honourable member recommended that no Ministers be selected from this Council and that all Ministers presumably should come from the relatively small House of Assembly. I could not disagree more. This Council is a House of Parliament, so why remove it from responsibility and reality (as indeed to some degree was the Tasmanian Legislative Council in 1969-72) unless we want to copy the American system, which I most decidedly do not want to do!

Tasmania has an Upper House of 19 members, and usually consists of four or five members of the Labor Party, which has been in Government for a long period, and a number of Independent members. The A.L.P. has been in Government in Tasmania for very many years, except for the period from 1969-72 to which I have just referred. It has always had, contrary to the fulminations of some media correspondents, one or two Ministers in the Council while the Labor Party has been in power.

During the 1969-72 period of Liberal Government, there were no Ministers in the Upper House. No Independent wished to be directly identified with the Government and, although a Leader for (not of) the Government was appointed, there was no sense of reality or of responsibility to the elected Government of the day. In some cases during that period Government Bills had to be hawked around amongst members in order to find someone who was willing to introduce them in the Upper House. We do not want that sort of situation to obtain here.

The Hon. Mr Sumner, at some stage in his speech, referred to a relatively small back bench in a relatively small Parliament. I do not know whether they were his exact words, but that was the import of what the honourable

member said. You would have a very small and ineffective back bench in the Lower House regardless of the Party in power if all Ministers were drawn from it. I think all members would agree that a strong back bench is a most necessary part of the Westminster system of government.

One of my colleagues, whose judgment I respect, stated that in his view it is most necessary to use the best men available, not merely from one House, in a small Parliament such as ours. It is quite stupid, in my view, to disqualify automatically nearly one-third of the members of this small Parliament—the smallest on the mainland—from being Ministers, thus unnecessarily weakening the back bench in the Lower House as I have just mentioned, and weakening the field from which Ministers can be drawn.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the Northern Territory?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am talking about State Parliaments. This is certainly the smallest State Parliament on the mainland. I emphasise my complete disagreement with my honourable friend regarding this matter. I consider that his earlier judgment that there should be four Ministers from this House rather than the present three Ministers is much more sound than the honourable member's present suggestion.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Hear, hear.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Leader might not be saying that in a moment. The Hon. Mr Sumner, in his speech, suggested that this Council should have no more power than the House of Lords. A more ridiculous suggestion would be hard to find. The House of Lords is an appointed or hereditary House of Parliament, that is, partly life peers and partly hereditary peers. This Council would now be almost certainly (since we straightened up the Electoral Act earlier this year) the most democratically elected Upper House in the world. Yet the honourable member suggests that we should have no more power than an appointed House! In 1975, when on a C.P.A. general conference tour, I made it my business to inspect a number of the Upper Houses in various parts of the world—notably the House of Lords, to which I have just referred, and the Canadian Senate, which is wholly appointed (one is honoured by being 'summoned' to the Senate, often as an 'elder-statesman' who has had experience in the Canadian House of Commons or in one of the Provincial Legislatures). I also mention the Rayja Sabah, the indirectly elected (by the States) Upper House in India, and the Malaysian Senate (partly indirectly elected, similarly to the Indian practice, and partly appointed).

There are other Upper Houses to which I could refer, but these four examples of appointed, partially appointed and indirectly elected Upper Houses will do. They have limited powers, and probably advisedly so, having regard to their particular situations, but in Australia we have insisted on fully elected Upper Houses and, if we so insist, we cannot but give such Parliamentary Chambers fully responsible powers.

The Leader's contention is typical A.L.P. outlook—they want to have their cake and eat it, too. I was interested, although I could not say that I really enjoyed it, to hear the remarks of the Hon. Mr Dunford on unemployment. In complete contrast to his remarks, I commend the work done by this Government and the Hon. Dean Brown, in particular, to stimulate industry and employment in South Australia. There is no doubt that unemployment is unacceptably high, even though it is now receding. It has never recovered from the body blow it received during the Whitlam years, when it really escalated—when it 'took off' so to speak. However, there is also no doubt that the work-force is increasing.

I was interested to hear the Hon. Mr Dunford say that we had promised 7 000 new jobs—he said it in criticism as though we had been able to do nothing about it. How wrong he is—and, of course, that is not unusual. I refer him to the recent figures supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which is most surely a reliable organisation. If he cares to examine those figures he will find that in the real trough being experienced when the Labor Government went out of office—just before then, in August 1979—there were 547 700 people employed in South Australia, the lowest number for some time. Today, nearly two years later, there are 561 300 people employed—an increase, not of 7 000 but of nearly 14 000—almost double the number which the Hon. Mr Dunford quoted. This has occurred as a result of the positive policy of this Liberal Government. So much for the Hon. Mr Dunford's comments!

I now turn to this Government's policy in relation to mines and energy. I wish to commend the Deputy Premier for the forward-looking policy he has developed. It is in stark contrast to that of the previous Government in relation to the development of the resources of this State and the escalation of exploration which has occurred since this Government came to office. That has occurred as a result of this Government and the policy of the Deputy Premier in particular. As his Excellency said in his Speech, 'mineral and petroleum exploration activity is at an unprecedentedly high level'. The result of this policy, particularly in relation to the development of petroleum liquids in the Cooper Basin and the exciting Roxby Downs project—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If this cackling jackass would keep quiet—

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. Those remarks are absolutely unparliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has been asked to withdraw.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I withdraw my remark, Mr President.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I rise on a further point of order, Mr President, and ask the honourable member to apologise.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: And I apologise.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Good on you, Boyd.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It might be an improvement if some other members followed my example. I was also interested to note the recent discovery of a very significant coal deposit by C.R.A. some miles north of Sedan. That discovery would not have occurred but for the forward-looking policy—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. I think your latitude is commendable in allowing the Hon. Mr Dawkins to read a speech prepared by the Minister of Mines and Energy. Pursuant to Standing Orders he should only be reading from reliable notes.

An honourable member: A brilliant speech!

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has raised a matter which could have been raised in relation to practically every speech made in this Council for a number of years. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am flattered that the honourable member believes that it is a brilliant speech written by the Minister of Mines and Energy. I wrote this speech and had it typed in a country town two or three weeks ago. The Minister of Mines and Energy does not even know that it has been written. I take the honourable member's remarks as a compliment. I believe that South Australia could eventually have much to thank this Government for in the field of mineral exploration. One must

not overlook the potential for exploration within the Great Australian Bight.

I now turn to the Agriculture Department. I commend the Hon. Mr Chapman for the job that he is doing in the Agriculture and Forests Departments. Earlier in this debate the Hon. Mr Chatterton had some harsh words to say about the Minister of Agriculture in another place and made some specific allegations about the performance of the Department of Agriculture and the Minister's conduct in general. The Hon. Mr Chatterton, in my opinion, displayed some petulance and an appalling lack of objectivity and accuracy. Of course, he has been away for three months and, as he made it very clear this afternoon, in a question to the Attorney-General, he has not caught up with many things that have happened.

The Hon. Mr Chatterton made several allegations in the course of his speech. He said that the Government had not serviced growers in the Virginia and Angle Vale areas who are struggling to improve the marketing of their fruit and vegetables. That is completely incorrect. The Government and the department are vigorously assisting growers in the Virginia and Angle Vale areas to improve their marketing. Through the offices of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Transport, land has been made available at Salisbury for a growers' market. I understand that the grower organisation involved is now negotiating with the Salisbury Council.

