LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 6 August 1981

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EDWARD CHARLES SPLATT

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There has been considerable public interest recently in a request by Mr Stewart Cockburn, in particular, to reopen the case of one Edward Charles Splatt. Mr Cockburn, a journalist with the Adelaide *Advertiser*, in a four-part series on 2, 4 and 5 May, in that newspaper asserted that as a result of his own inquiries, and new material, he believed that this case should be reopened.

Edward Charles Splatt was convicted in the Supreme Court of South Australia on 24 November 1978 of having murdered an elderly Cheltenham woman on 3 December 1977. The trial was heard before Justice Mitchell and a jury of seven men and five women and occupied 21 sitting days between 24 October and 24 November 1978. Splatt was found guilty by a unanimous verdict of the jury after a six-hour deliberation. He received the mandatory life sentence.

Splatt appealed against this decision to the Court of Criminal Appeal which consisted of three Supreme Court judges: the Chief Justice (Mr Justice King), Mr Justice Zelling and Mr Justice Sangster. The court heard the appeal on 30 and 31 January and 1 and 2 February 1979. The appeal was subsequently dismissed on 28 February 1979. Leave to appeal to the High Court of Australia was sought by Splatt. The application was heard in Adelaide on 11 and 12 September 1979 before Justices Stephen, Mason, Murphy, Aickin and Wilson, and rejected on 12 September 1979. In short—a jury, three courts, and nine judges have all unanimously found this man guilty of a most abhorrent crime and there is no hint at all of any suggestion of a miscarriage of justice. Nevertheless, Mr Cockburn, 18 months after the final appeal was dismissed, questioned the veracity of this decision and in his last article on 5 May 1981 said:

> After research extending over the past 18 months I have concluded that it is only remotely possible that Splatt personally killed Mrs Simper.

Mr Cockburn has alleged that the subject matter of his article contained 'new information, new evidence and new arguments stated in non-legal terms' and he called for an urgent review of the case. As a result of the debate which these articles raised about Splatt's guilt, and the associated attack on the ability of the judicial system to deal with complicated criminal matters, I decided to clear the air.

On 4 May 1981 I ordered a Crown Law investigation into all the matters raised by Mr Cockburn. Subsequently, I asked a leading Adelaide barrister, Mr Derek Bollen, Q.C., to independently review the case—11 volumes of transcript from the trial, including the addresses of the prosecution and defence lawyers, the summing up of the judge, the proceedings of the Court of Criminal Appeal and of the High Court, and the Crown Law advice.

Both of these reports conclude that there is no new evidence or any basis at all for justifying any further action in this case. I believe that Mr Bollen's report clarifies the matter rather well when he says in part:

> Mr Cockburn has produced nothing. He has a sincere conviction in the innocence of Splatt. But an examination of his articles, of his reasons and of his comments shows that there is nothing to justify any further inquiry.

He goes on to say:

> Nothing has emerged to throw any doubt on the strength and effect of the scientific evidence. In my opinion the view of the Court of Criminal Appeal that the case was 'quite overwhelming' stands unshaken. There is no room for any disquiet about the conviction. I think there is no basis for any further judicial inquiry or for a Royal Commission.

After having studied both of these reports, I am satisfied that, on the material which is available, justice has in fact been done. I have decided that there are no grounds to institute any further inquiry into this case.

Because of the seriousness of the matters which were raised by Mr Cockburn and because of the intense public and media interest in the affair, I have taken the unusual step of releasing both reports publicly. I have also lodged a copy of each report in the Parliamentary Library for use by honourable members. These two reports adequately answer all of the points raised by Mr Cockburn.

I now turn to a practice, commenced in this case and copied in another. It is the practice of endeavouring to discuss a case with jurors after a trial has been completed with a view to publicising individual and corporate views. In our system of law the principle of ensuring privacy for the deliberations of a jury is well established, tried and proven. As Lord Denning once observed:

> If this [that is, probing jurors after the event] were to be permitted, where is it to stop? After a jury have solemnly found a man guilty and he has been sentenced, are they to be at liberty next day to return and say they meant to find him not guilty? It cannot be.