I point out that it was the Minister of Agriculture who drew to the attention of the growers and the Salisbury council the fact that legislation already existed under section 49 of the Markets Clauses Act giving the council power to set up a growers' market. Therefore, there is no need for legislation which the Hon. Mr Chatterton seemed to think was necessary. The growers have a market site in mind. There has also been action in relation to the Tomato Industry Action Committee, which was organised by officers of the Department of Agriculture to assist growers who are facing difficulties in marketing their produce.

A major extension programme is under way so that growers can improve the quality of their produce. This programme focuses on correct harvesting procedures and post-harvest handling of products, with emphasis on cooling after harvest so that the tomatoes are acceptable in interstate markets. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture has established an office at Virginia to assist the growers. That is something which the previous Government was apparently loath to do.

Officers have been working from a caravan, but more permanent quarters will be provided on a block owned by the Highways Department. I am advised that a vegetable adviser will be permanently stationed at Virginia to service the industry. I am also pleased to indicate that applications have already been called and applicants have been interviewed. I understand that an appointment will be announced shortly. I have gone to some lengths to demonstrate that the Hon. Mr Chatterton, having been away for three months, has obviously not kept himself informed on this matter.

The Hon. Mr Chatterton also indicated that the future of the Rural Adjustment Scheme is in jeopardy. As a former Minister, the Hon. Mr Chatterton should know that the cut in Commonwealth funds to the rural assistance scheme occurred in 1978 when he was in office. Far from the South Australian Government placing the scheme in jeopardy, prudent management has provided more funds for rural adjustment than those allocated by the Commonwealth.

During the past financial year $5 650 000 was lent to farmers, whilst only $2 300 000 of that total was received from Commonwealth sources. This Government was able to lend more money than was received by relending money which had been repaid by farmers. We had a 'roll-over', so to speak, of finance available to assist farmers. Generally, that would answer the allegation that the rural assistance scheme has been placed in jeopardy. I do not wish to delay the Council any more on this matter, although I certainly could do so if it were necessary.

The honourable member suggested that market development had been neglected by the Department of Agriculture. Again, the honourable member may be a little behind the times because he has been away for three months and does not know what developments have occurred. The Hon. Mr Chatterton perhaps could be forgiven for not knowing the details of the Salisbury growers' market and assistance to the tomato industry, to which I have referred, but the honourable gentleman should surely know that market research and support are still actively pursued by the department.

The Hon. Mr Chatterton also talked about overseas projects and the fact that policy decisions have affected the viability of overseas projects. In regard to those matters the honourable member said that the Minister had made them a political hot potato. Rather, I suggest the honourable member is the one who has made overseas projects into a political hot potato. The present Minister has gone to some pains to recognise the contribution of the previous Minister in some spirit of bipartisanship. The previous Minister's record in regard to co-operation is not good.

I refer to the briefing of the Hon. Mr Chatterton before his overseas trip, and I have been informed of this by those who attended. The present Minister certainly did not ask the Hon. Mr Chatterton to find out anything for the Government. The honourable member has no standing in the Government of South Australia at present and, for him to assume otherwise, or to let other people assume otherwise, is quite wrong.

The honourable member suggested that the present Minister had used undue influence on the Minister of Fisheries in relation to the Investigator Strait prawn fishery. I refute that statement completely. I have known the Hon. Allan Rodda for many years, and to suggest that the Hon. Mr Rodda could be intimidated by the Hon. Ted Chapman is ridiculous. The Hon. Allan Rodda is a man of the highest integrity. The Minister of Agriculture is the member for Alexandra, and Kangaroo Island comprises part of his electorate. Honourable members would all be aware that the Minister of Agriculture is interested in the welfare of the families on the island which depend upon fishing. For him to be otherwise interested would be a dereliction of his electoral duties. All that the Minister of Agriculture has ever sought is that Kangaroo Island prawn fishermen, indeed all fishermen operating from Kangaroo Island, be treated as South Australians and not as some race apart. Also, in regard to agricultural matters, I refer to the use of leaked documents in the Hon. Mr Chatterton's speech. I find this tactic quite abhorrent.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Tonkin could do it when he—

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Under such a practice the Opposition is saying that a Minister cannot even change a draft of his own report, and I am not referring to the Director-General's report but the Minister's own report. Indeed, I want to inform the Council (if it needs such informing) that the Department of Agriculture, the Woods and Forests Department and the Fisheries Department are not toys but are departments involved in important sectors of this State's economy. The sooner the Opposition obtains a reasonable and objective spokesman for agriculture and woods and forests the sooner we will have something approaching a bipartisan policy, rather than an Opposition

policy which is directed by the honourable member, based on pique.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: We got a new Minister two years ago when we got a new Government, but the previous Minister was in Government and under Government from the time of his appointment to the Ministry.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: You can work it out for yourself. Further, before I close, I wish to commend the work of the Minister of Arts (Hon. C. M. Hill), who is endeavouring, with some success, to bring into proper perspective the assistance which this Government provides for the arts. The Minister's reply to a question today on this matter emphasises that an irresponsible waste of public money should not occur, especially as it did during the period of office of the previous Government. As I have said previously, I had no quarrel with the total amount provided for the arts but I did query the priorities developed in regard to how that money was spent. The Minister of Arts is doing a good job in improving that situation, and I commend him for it. Finally, I commend the Government for doing a good job generally in times of tight financial restriction. It has many constraints placed upon it by the actions of the previous Government and by the escalation of the Public Service. It can only reduce this swollen size, which is in accordance with socialist philosophy. It can only reduce the size of the Public Service by attrition, and even that has its limits. One cannot put a complete blanket upon the employment of new members of the Public Service. I support the motion.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Today in this debate I want to talk about the resources boom, a term which for South Australia, at least, seems to be a misnomer. When the Liberal Government came to office in September 1979 it talked incessantly about South Australia's vast mineral wealth and the huge economic advantages this would provide for the people of South Australia. Mr Tonkin promised to stop the job rot.

Today, with good reason, those claims are no longer being made since they were quite fraudulent—the unemployment rate has actually risen. In September 1979, 44 700 of the South Australian population were unemployed—a most unsatisfactory situation—but by March 1981, 8.2 per cent or 49 100 people were looking for work. In addition, this Government has been able to do nothing to arrest the outflow of people to other States in search of work. Before the election Mr Tonkin bitterly attacked the Labor Government for causing people to flee South Australia in search of jobs. Since he came to office, the number of people leaving the State has increased markedly. In the year ended September 1980, 7 479 people moved out of South Australia—2 905 more than for the corresponding period ended September 1979. If these people had not left the State, the unemployment rate would have been even higher.

I said that Liberal claims during the last election campaign, that they would stop the job rot, were fraudulent. I say this with confidence, since the same individuals who were so confident in 1979 in predicting the number of jobs which would be created now claim they cannot make any predictions at all. For example, on 4 June, I asked the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, the following questions:

1. How many new job-seekers are expected to enter the job market in South Australia during the next five years?
2. How many new jobs are expected to be created in South Australia in the private sector by major development projects (over $5 million)?
3. How many jobs will be created in other private sector areas?
4. How many public sector jobs will be created or become available through retirement, etc., during this period?

I was astonished to receive the following reply from the Attorney-General:

Precise figures cannot be placed upon the numbers of job seekers expected to enter the labour force or the number of jobs likely to be created in the next five years. Estimates of this nature must take account of interstate and international migration, educational participation rates, availability of skills, economic growth and a variety of other factors, all of which affect the labour force participation rate and all of which are subject to change.

At best, forecasting techniques based on major development projects which are presently in the preliminary stage can provide an idea of orders of magnitude but not precise figures. Accordingly, job creation forecasts are tentative and subject to substantial change depending upon the assumptions used. However, the honourable member may care to extrapolate from recent data provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Commonwealth Employment Service and A.N.Z. Bank.

The reply then gave details of particular employment figures, both past figures and projections for the future. I am expected to make my own assumptions based on that data.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This reply to my question can mean either that the Government is treating my question and this Parliament with contempt and has not bothered to answer properly, or that its forecasting capabilities are so inadequate that any statement about the job benefits of minerals development projects should be treated with the utmost scepticism. If that reply was not enough to show that this Government is rather haphazard about the way in which it treats this issue, on 2 June I put a Question on Notice to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, as follows:

What calculations has the Government made to ascertain the relative costs and benefits to the South Australian community of the Roxby Downs project? In particular, what estimates are there of the infrastructure costs of the project which will be borne by the taxpayer? What estimates are there of the loss of potential revenue due to the various forms of taxation and other incentives to the companies concerned and what are the estimated revenues to the State from Roxby Downs? What is the Government's latest estimate of the number of jobs which may be provided directly and indirectly as a consequence of the Roxby Downs project and over what period of time will these jobs be created?

These are very reasonable questions to ask about an extremely important project, which this Government heralded as being one of the major projects that would save South Australia. Having asked this question on 2 June and being very keen to know exactly what the Government had to say on these issues, I discovered that the Government either does not know the answers or cannot be bothered providing the information, because so far I have received no reply.

Since the Government now is apparently unable to answer the most basic questions concerning development in this State, I have had to look elsewhere for information on which to base my own assessment. I will share some of this information with honourable members since the Government does not seem to be very keen to do it for us. I refer first to jobs. The most minimal manpower planning policy requires us to know just how many new jobs must be created in South Australia during the next few years. Contrary to the Government's statement in reply to my question, we can make such estimates. The aggregate size of the labour force is growing by about 1½ per cent a year. Therefore, about 9 000 more people per year need jobs. So, merely to maintain current levels of unemployment, we will have to generate an extra 45 000 jobs by 1985 in South Australia. If we cannot do this, the unemployment rate will rise and the number of people leaving the State will escalate.

What are the prospects for achieving this goal and what role will the resources boom play in our development? There are currently 19 major investment projects in South Australia likely to proceed by 1985, but only four are in the mining sector. The remaining 15 are in the manufacturing sector. Manufacturing projects relate to the following products—motor vehicles, paper products, iron and steel, brewing, timber, chemicals, lube oil, whitegoods and gases. Total investment for these projects is expected to be about $385 000 000.

The mining projects being pursued before 1985 are the Cooper Basin oil and gas project, Leigh Creek coal, Honeymoon uranium and Mannahill uranium. Total investment for these projects will be about $2 340 000 000, and these figures have been supplied by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce. In addition, there are a number of other mining and manufacturing projects under study, but these are not likely to be significant before 1985 and are not likely to provide significant change in our overall prospects after 1985.

I have to acknowledge that it is difficult, at this stage, to predict accurately what the employment levels will be for these projects, because there is no data on expected employment levels for about half of them from the Department of Industry and Commerce. However, extrapolating from the available figures and assuming a constant employment-investment ratio (except in the Cooper Basin case where Santos figures differ), it is possible to make some fairly informed predicitions, and we find that about 1 750 jobs will be created during the construction phases of the projects I have outlined and about 1 800 in the production phases.

In other words, only about 1 800 jobs, or 3 per cent of the number of additional jobs required by 1985, will be generated during that period by known investment projects. Only about half, that is, 1½ per cent of the total jobs needed, will come from minerals development. If the Government thinks this constitutes a boom, then its economic views are even more bizarre than we previously thought.

But, of course, as we all know, these projects are likely to create jobs indirectly, too. Using a conservative multiplier of five (most reputable studies suggest two or three is more reasonable), we might expect an extra 7 200 jobs to be generated, bringing the total to 9 000, or 16 per cent of the total number required by 1985. In other words, only one job in six of the total number needed during the next half decade will be provided by the major manufacturing and mining projects presently expected.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Does that multiplier include any increase in public sector employment as the result of royalties and the like?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not sure about that. I do not think it does. What is being done and how much can South Australia expect to prosper from the so-called resources boom? If we take the question of research into the critical question of the impact of resource development on the labour market, it seems very little is being done in South Australia.

The Australian Industries Development Association, in a briefing paper prepared this year outlining the known research projects being carried out around Australia, reports that the South Australian Government is understood to utilise a model of assessing the impact of resource developments which is similar to that used by the Queensland Government. If one thinks that that sounds a bit tentative, the paper goes on to say that there have been no significant studies undertaken in relation to the impact of resource development upon the labour market, although the report acknowledges that the S.A. Department of Labour and Industry produces high quality information on some of these matters as part of its on-going work. All this seems rather half-hearted for a Government which claims to have so much faith in the resources boom.

On the question of what we might expect to get out of resources development, the pessimistic outlook which I outlined earlier seems to be shared by the Commercial Bank of Australia Limited as evidenced by its economic review dated December 1980, which concludes:

> Overall, the greater number of large natural resource projects scheduled for development in Queensland, N.S.W. and W.A. will provide direct stimulus to these States and, although indirect benefits will spin off to other States, especially to some of Victoria's manufacturing industries, the relative growth of Victoria, S.A. and Tasmania will be less than the growth of the more resource-rich States of Queensland, N.S.W. and W.A.

Furthermore, the report predicts that the motor vehicle industry, which employs 20 per cent of the State's manufacturing workforce, may well be subjected to a reduction in its tariff protection in future; this would cause a further marked deterioration in the employment situation. Tariff reductions are a probable consequence of the resources boom, being one measure designed to reduce embarrassingly high balance of payments surpluses caused by foreign capital inflow into the mineral development sector.

So, the resources boom in other States threatens vehicle industry jobs in S.A. In return for this, over the next few years using the most optimistic calculations, S.A. mineral development will provide less than 2 per cent of the 45 000 new jobs which must be created if unemployment is not to worsen still further. The Labor Party is not opposed to minerals development but it does not see it (for reasons I have indicated) as a panacea for the State's economic problems.

In contrast to the Liberal Governments at the State and Federal levels, we believe that minerals development poses a number of serious social, manpower and environmental problems. I want to deal with the manpower problems first. Last year, the Federal Department of Labour's advisory committee examined the probable demand and supply of skilled labour during the development years of the resources boom. It attempted to collate data and to revise existing figures. But it was severely hampered by the lack of adequate statistical information. The committee recommended that the Australian Bureau of Statistics 'should be approached to undertake frequent, regular surveys of the stock of skilled labour in Australia and in each State'.

It is astonishing that planning for one of the most crucial phases of economic development in our history should be based on a totally inadequate data base. Nevertheless, the working party, on the basis of known labour shortages, recommended that the greatest possible apprentice intakes should be undertaken immediately in order to meet the anticipated requirements in a few years time. Two things seem clear. First, we are going to need more skilled workers, scientists and technologists, and secondly, this can only be achieved by intelligent forward planning.