Mr President, there are very real dangers in subjecting jurors to publicity after a trial and having their deliberations cross-examined by the media or anyone else. Our jury system, where 12 ordinary people come together to assess the evidence, the argument and the witnesses (with the knowledge that they can be honest and forthright in the jury room), is under threat if the media and others can gain access to them at a later date, put them under close public scrutiny, and invade the privacy and confidentiality of the jury room. I agree completely with Justice Wells's recent comments to a group of jurors in which he also strongly criticised this practice. He said in part:

> I say to you that if this sort of thing continues then the very institution of the jury system is in peril, simply because you could never expect, you could never reasonably expect, jurors to express themselves in that way in the jury room in confidence because it would not be in confidence.

It is my understanding that the United Kingdom Parliament is legislating to make illegal any attempts to probe the views of jurors. I have instructed officers of my department to investigate that possibility for South Australia in light of the recent abuses.

With regard to Mr Splatt, after an exhaustive examination of the evidence and proceedings by three courts and now a Crown Law report and an independent barrister's report, I have concluded that on all the evidence this man is guilty. In the light of Crown Law and Bollen reports, there is no material giving any ground at all which would require any further investigation.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement on hospital accreditation, and I have no doubt that the Attorney-General will be prepared to extend Question Time if that is necessary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On Tuesday 4 August 1981 the Hon. R. J. Ritson, M.L.C., asked a question which raised issues concerning quality assurance for patients and delineation of clinical privilege for doctors and dentists. The issues which Dr Ritson raised are of such critical importance, not only in respect of the incident to which he referred, but to the nature and quality of services provided by health professionals to the public, that the Minister of Health has asked me to provide not only specific answers to Dr Ritson's questions, but also to advise the House of action she proposes to take as a result of the matter being raised.

Dr Ritson asked whether a patient who had been admitted to a dental bed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Friday 31 July was under the primary care of a suitably qualified medical practitioner; whether the Royal Adelaide Hospital has a system of delineation of privileges as between medically qualified staff within the hospital; and 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 specific answers to Dr Ritson's questions are as follows:

1. A patient was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 31 July with face and head injuries. It has been alleged that the patient had leaking cerebro-spinal fluid. This has not been proven. The patient was admitted to a dental bed and was under the care of a dentist. However, consultations had been provided by a general surgeon, an E.N.T. surgeon, a neurosurgeon and an ophthalmologist over the period between his admission and prior to the issue being raised in Parliament. Owing to a professional demarcation dispute between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons over the care of this patient, the patient was transferred to another hospital on the morning of Wednesday 5 August. This was done at the direction of the oral surgeon in charge of the case.

2. Although there is no Delineation of Privileges Committee as such at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the mechanism for privileges is via Appointments Advisory Committees of Dentistry and Medicine. This is common practice in Australian teaching hospitals.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leave was granted for a Ministerial statement. If honourable members do not want to hear it, they can withdraw that leave.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: These committees have representatives of the professional colleges, the University of Adelaide and the administration of the hospital. Both committees have independent chairmen who do not hold staff positions. These committees were reconstituted not long after assuming office, following my colleague's recognition of the inadequacy of existing appointments procedures. The reconstitution of the committees has ensured that greater objectivity and independence is exercised in the matter of medical appointments to the hospital and has allowed the board to exercise more control over the selection of medical staff. In a letter dated 24 April 1980 to the Chairmen of the Boards of Royal Adelaide and The Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, my colleague said:

> The Board of Management has my full support in establishing an Advisory Committee in conjunction with the University of Adelaide; in appointing an independent chairman of that committee; and in establishing terms of reference for the committee. I feel sure that your board will share my view that the board itself should take steps to see that the committee's method of operation is designed to ensure a rigorous assessment of appointments to such categories of staff as may be determined by the board as coming within the committee's overview. Appropriate criteria should be agreed upon by the board so that it is satisfied that the merits of all applicants are subject to closest scrutiny.

3. The answer to Dr Ritson's third question about powers of enforcement of quality assurance for hospital and private patients, both medical and dental, is that all patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, regardless of insurance status, are under the same rules of professional conduct for treatment. The assurance of quality stems from three principal factors. First, the quality of staff appointed is critical to this process, and my colleague believes the mechanism by which all applicants are rigorously scrutinised on the basis of merit is designed to achieve the best possible outcome.

The second factor is the system of peer review which has been established and is being actively pursued at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other teaching hospitals. Peer review encompasses a wide range of activities including regular clinical case reviews, tissue audits and death audits. The Royal Adelaide Hospital, in addition, has introduced a system of criteria audit and is one of the first in Australia to introduce this new initiative of systematic examinations of outcomes of patient care. In the last financial year, my colleague approved funds for the development of these initiatives in peer review, not only in the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but all other major hospitals in South Australia.

The third factor is adequate administrative procedures. During the last six months, all the manuals of practice at the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been under review. This process is, in effect, an on-going one and manuals are continuously being up-dated and supplemented by administrative instructions. This process was followed in the case of delineation of privilege between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons when it became clear in March of this year that there were difficulties with clinical privileges between the two groups which share an area of overlap as well as having their own areas of exclusive competence.

The question of clinical privilege between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons is currently under consideration and the Royal Adelaide Hospital administration will be consulting with the Medical Committee of the Board of the Hospital, with the Royal Colleges and with relevant specialists, to determine a system of delineation of privileges in the best interests of patients. All three factors—staff appointments, peer review and administrative procedures—are taken into account in the process known as hospital accreditation, to which Dr Ritson referred in the statement which prefaced his question. The Government has specifically supported and funded the hospital accreditation programme as it applies to Government hospitals. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was accredited in 1980, Modbury Hospital has recently gained accreditation and the Royal Adelaide Hospital intends to seek accreditation in 1982.

My colleague has given instructions to the Health Commission that the goals inherent in hospital accreditation will be vigorously pursued in all hospitals throughout South Australia to ensure that quality assurance programmes and delineation of privilege operate effectively in all branches of medicine throughout the health and hospital services of the State.

QUESTIONS

SPLATT CASE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Crown Law investigation ordered into the Splatt case was carried out by the prosecutor who handled the case in the first instance?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not prepared to disclose the name of the officer who conducted the initial inquiry. I have clearly indicated that it is a report prepared by Crown Law officers.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I wish to ask a supplementary question. The *Advertiser* journalist, Mr Stewart Cockburn, alleges this morning that the report was carried out by Crown Law officer Bishop. Is that correct? Secondly, was Mr Bishop the prosecutor who handled the case in the Supreme Court?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is that I am not prepared either to confirm or deny—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Come on!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Oh, shut up!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I rise on a point of order. That is certainly unparliamentary conduct.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Quite unseemly.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will withdraw the remark. It is unfortunate that honourable members opposite are not prepared to listen to the answers for which they ask.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am prepared to listen to them if the answers are given. I asked the Attorney-General, first, whether Mr Bishop was the person who prepared the report, and, secondly, whether he was the Crown prosecutor involved in the case. Certainly, the second question can be answered, even if the Attorney-General is not prepared to answer the first question.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is that I am prepared neither to confirm nor to deny that Mr Bishop was one of the persons who prepared the report. The answer to the Leader's second question is that Mr Bishop of the Crown Law Office was the prosecutor at the trial.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: First, was the Attorney-General aware that the Legal Services Commission had appointed Mr F. B. Moran, Q.C., to inquire into the case and the allegations of Mr Stewart Cockburn and, secondly, if the Attorney-General was so aware, why did he decide that Mr Splatt was guilty without the benefit of Mr Moran's opinion?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I was not aware that Mr Moran was involved in this matter in any way until several weeks ago, when I received a request from his office for some forensic materials to be made available. But, even if I had been aware at an earlier stage that Mr Moran was involved, it would not have altered the course of the matter as far as I was concerned.