The Australian Petroleum Exploration Association Ltd, for example, has argued that 'the critical factor in expanding exploration and production activities in the 1980s could be limited availability to human resources rather than limitations of finance or technology'. In a submission to the Federal Minister of Education dated April 1981, the A.P.E.A. argued the following:

> The Australian education system, in its current state, does not have the capacity to supply sufficient new graduate earth scientists and engineers to satisfy the needs of the petroleum, coal and mineral industries over the next 10 years. This is part of a wider problem involving shortages of skilled tradesmen, apprentices and technicians.

The A.P.E.A.'s submission dealt primarily with the supply of earth scientists and engineers for the petroleum explo-

ration and production industry. It pointed out that Australian universities will need to produce 250 to 400 graduate geologists, plus between 120 and 150 graduate geophysicists each year of this decade to meet the needs of these industries. But, during the next few years universities will be unable to produce more than bout 200 earth science graduates, and only about 20 of these will be geophysicists.

Engineering faculties, too, will be unable to produce the number of graduates required, although there has been an increase in enrolments recently. In Australian universities at the moment capacity utilisation of Engineering Department facilities is only between 50 per cent and 60 per cent.

In both these faculties the main problem is finance. The Federal Government has severely cut back funding for universities which in turn has meant frozen staff levels and quotas on student intake numbers. The State Government has done nothing of any substance to try to reverse this situation. So, on the one hand, we have a Federal and a State Government suggesting that resources development will secure Australia's future and, on the other, they are failing to provide the planning and resources to allow that development to proceed efficiently.

Another aspect of the manpower problems generated by the new resource development projects—one which is receiving virtually no attention—concerns women. The skilled jobs which will be created by the resources boom are almost exclusively a male preserve. If it is true that many of the job opportunities in the 1980s will be found in the mining and resources development sector and if it is also true that shortages will exist in these areas, then why are there no campaigns being mounted in our schools to encourage girls to consider pursuing careers in these areas? Why are our vocational guidance officers in schools not aware of the possible opportunities? Why are the universities doing so little to encourage girls to take earth science or engineering instead of arts courses? Also, when will the Government begin a campaign to persuade mining and other companies to consider girls and women for jobs for which they have usually employed men?

The only such project of which I am aware is one being sponsored by the Hunter Development Board in the Hunter Valley in N.S.W. where there are currently 4 000 women and girls seeking work.

The programme, called 'girls can do anything', is designed to educate women and girls about job opportunities in the region, to increase awareness of schools and employers, and to work with Government and other agencies in the community to remove the social and legal barriers to female employment in the new industries being developed in the Hunter Valley. The project is an excellent idea. The Tonkin Government could learn much from it.

The question of work for women and girls in the new mineral development areas must be taken more seriously by State Governments and the Federal Government because it is in their interests as well as those of the women concerned. It is all very well to set up new projects miles from anywhere expecting to attract workers with higher than average wages. But these days, with more and more married women having jobs of their own, families are less likely to find such a move attractive unless women too have some job prospects in the new centres. In some cases moving from two wages to one would mean that families would be financially disadvantaged, even if the male wage were much higher than it would be in traditional employment areas. In other cases, women will be unwilling to give up the personal satisfaction they derive from having a job of their own.

Add to this the lack of amenities and social deprivation so common in new development centres, and the wages would have to be fairly spectacular to compensate for the loss of city amenities. Stories are legion of the appalling living conditions and social problems which have already developed in some of the new mineral development centres in Australia. One such place is Gladstone in Queensland. This town is at the very centre of the resources boom and provides a classic example of the enormous problems which can arise when rapid development is allowed to occur without proper social planning. Gladstone has already gone through one boom during the 1960s and now faces another. Its current population is 27 500. By the end of the 1980s, it will be more than 62 000.

Since the first boom began in Gladstone in the 1960s, the ratepayers of Gladstone have had to pay for all the social amenities and many of the infrastructure costs for the development that has taken place there. The Queensland Government, the Federal Government and the companies which have operated there have not made any real contribution. As a result, average rates in Gladstone have risen by 164 per cent to $508 in seven years.

Gladstone demonstrates what happens without planning when the so-called free market is unchecked; 40 per cent of the State schools in the area are accommodated in facilities classified as 'non-permanent'. The city's loan programme has trebled in a year to $3 000 000 to meet sewerage, water and road requirements. The water supply is inadequate, too, the roads are substandard and there is no public transport. There is a desperate housing shortage. Rents have risen 30 per cent in the last two years. About 2 000 people live in caravans. People sleep in their cars for months, or in tents by the river. There is no crisis accommodation for the unemployed who come from the cities to get off the dole.

For those living in caravans in development centres like Gladstone, life is not easy. It is rather difficult to live a normal family existence with the whole family living and sleeping in one room and with the neighbours just 3ft. away. Entertainment and recreational facilities are limited. Marital problems are growing, and abuse of alcohol and analgaesics are creating serious social problems. And Gladstone has only one welfare worker. It is difficult to imagine a situation more likely to create the breakdown of family life about which the Federal and State Liberal Governments profess to be so concerned.

For skilled tradesmen wages are high, but in the service industries the average take-home pay is $150 a week. For council workers, railway men, the unemployed, and pensioners, life is a constant struggle with soaring prices for rent and food. It is no wonder that some people in Gladstone describe it as a 'doom' town rather than a 'boom' town.

This sort of disaster is now being repeated in the La Trobe Valley in Victoria and the Hunter Valley in New South Wales. These examples should serve as timely warnings to us in South Australia of what could happen here without proper planning if such centres as Roxby Downs are eventually to develop to the size that the Government has predicted. I do not believe that Roxby Downs will grow to the size that some Government members have predicted. However, as late as last week a Government member in another place suggested that Roxby Downs could eventually grow to a town bigger than either Mount Isa or Broken Hill. I do not believe that that will happen, but if it does we need to be rather careful about social planning.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What do you base that on?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: If the honourable member had bothered to be in the Chamber for the first part of my speech, he would know. It should be necessary for us to go no further than Whyalla in our own State to learn some of the lessons about proper pre-planning in a growth region. Whyalla is another classic case of a town where the boom turned sour. The area was developed to serve the needs of B.H.P.'s shipbuilding and steel-making activities. And in

the mid-1970s, when shipbuilding went into decline and B.H.P. shut down part of its operations, thousands of people lost their jobs and the future of the town was threatened. Fortunately, things have picked up again in Whyalla more recently, but it stands as an example of the dangers inherent in promoting a growth centre with too narrow an economic base.

State and Federal Governments must take the initiative to decide what will happen and how it will happen if resources development is to work for the Australian people and not against them. Careful thought should be given to the ways communities should expand before the development begins, not after it has got way out of hand, as it has in places like Gladstone. Proper attention must be given to the basic needs of life like housing, health, education, recreation, and so on.

The social role of the companies benefiting from such development must be determined before they are allowed to go ahead. They should be required to provide some of the infrastructure costs of projects with which they are involved, and some sort of on-going commitment to such an area is not an unreasonable expectation. If it is true, as the Commercial Bank's report and others have suggested, that South Australia is less likely to be directly involved in the resources boom and therefore likely to receive benefits from it only indirectly, it is the responsibility of our State Government to exert as much pressure as possible on the Federal Government and other State Governments to see that resources development is planned, controlled and rationalised, that the benefits are shared as equally as possible, and that some parts of Australia are not sacrificed for others. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I, too, support the motion. In his Speech, the Governor referred to the death of Sir Thomas Playford and his contribution to the State of South Australia. I would like to endorse those comments and extend my sympathy to Lady Playford and her family. I would also like to add my congratulations to those already given to the Hon. Mr DeGaris, who became a member of the Order of Australia in the Queen's birthday honours list. Irrespective of one's politics, I feel that considerations of another person's contributions to his or her public office is worthy of recognition by all sections of our community, and I fully support the comments made by earlier speakers.