It needs to be recognised that the Legal Services Commission, by Statute, is to be independent of Government influence. It also needs to be recognised that the commission takes its own decisions on whether or not it will grant legal aid to any citizen. The commission has obviously exercised its own discretion in this case, and it is quite proper that it should exercise its discretion in that way. If Mr Moran wants to report in one way or another, that is a matter entirely for him in his professional capacity of advising Mr Splatt through the auspices of the Legal Services Commission.

One must recognise that there is much interest in this matter. It is now three months since Mr Cockburn raised the issue. There have been persistent requests for information as to when a decision would be available, and I have acceded to those requests. One can hardly be criticised for releasing two comprehensive reports on this matter and for relying upon them, in the light of that background.

The fact is that, notwithstanding the Leader's earlier questions, which tended to try to throw some discredit upon the Crown Law officer's report, there is a completely independent report by Mr Derek Bollen, Q.C. As I indicated in my Ministerial statement, Mr Bollen had all the material available to him in the preparation of that report. So, I am quite satisfied that the matter has been properly examined and that the decision that both reports reach is a proper one.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General another question regarding this matter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is now clear that the Attorney-General is not prepared to reveal to the Council whether the Crown Law opinion that was prepared was, in fact, prepared by Mr Bishop, the man who prosecuted the case in the court in the first instance. That, of course, is most unsatisfactory because, for the public to make a judgment on this matter, this information should surely be made available to the Parliament and the public.

I appreciate that the Attorney-General has made these two reports public and I do not criticise him for that. However, as well as making the reports public he has come to the following conclusion, as stated in his Ministerial statement:

> With regard to Mr Splatt, after an exhaustive examination of the evidence and proceedings by three courts and now a Crown Law report and an independent barrister's report, I have concluded that on all the evidence this man is guilty.

The Attorney-General has come to that conclusion after the consideration of only these two reports. Certainly, I have no objection to his making them public. However, in answers to questions, the Attorney-General has now admitted that he knew some weeks ago that the Legal Services Commission had asked Mr F. B. Moran, Q.C., a well-known criminal barrister in this State, to carry out further investigations into the Splatt case, the allegations of Mr Cockburn and particularly the allegations relating to the forensic evidence in this matter. Despite the fact that the Attorney-General knew that the report had been ordered, he has come to this conclusion. I believe that it is unacceptable for the Attorney-General to have come to that conclusion without the benefit of Mr Moran's report, knowing as he did and as he has admitted to the Council that that report was being prepared. In view of the fact that the Attorney-General knew that Mr Moran's report was being prepared at the instigation of the Legal Services Commission, why did he not await receipt of that report before coming to the final conclusion that there was nothing in Mr Cockburn's allegations?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I wish to comment on some points. First, in relation to the name of a person who has participated in the preparation of this report, the Leader of the Opposition knows that it is not proper to identify individual public servants as preparing particular reports. They are servants of the Crown. To identify any one officer places that officer at a distinct disadvantage because he or she will have public attention drawn to him or her in the discharge of that professional duty in service to the Crown. So I am not prepared to reveal the name of the person or persons who prepared the report. It is sufficient that it has been prepared by Crown Law officers, and I am prepared to accept it on that basis. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to cast doubts on its credibility, be it on his own head.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I'm not saying that.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: You are. The Leader is seeking to cast doubts on the credibility of the report. If he wants to do that, be it on his own head. The report will stand close scrutiny, and I suggest that the Leader go to the Parliamentary Library, look at the report and endeavour to make an assessment on it based on what is in it and not on

who he presumes wrote the report. If he seeks to take the latter course, it is an improper assessment of the value of this report.

The Leader has said that he thinks it is wrong of me to have come to a conclusion based on only these two reports. How many reports do we have to get before the Leader is satisfied? We have two reports, each one independent of the other, and one is completely independent of government. Both reports conclude that there is nothing new in this matter at all and that there is no reason at all to reopen the case.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: And three courts were involved.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Yes, three courts, nine judges and 12 jurymen.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You knew Mr Moran's report was coming.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have said that I knew several weeks ago that Mr Moran was retained for the purpose of preparing a report. I did not speak to Mr Moran because, if I had, the Opposition would have been the first to criticise me for trying to bring undue influence on someone such as Mr Moran if his decision had been the same as the decision in these two reports. I very carefully desisted from any contact with Mr Moran's office at all. I have no control over the Legal Services Commission in respect of this matter. I have no control over Mr Moran and I do not want to have such control. If Mr Moran independently reaches the conclusion that there is no new material or evidence that would cause the matter to be reopened, it will justify my view that it was best that he should remain totally indepedent, so that there could be no suggestion by the Opposition or anyone else that I might have attempted to exercise any influence over him at all.

HOSPITAL COMPUTERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on hospital computers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Members will already be aware of part of the fiasco which has gone on regarding the acquisition of an interim computer system for Adelaide's teaching hospitals. If they are not, they can refresh their memories by referring to a copy of today's *News*. However, there is much more. Sometime around late June Dr Sue Britton, Medical Superintendent at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and Mr Ray Blight, Director of Management Services in the Health Commission, were sent to the United States. They inspected several multi-million dollar hospital computers, including I.B.M. and Burroughs installations. In the meantime, the Minister of Health stated in a Ministerial statement and press conference on 22 July that I.B.M. and Burroughs had been asked to re-tender privately. The offers closed on 3 August. The situation at that stage was confused, to put it mildly. However, the recent release within the commission of a consultant report from Australian Computer Sciences has moved it from confusion to chaos. The two-volume report is highly critical of the procedures followed over the past 12 months in seeking an interim A.T.S. system. On page 17 the report states:

> The tender process for an interim A.T.S. system followed an evaluation process suitable only to an interim system, yet produced solutions that were very non-interim in their nature.

The report recommends that an interim system be installed at the R.A.H. which 'emphasises manual procedures and fits the definition of a truly interim system'.

It is quite obvious from the report that the consultant believes that mini-computers, rather than main frame monsters, can adequately handle the A.T.S. and related systems and can do it for a small fraction of the cost. The release of the consultant's report from Australian Computer Sciences has also introduced an entirely new dimension into the health computer fiasco. A.C.S. estimate the cost of the Health Commission's proposals for full computerisation at a massive $20 000 000; so, we are no longer talking of expenditure of $200 000; we are talking about $20 000 000—a massive amount of money.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about the fiasco—

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It will make the original Flinders fiasco look like kindergarten before it is over. You should listen; you might learn something.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The report states:

> No attempt has been made to justify systems designated in the plan with a formal cost-benefit analysis. The justification is taken as given, based on a policy committee direction to proceed with the nominated systems.

My questions are as follows: Who are the members of the Health Commission's policy committee? What were the extraordinary directions given by the policy committee to the consultant at Australian Computer Sciences?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PETITIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Local Government on the matter of severance petitions and amalgamation petitions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In reply to the question I directed to the Minister seeking information on severance petitions and amalgamation petitions within local government, the Minister said:

> 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.

As I understand the position, one petition for severance from the Munno Para council was lodged three or four years ago. This petition was rejected on technical grounds. The commissioners have already taken evidence on a second petition and the petition has been rejected, I understand, on the grounds that it was invalid. A third petition was lodged 18 months ago.

Can the Minister inform the Council as to the reasons for the delay in making a decision on this petition? Is it necessary for the commission to make any further inquiries into this petition? If so, can the Minister say why and give any indication of when that inquiry will be completed?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think it would be proper for me to get the exact information concerning the principal petition, if I could use that expression, involved in the situation at Munno Para. At the moment there are four petitions but the one to which I made special reference was the one dealing with the possible secession of an area near Virginia from Munno Para council, and in that petition the petitioners sought to become part of the District Council of Mallala. That must have been in train now for approximately 12 months.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Eighteen months, I think.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think it was closer to 12 months. Anyway, as I recall, it was some time early last year when I first received that petition. There had been an earlier one

in regard to that matter but that was a considerable time before that. Regarding the position in regard to this one dealing with Virginia, the one I commented on in regard to the delay in coming to finality, in the ordinary course of the commission's investigation, a considerable time has been involved. The most recent delay has been occasioned by the fact that the Commissioner, His Honour Judge Ward, has been in ill health, I understand, and one can appreciate in a situation like that that the commission must defer its consideration until he can take up his work again.