I have listened with considerable interest to the Address in Reply speeches given by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, the Hon. Mr Sumner and, more recently, the Hon. Mr Dawkins. I must say that I fully concur with the thoughts and comments of the Hon. Mr Sumner and the Hon. Mr DeGaris on the role of the Legislative Council and its relevance in the arm of Parliamentary Government in this day and age. However, I cannot say that I concur with the comments made by the Hon. Mr Dawkins.

Prior to my entering the Legislative Council, the only things that I knew of the Hon. Mr DeGaris were those things that I had heard or read about him. The impression I had formed of him was that he was a person who was so politically conservative as to be frightening and that he was an ultraconservative member of the Liberal Party. What has surprised me is that in the past the Hon. Mr DeGaris has fully believed in the role of the Legislative Council. He has served in it and has not seen it as a mirror image of the House of Assembly.

From the tenor of the Hon. Mr DeGaris's speech, it would appear that he now has some doubts about the role of the Legislative Council, as does the Leader of the Opposition. I also have grave doubts about the relevance of the Legislative Council at this present time in its history. Unfortunately, I can only go back to the two years I have been here to form my judgment. However, to satisfy myself that I was not alone in my views in the role that this Council was playing in the political arena I have, through the good offices of the Parliamentary Library, had the opportunity to read and study other points of view on the role Upper Houses play in the bicameral system of Parliament.

My reference to the Hon. Mr DeGaris's being conservative is exemplified in an article I came across in the *News*. The article, which is entitled 'The majority is not always right', relates to an interview between a *News* writer, Les Hinton, and the Hon. Mr DeGaris that took place in July 1970. The article states:

> The most discussed current political topic in South Australia is what happens if the L.C.L.-dominated Upper House substantially amends or rejects legislation passed by the Labor Government-controlled House of Assembly. The Premier, Mr Dunstan, has warned that he will call a snap election within 12 months—leading to a double dissolution—if the Council blocks the Government's programme.
>
> So this week, *News* special writer Les Hinton went to the Opposition Leader in the Legislative Council, Mr Ren DeGaris, and asked him to explain in detail why the Council should have the power to reject Government legislation.

The article then continues with a record of the conversation between the Hon. Mr DeGaris and Mr Hinton. In part, that conversation was as follows:

> Hinton: Some people feel that an Upper House is not necessary. What do you say to that?
>
> DeGaris: This is not borne out, of course, by any democracy. All the writers on the formation of a democracy agree on the necessity for the bicameral system. If you get one House acting on legislation and that House is always right because of the dogmas of one Party machine, you're going to see deterioration in the standard of democracy.
>
> Hinton: You believe more in representing equally the interests in the State rather than in representing the majority of the people in the State.
>
> DeGaris: Oh, no. I think you represent the majority of people. Take Great Britain for example. In the House of Commons you get a variation of four to one in the electorates in Scotland as compared to the electorates in England.
>
> The principle of one vote one value over both Houses doesn't apply, I don't think, anywhere in the world. It's not accepted in most democratic countries. There are loadings to country areas.
>
> Hinton: Accepting that it is your view that some of Labor's policies are against the interests of the people, how do you justify blocking them when the people have given support for them at the ballot box?
>
> DeGaris: How can you say in a massive document of a number of policy matters that the public have given *carte blanche* for these things to come on the Statute Book?
>
> I would say that if you go round South Australia today there's not too many who could give you any exact detail of what was proposed in the Labor Party policy speech, or even our policy speech. Then you come to the consideration of words being used in a policy speech, but the Bill when it comes in containing totally different matter.
>
> Hinton: But the Government did say what it proposed to do and presumably it was elected on that. Again, how can you justify in your position, being a member of a Government which was defeated, stopping legislation which has been promised by the Party that won?
>
> DeGaris: We won't stop any legislation, where there is, we feel, a clear and fair mandate. On the other hand, there are certain matters which we believe that the people should have the chance of a second look at.
>
> It's very difficult at this stage, as I pointed out, to take any section of the Labor Party policy and say: Now this is a clear mandate given. But we do generally accept the principle that there has been a fair mandate given. The Council never has in its history been obstructive to any Government. And it won't be in the years ahead, either.
>
> But if there is sufficient support of the individuals in the Council that certain action should be taken, and will be taken. And then the Government has the right to challenge what the Council has done.
>
> Hinton: Talking about the need for a different view. Do you think the present arrangement where there are so few Labor members in the Council needs changing?
>
> DeGaris: You come down to this one problem again, which we started with in discussing an Upper House. I believe in its structure

somehow we must maintain this attitude of independence. You can't do this with a dominant Party machine.

Hinton: But the dominant Party now is your Party.

DeGaris: We do not act as a Party. Not in any way whatsoever. We don't meet with our House of Assembly colleagues. We get pressure from—it's quite interesting to talk on this too, because not only do we get approaches occasionally from our own members in the House of Assembly—we get approaches from the Labor Party members.

Hinton: What kind of approaches?

DeGaris: They would deny this, possibly, but it has happened in my time. A Labor Party member will come along and say: Now look, I can't oppose this because the Party machine has said I must vote for it, but I'd like you to do something about it in your House.

Hinton: Labor members have sought your help to defeat the legislation of their own Government?

DeGaris: Yes.

Hinton: Has that happened in this sitting of Parliament?

DeGaris: No. Not as yet. But perhaps I'm slightly wrong there. I have had approaches from Labor members that we should consider amendments to legislation that they could not get accepted in their Party machine.

Somehow in an Upper House you must structure it so that you can break this growing dominance of the Party machine. I don't care whether it's a Party machine that's Liberal and Country League or whether it's a Party machine of the Australian Labor Party or any other Party.

I believe that the Upper House must act in this way as some independent court of appeal where people can approach and put a viewpoint and know that the Party machine is not going to dictate how that amendment or that piece of legislation will go through the House.

Hinton: Mr Dunstan gave a dramatic warning on Friday that if there was any difficulty getting legislation through that he'd call another election. Do you think it is going to come to that?

DeGaris: That is up to Mr Dunstan to decide, and the Labor Party. As I said, we will continue our role of being as co-operative as possible to the Government. But if we reach the stage where we have a very strong view on certain legislation and the Government disagrees with our view, then it's Mr Dunstan's right under the Constitution to challenge the Council.

Hinton: Finally, I'd like to ask you if you question the principle of majority rule?

DeGaris: I'm questioning the right of a Party that has a majority to say that it's always right. There is such a thing as a majority dictatorship, which I think we must try and overcome by looking at various small questions in the Council where in a massive policy speech there are areas that haven't got majority support.

Another article which I came across and which is dated 30 June 1973 is entitled 'Last holdout on adult vote falls: Labor's 67 year fight ends'. It was written by the South Australian correspondent to the *Canberra Times* and states:

South Australia was the first Australian State to give voting rights to women (in 1896) and yet has been the last to hold out against giving a vote to every adult over 18 for its Upper House.

But at last, as a result of three days of politicking and drama in both Houses of State Parliament, full adult franchise has been achieved for the Legislative Council, 122 years after it was established. In all those years the Council has not once been controlled by any group except the conservative non-Labor Parties.