I understand, too, that at one stage the commission discussed the matter with the District Council of Mallala because it wanted to seek that council's views as to whether, in fact, it wanted further territory joined to it, and it naturally wanted to apprise the District Council of Mallala, as was its duty, as to the full responsibilities of the council for the new area if secession and consequent amalgamation with Mallala took place.

Then, I understand, the District Council of Mallala indicated that it had had second thoughts on opinions it had expressed, and I believe that this caused the Advisory Commission to go back to Mallala again. There have been a series of reasons for the delay but I will get the story in more detail for the member.

Regarding the other three petitions dealing with the areas to the north, south and east of the District Council of Munno Para, it is true that either one or more of those petitions have been found to be invalid and we have had to advise the petitioners accordingly in case they wish to re-petition in proper form, but I will get the full story.

HOSPITAL COMPUTERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, concerning hospital computers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is now clear that the South Australian Health Commission has moved from what the Minister recently described as 'the cautious approach of the present Government'. The A.C.S. consultant report to which I referred earlier states, at page 12:

> The policy committee has stated that their goal is to make progress as fast as possible in all the major systems identified rather than set priorities.

The report is highly critical of data processing people in the South Australian health area. It states:

> The actual track record of achievement in the major systems areas is very poor. Such a result is invariably a management problem.

The report details a long list of deficiencies in the Health Commission's management system and it concludes:

> Clearly any attempt at achieving the desired goal in the observed environment is very risky.

The desired goal, of course, is $20 000 000 worth of computer equipment. The consultant makes clear that an expenditure of this size is consistent with the commission's computer strategy, yet as recently as 22 July, just two weeks ago and well after the report was available, the Minister was still talking of an expenditure of $200 000. Clearly, the Minister and the Health Commission have embarked on a policy of massive computerisation by stealth.

My questions are: is the Minister aware that patient care in public hospitals has already been seriously affected by massive cuts in hospital budgets? Does she consider it offensive and immoral to consider spending $20 000 000 on computers in these circumstances? Is she aware that the consultant considers that the computer services unit completely lacks the expertise to do it? And will she give a firm undertaking that she will instruct the Health Commission to abandon this massive waste of $20 000 000 immediately?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Attorney-General whether he can tell the Council of the superannuation arrangements for employees in the major statutory authorities of ETSA, T.A.B., S.G.I.C. and the Health Commission. How is the superannuation funded, what contributions do the employees make, do the chief executive officers of each organisation mentioned have any special consideration as far as superannuation is concerned, and is superannutaion payable to any chief executive officer in those organisations to be paid in a lump sum rather than an annual payment?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the appropriate Ministers and bring back a reply.

SPLATT CASE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the matter of the Splatt case.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Attorney-General has sought to indicate to the Council that the reason why he is not prepared to say who prepared the Crown Law report on the Splatt case is that he does not think it proper for public servants to be publicly identified with reports of that kind. That, of course, is purely a matter of convenience for the Government, because it is quite clear that on many occasions—

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. The Leader's remark is out of order. It is not part of the explanation, but is in fact a matter of opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I believe that the Hon. Mr Sumner is expressing an opinion.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, I am not expressing an opinion—I am expressing a fact. Many reports prepared for the Government have the names of public servants attached to them. That is a fact. The Gaylor Report into deregulation is a fact. The Hon. Mr Burdett recently had a report prepared on shopping centre leases, and public servants names were attached to that report. Therefore, the argument put forward by the Attorney-General that it is not proper for public servants' names to be identified with reports is quite incorrect. There may be circumstances when it is not proper, but to take it as a general rule is quite wrong and quite contrary to the facts.