The report continues:

There can be no doubt whatever that the gerrymandered South Australian electoral system cost the Playford Government tens of thousands of votes among academics, professional men and women, and the moderately idealistic. People everywhere thought it did need major reform. Previously most of them had probably voted for Sir Thomas Playford as a genial, pragmatic man who got things done and was patently efficient in developing South Australia economically.

Gradually the blatant injustice of his electoral system lost Sir Thomas most of the goodwill of the middle classes and he and his elitist establishment supporters forfeited their special privileges and powers forever.

It further continues:

The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council Mr DeGaris, retorted, 'We are ready for a double dissolution. The Government's proposition in my opinion would make a dishonest horsedealer look like a saint by comparison.'In the best political tradition, compromise was achieved within 72 hours. In future the whole State will become one giant electorate for [the] Council ...

Apparently at that time the Hon. Mr DeGaris had no qualms about whether the Council was working effectively. Why and what has changed his mind so convincingly is irrelevant. What is relevant is the three points that the Hon. Mr DeGaris made in his speech, as follows:

1. If this Council does not consider reforms in its structure and procedures, it will become, I believe, a useless appendage in the Parliamentary system.

2. That reform should follow the lead given by the Senate in the establishment of Standing Committees covering all aspects of Government activity.

3. I come to this conclusion after careful consideration of what is happening here. The Council should operate without Executive representation so that its role can be enhanced and developed as a House of Review, as well as giving greater ability to require Ministerial responsibility to the Parliament.

The Leader of the Opposition tackled the subject in a different way in his speech and referred to the question of this Council's relevance on a cost-benefit analysis. He said:

I do not see any immediate prospect of the Legislative Council being abolished. Given that that is the political reality, it behoves us, if this is part of the Parliamentary process, to ensure that it works and acts in a way that provides some Parliamentary review of the Executive in the terms that I have just mentioned.

It would appear from listening to their speeches that there should be cause for alarm as to just what role the Legislative Council should play in Parliamentary Government in the future of South Australia. Having referred to what other speakers have said in relation to the Upper House in supporting their views, I will now give some of the reasons why I see the role of the Legislative Council as becoming irrelevant in the Parliamentary system, and say possibly what type of role it should be concentrating on.

I have now been a member of this Council for almost two years, time enough, I think, to have formed some impressions and to have reached some conclusions. I believe that this Council is nothing more nor less than a rubber stamp for Parliament. It is Government in duplicate, if one likes to put it that way. Everything that happens in the Lower House in relation to a Bill happens again here. In fact, the same amendments defeated in the Lower House are wheeled in and defeated in the Upper House, except perhaps for a minor dotting of i's and crossing of t's—to me that is Government in duplicate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's not true.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Nothing major happens. I am referring to an example.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What about random breath tests?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I will come to that. The only way in which this Council could act as a House of Review or perform a role in overseeing legislation, or whatever one wants to call it, would be for an opposing Party to be in power in this Council. It would work then and be a House of Review, as has happened in the past.

I refer to the recent Offenders Probation Act Amendment Bill that came before us from the Lower House. The Opposition, in researching the Bill, found that the Trades and Labor Council had not been fully apprised of it and had not, in fact, given the Bill its unqualified support. It was apparent that, for the Bill to work properly, it would have to have the full support of the trade union movement in South Australia, because of the sensitive nature of the Bill—its object was the introduction of voluntary labour. Debate in the Lower House failed to obtain a consensus opinion, and all Opposition amendments to achieve this were defeated. The Bill came to this Council and I was given the task of moving amendments to it and seeing the Bill through its various phases in this place. A discussion with the Minister in charge of the Bill resulted in my being advised that the Government would not support a delay of the Bill to enable discussions to occur with the Trades and Labor Council.

An approach by me to the Australian Democrats member in this Chamber (Hon. Lance Milne) resulted in his indi-

cating that he believed that the Bill would best operate if a consensus opinion of all Parties concerned was reflected in it and he indicated that he would support a delay of the Bill to enable discussions by the Government and the Trades and Labor Council to take place. I commend him for his action.

Accordingly, I moved some complex procedure that would have shelved the Bill for about three months. The Minister, when he discovered that the Australian Democrat's member would support such a delay, in a flurry announced that the Government would support a 24-hour delay while the Government discussed the matter with the Trades and Labor Council.

When the Bill came up again for debate 24 hours later, the Minister announced that the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda) and the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown) had met with officials of the Trades and Labor Council and, as a result of those talks, the Government proposed to move amendments to the Bill to reflect the consensus opinion derived from the talks that had taken place. These amendments resulted in the amendments we were seeking to move not being proceeded with, as the Government amendments said it all. I believe that the final Bill that went through was a better Bill for the amendments it contained. They were not political, but they clarified and added to the Bill, giving it at least every chance of becoming an effective and worthwhile Bill.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Have you not changed your argument there?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: No. What disturbs me is that the only reason why the amendments were considered was that the Australian Democrat member in this Council indicated that he would support a delay to the passage of the Bill. Apparently, the merits of the case being put forward were not recognised and would not have been recognised if the Government had had the numbers to push on with the Bill, as of course it did have in the Lower House.

It seems completely wrong to me that the Australian Labor Party, with over 40 per cent of the South Australian vote in this Council and the Liberals with much the same percentage of votes have the shots called and have to give recognition to the Australian Democrats who have only some 8 per cent of the vote. Surely what we were seeking with our amendments to the Offenders Probation Act Amendment Bill should have been given recognition without the Hon. Mr Milne putting the Government to the wall in this matter. I believe that is what happened.

It would appear that what I said earlier, that the Legislative Council can operate as a House of Review only if it has an opposing Party in power from that Party which controls the Lower House, is true. Possibly this is why the Hon. Mr DeGaris said the Upper House was so effective when the A.L.P. controlled the Lower House.

Again, I refer to the press report of the conversation between the Hon. Mr DeGaris and Mr Les Hinton, bearing in mind the comment of the Hon. Mr DeGaris that 'the majority is not always right', as follows:

Hinton: You have stressed that the role of the Council should be that of a court against political bias. But do you really think that a House with 16 Liberal and four Labor members can operate with out any political bias?

DeGaris: Yes, I do. And I think the figures if one looks at them over the years bears this out. You would expect, of course, if there was political bias—or strong political bias—for the Council to defeat a Government in the Assembly that wasn't of its political color.

This has never happened in the history of South Australia.

Hinton: You've said that no party machine operates within the Council and that each member has the right to make up his own mind. What legislation did the Council block during the last Liberal Government.

DeGaris: There weren't Bills that were not passed, but there were several Bills that were very heavily amended. Of course, the Government accepted the amendments.

Gift duty legislation was one, stamp duty legislation was another where there were considerable amendments. In the gift duty legislation there was a long conference between both Houses when a compromise was reached between the views of the two Houses.

Hinton: How many Bills did the Council reject during the last Labor Government?

DeGaris: Two hundred and forty-four Bills came into our House, six were defeated in the Council. Of the 244 considered by the Council, 228 were passed by both Houses, six were defeated by the Council, four were laid aside, and six were defeated or laid aside in the House of Assembly.

So even in the House of Assembly the record was about the same as ours.

It would appear that when both the Houses had Liberal Party control the necessity to reject any Bills did not arise. But with the A.L.P. in control in the Assembly and the Liberal Party in control in the Upper House it was necessary to reject or defeat six of those Bills in the Council and it would appear from what the Hon. Mr DeGaris says that six were also defeated in the Assembly, no doubt because they were so heavily amended that the Government regarded them as ineffective. Mr DeGaris also states that four Bills were laid aside. Altogether a total of 16 Bills were not proceeded with. With Liberals vetting Liberal legislation, no Bills were rejected, although some were heavily amended.

I am sure that the mirror image he so often speaks of and deplores was present then, healthy and alive, in the Legislative Council while the Liberals vetted Liberal legislation. The House of Review of which he speaks so strongly in support and which he wants so diligently to formulate now has operated as such only while opposing Parties have the numbers in the two Houses. Thus, I can understand why the Legislative Council came into being and why it was so jealously guarded.

During my research, I came across an article by Dean Jaensch entitled 'Upper Houses of the Australian States'. This very interesting article gives the structure of the system and explains why this Chamber came into being. Any honourable member can peruse it, but I would like to place in *Hansard* some parts of it so that anyone who reads *Hansard* can have access to it. The article, which was written in 1972, states in part:

The roles and structures of Upper Houses in the Australian States have become matters of debate in recent years. Arguments about the proper role of a Legislative Council were fully canvassed in New South Wales in the 1961 referendum proposing abolition. The South Australian Council is becoming more newsworthy. And Upper Houses in the other States have come under fire.

Labor Governments have been pressing even harder than usual their policy of making the Australian States a mirror of Queensland with a unicameral system. Conservative Governments have equally vehemently defended the Upper Houses against claims that they have become little more than houses of privilege.

The purpose of this article, then, is to examine some of these arguments for abolition or reform, the constitutional and political background of these arguments, and the role the Legislative Councils have played in State politics.

An axiom of mid-Victorian constitutional theory was the necessity for bicameralism, and this was widely accepted in the Australian colonies. The constitution makers planned for two Houses of Parliament, the lower to represent the people, the upper to consist of 'the Education, Wealth and more especially the Settled Interests of the country... that portion of the community naturally indisposed to rash and hasty legislation'.

The founders feared a 'pure and unchecked' democracy. The wide franchise granted in the Assemblies was to be balanced by Legislative Councils, controlled and staffed by those with a stake in the country. To accomplish this, the Councils in all the colonies were planned to be constitutionally powerful, politically conservative and beyond the control of the great unwashed.

It was prudent and necessary to safeguard the rights of property, and especially of rural property, against the possible incursions by those who had little. The diggers, the Chartists, the embryonic commercial and industrial workforce and the rural labourers were economically essential—but politically doubtful elements in the

new societies. And while democracy might have its head in the Lower Houses, it was to run the gauntlet of the settled men of property in the upper.

To accomplish the necessary check, to block radical legislation before it did any damage, New South Wales and Queensland opted for nominee Councils. Members seated by the Governor, it was assumed, would offer a solid defensive phalanx. South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria in the 1850s incorporated fully elective Councils, and Western Australia followed suit in the nineties. But these four colonies included two electoral means of control over the radical elements:

> A franchise restricted to the right sort of people, the propertied,
>
> An electoral system heavily weighted in favour of rural property.

These provisions dealt effectively with the voters, but a third defence was thought to be necessary—a bulwark against the Lower House itself, and this was achieved more by what was omitted from the constitution than by what was incorporated. The Councils were given co-equal constitutional powers with the Assemblies, with only one minor limitation—money bills were to originate in the Lower Houses. Only in Victoria was there any specific reference to subsequent powers; the Council was given the power to reject, but not to alter, money bills. None of the constitutions made any provision for settling disagreements and deadlocks. None set out any rules of dissolution.

Contrary to expectation, the elective Councils proved to be the more stable, more conservative and more powerful Upper Houses . . .

Bitter struggles between the Houses were not long in coming. Each colony debated loud and long the vexed questions of the exact status of the two Houses, and it became patently clear early in the piece that, by accident or design, there was no adequate provision for deadlocks. The Assemblies claimed ultimate power over legislation on the grounds that they were representative of the people, and the Councils denied this, claiming they were. In South Australia, the first Bill of the new Parliamentary era, an apparently innocuous piece of legislation, brought a deadlock and a constitutional crisis. The crisis occupied much of the first session, and provoked the Premier, Finniss, to thunder, 'I deny to the Upper House that they are virtually representatives of the people . . . they represent only a monied class . . . they are not directly responsible to the people'. . .

All the colonies moved into the twentieth century with Legislative Councils which had successfully defended their powers and privileges against attack . . .

Queensland retained its nominee Council virtually unchanged until the Labor Party abolished it in 1921. It is the only State which has ended the long and bitter quarrels between the Houses by getting rid of the cause. The existing unicameral system is well protected, as the Upper House can be revived only if a referendum approves . . . The Labor Party early this century, as in the other States, found the Council totally antagonistic, and swamping was not a satisfactory palliative. The Labor Government had passed abolition Bills through the Assembly in 1915 and 1916, which the Council promptly rejected, and they failed in their attempt to carry a referendum in 1917 when 60 per cent of the electorate voted 'No'. But the Government fell back to arguments based on an election mandate and ignored the referendum.

In 1920 the Governor refused a request to swamp to bring about abolition, but his departure allowed the Labor Speaker in the Assembly to become Lieutenant-Governor. A suicide squad of 14 Labor members were promptly marshalled and nominated, and an abolition Bill passed rapidly through both Houses. Opposition members were incensed but impotent.

It details what happened to the Upper Houses in Australia, and states:

In recent times, Labor has consistently accused the Councils of using their constitutional power for political purposes. And certainly any legislative lethargy in the Upper Houses has disappeared with the advent of Labor Governments.

It states further:

The grounds put forward by the conservative members of the Councils vary little from State to State, and have varied little over the past century. The following selection of quotations from the conservative majority in the S.A. Council is characteristic of all.

'I hold that the Upper House essentially represents the acquired and settled property—the independent leisure and superior education of the colony.' (1857)

'The advantage of a second Chamber was that it often stopped hasty and dangerous legislation.' (1879)

'The founders . . . acted wisely in providing safeguards against hasty and undemocratic legislation.' (1966)

'There is no political partisanship . . . My Party acts impartially in the interests of the people of South Australia.' (1966)

'The members of this Legislative Council will use their own well-considered judgment on matters before them, without influence from any Government.' (1967)

'If the powers of the Council are decreased, it will no longer have the power to defend itself.' (1970)

Such conservative, paternalistic and elitist views have been in the majority in all four elective Councils, and they have been transposed into practice.

Have the Councils been obstructive? The difficulty here is to distinguish between review functions and partisan obstruction. They have diligently corrected drafting mistakes, closed legal loopholes and the like, and this activity does not constitute obstruction. But their activities have gone well beyond the area of a legislative second look into the area of partisan and essentially conservative gutting of Bills. Labor Governments have suffered most, and the level of Upper House activity in the areas of amendments, requests, six-month clauses and outright vetoes has risen with the advent of Labor majorities in the Lower Houses.

Two States with L.C.P.-dominated Upper Houses have recently undergone changes in Government and a comparison of Council activity before and after is testimony to the change in tempo. This is illustrated in the following table:

	Total Bills introduced into Council	Bills received from Assembly	Amended by Council	Conferences required	Defeated or forced to lapse
South Australia					
1969—LCL Government	96	56	19	2	—
1970-1971—ALP Government	116	106	35	10	6
Western Australia					
1970—LCP Government	87	66	9	—	1
1971—ALP Government (2 sessions)	83	69	16	1	13

The publication further states:

Overall, it seems to me that what we have at present is anachronistic, serving a purpose which has passed into history. What we need is deliberation, legislative review, an ombudsman house. What we have is partisan conflict in both Houses and domination by one Party in the upper.

That was said 10 years ago and I see nothing to change my view that what was said then is still true today. I believe that the Legislative Council of South Australia, in its proper role, is necessary in this day and age. Given that the Upper House would be difficult to abolish, surely it is up to us to justify its existence and make it an effective arm of government. I have served on three Select Committees since my election to Parliament. Two of them related to council boundaries and the other to the random breath tests legislation. I believe that the Select Committees on council boundaries served a very useful purpose, as I am sure that there was no way that the councils involved could have resolved the issues of the boundaries, as they were all too involved in those issues and could not have been seen by the persons they represented to have a different viewpoint that would have allowed one council to have differing boundaries at the expense of another council.

The Select Committee or some other outside body, I believe, was the only way that the boundary issues could be resolved. I also believe that the legislation brought before Parliament as a result of the findings of the Select Committee on random breath tests was better legislation than the type of legislation previously introduced by the Government as one of its election promises.

Irrespective of whether one favours the legislation or not, I believe that it is the best legislation of its type in Australia

and shows that, given the opportunity, the Legislative Council could have a role to play as an arm of government. But, for us to condone the way that this Council operates in its present role is nothing short of disgraceful. I can see no reason why a reform could not take place that at least gives this Council some useful and gainful role to play in the governing of South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you believe in the changes made in the Senate?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I have not studied them adequately to be able to give the honourable member an honest opinion. I would be interested to study them, as any change would be a change for the better. It would appear that the Executive Government will eventually be the only Parliament that we will see. It is easy and convenient for the Party in power, but it diminishes Parliament and takes away the representative role of Parliamentarians as the watchdog of people's rights and makes the much vaunted role of this Council as a House of Review a hollow mockery. As this Council presently operates I would have no qualms in seeking a mandate from the people for its abolition. We are the members of the Legislative Council and we should do all in our power to make it an effective and responsible arm of government if it is to be maintained.

Another possible role for the Council would be a watchdog role on other States' legislation. It seems incredible in this day and age that there can be such a variance in legislation from State to State and that States with accepted legislation in certain areas can suffer a disadvantage because other States have not come to grips with issues of the same magnitude. An example that springs readily to mind is the can legislation that operates in South Australia. Other States have not seen fit to introduce such legislation, yet there can be no doubt whatsoever that the legislation is effective and warranted. However, because of pressure of vested interests in other States, such legislation does not exist there. During a recent holiday in the Northern Territory I was appalled by the number of cans evident everywhere. If ever a place needed can legislation it would be the Northern Territory. Other States I have visited, while not as bad as the Northern Territory, would certainly benefit from such legislation.

We now have a situation in relation to PET bottles and, because we have this legislation, we may have a job loss of some 50 people in the industry, if we are to believe one of the major firms. Surely such legislation should be uniform throughout Australia. Random breath testing is another example; some States have it and some do not. With drink driving the blood alcohol limit is .05 in some States and .08 in others. Traffic regulations and State speed limits vary, with numerous minor differences in the Road Traffic Acts from State to State. Surely there could be a role for Upper Houses in the various States to try to get more uniform legislation so that unfair advantages or disadvantages in industry or for the individual are abolished. The Attorneys-General meetings are coming to grips with these problems.

I refer to today's *Advertiser*, which contains an article headed 'States to act on test tube children'. In the *Australian* of 2 August another article was headed 'Law chiefs consider unified courts system'. Surely State Governments could get their act together better than they are presently. It appears that the Attorneys-General recognise the need for legislation that is uniform throughout Australia in matters that are not as political as are other matters. It seems a bit like the early days when every State decided to run a different railway system.

Australia suffered from this short-sightedness and still does. State Governments would still have the right to decide where their priorities lay in Budgets and money spending. The differences between philosophies of different Governments surely have nothing to do with the introduction of more uniform legislation in a non-political situation. The Murray River system is a typical example of the failure of States to see an overall view of this situation for the benefit of Australia and not just individual States.

It frustrates me as a member of Parliament that one cannot be more effective in assisting people who are in need. I refer now to the unfortunate people who are trying to buy their own homes and have to cope with the spiralling interest rates. I can understand how interest rates must rise in all sectors to keep pace with the demand for money and inflation. If the high interest rates were not available in the housing sector, of course money would dry up in the building sector. However, I cannot understand why, if one pays $2 000 or $3 000 interest per year, one must pay tax on that amount. Surely some relief must be forthcoming for those people trying to make ends meet and buying their own home, as they now have the added burden of having to take out health insurance even though they are not really in a position to afford it.

I have just finished reading the report by the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Ted Chapman, on his visit to the Middle East/North African region. I have heard and know of the interest of the Hon. Brian Chatterton, the shadow spokesman on agricultural matters in this area. What amazes me (and I guess it should not) is the fact that the two people who should be vitally involved in the matters of overseas projects and market development for agriculture are on opposing sides of the political spectrum. From what I can gather, when the Hon. Ted Chapman came into Government there was a flurry and any project which the previous Labor Minister of Agriculture had been involved in was curtailed and emasculated or shelved while it was assessed. Surely it would have been better if the Hon. Ted Chapman, as shadow spokesman, had been fully informed and involved in long-range planning talks and projects, and it would have been in the best interests of the business and farming community in South Australia. As the reverse applies, surely the Hon. Brian Chatterton should be involved so that if there is a change of Government in South Australia at least the long-term plans and projects are protected. I realise that there are fundamental differences in the basic philosophies of both major Parties, but this should not stop proper and balanced consensus planning of projects to proceed on a long-term basis for the sectors of South Australian business and industry concerned in these projects.

Would it not be a radical departure if we could see in certain non-philosophical areas Ministers and Shadow Ministers coming up with consensus opinions for the benefit of all concerned? It would be Utopia.

We often hear Parliaments condemning the industrial relations of unions and employers, and using the example of the 'them and us' philosophy. Even the newspapers deplore the 'them and us' attitude of unions and employers, and advise that all should work together and resolve their issues for the common good.

However, where else could one find a bigger 'them and us' attitude than in the Parliaments of Australia? It is a case of 'Do as I say', not 'Do as I do' to outside bodies given advice by the Parliaments. How can we give examples of leadership to the community when we are the worst offenders in the community on all counts: unity, wage restraint, and so on?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Are you talking about politicians?

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Yes. We condone what we see as excesses in the community, yet we happily apply a different standard to ourselves. It seems to me that we

reflect and magnify all the things that we so roundly condemn in the community.

I believe that our credibility is at an all-time low. We do not have the respect of the community at large, and I do not believe that we have earnt it. We promise jobs, better education, better housing and development, better services, and better security. We seem to promise anything and everything.

Do we deliver? Not on your life! People have come to accept as the norm broken promises of politicians. Irrespective of the Party to which one belongs, this reflects on us all. What can be done about it? I believe that we should be more accountable to the people for our promises. A change of Parties at the ballot-box is not enough.

I believe that this Council could have an important role to play in the credibility of government. It could be a watchdog for more uniform legislation. It could be run on a committee system to see that value for the Government dollar spent was received. We should have more flexibility and power to ensure that the best legislation possible comes out of this Council.

I believe that, as a matter of urgency, a review of the role of this Council should occur and that such a review, if necessary, could recommend changes to the Constitution so that value for money at least comes from this Council and this arm of government. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 5 August at 2.15 p.m.