In this case, the allegation has been made that the person in the Crown Law Department who prepared the report is the same person who conducted the prosecution. Doubt has been thrown on the report because of that allegation. That is also a fact. I have no complaint about Crown Law officers or Mr Bishop, if he was the person, but surely if the allegation being made is factual (that the person is one and the same) then that is a matter that should be made public in these circumstances so that Parliament and the public can judge the report in that light. Indeed, if the Attorney-General does not want to identify the person specifically, he could clear the matter up by simply denying that it was Mr Bishop, if in fact it was Mr Bishop who conducted the original prosecution.

Secondly, the Attorney-General has said that he did not wait for Mr Moran's report and he did not want to contact

Mr Moran because then the Opposition would accuse the Government of trying to influence Mr Moran's report. That is nonsense. Obviously, the Attorney-General could have ascertained from the Legal Services Commission when that report was expected without any direct contact with Mr Moran. The Attorney-General knew several weeks ago that a report was to be forthcoming, but he made his decision without the benefit of that report. In the circumstances I think the least that he could have done, knowing that the report was coming, was to have waited for Mr Moran's report through the Legal Services Commission before coming to his final decision. Will the Attorney-General deny that Mr Bishop is the officer who prepared the report?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am surprised that in his statement the Leader of the Opposition again sought to raise the Moran Report. I have given a very clear and, I think, proper reason why I felt that it was not appropriate to make any contact at all in relation to the preparation of the Moran Report. In any event, people cannot have it both ways. They cannot want to know what is in the Government's report and on the other hand expect the Government to wait until the so-called Moran Report is made available to Mr Splatt. It may be that that report will never reach the hands of the Government, because it is not within the Government's control. For that reason, there is no reason at all why the Government should not take the opportunity of releasing the reports which it has had for some time and which closely examine the matters raised by Mr Cockburn.

In relation to the Crown Law officer, the Leader of the Opposition can speculate as much as he likes about who prepared the report. If he wants to believe that a certain officer prepared it, let him make his judgment on the report in that light; if members of the public want to judge it because of the person who may have prepared it, then let them do that. I have been saying that the report will stand on its merits. If the report is looked at objectively it will stand close scrutiny.

In any event, the Opposition is not taking any notice at all of the independent report prepared by Mr Bollen. I wonder why members of the Opposition are not taking any notice of that report: maybe because it is independent; maybe because it has been released; maybe because it does not suit the Opposition to come to terms with the fact that there is an independent report. The reports speak for themselves. The independent report by Mr Bollen is clear. It reaches a conclusion which I am prepared to adopt and have adopted: that there is no reason at all why this matter ought to be reopened.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Does the Attorney-General consider it proper that reports about Mr Bishop in the leading newspaper in Adelaide, the *Advertiser*, were incorrect? Secondly, does the Attorney-General consider that the newspaper was improper in using the name of any Crown Law officer who produces a report?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have no control over the *Advertiser* or any other branch of the media. What the media choose to report is a matter for them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask a further supplementary question. Is the Attorney-General prepared to be honest in his consideration of this matter?

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: He's always honest.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Foster will ask his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Attorney-General prepared to give an honest answer about whether or not the person named by an Adelaide newspaper is in fact a servant of the Crown?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am always prepared to give honest answers.

PRAWN FISHERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question about the Investigator Strait prawn fishery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yesterday, in another place the Minister of Fisheries answered a question from Mr Blacker, the member for Flinders, about the Investigator Strait prawn fishery. The answers that he gave are causing very grave concern indeed to the fishing industry. I seek clarification on two points the Minister made in his answer. First, he said that a decision would be made on the future of the Investigator Strait prawn fishery this week. I point out that Cabinet has established a subcommittee to look into this whole subject.

While the Minister of Agriculture has been able to put the views of some of his constituents to that Cabinet subcommittee for nearly two hours, the official representatives of the fishing industry in this State (that is, the President and Secretary of the A.F.I.C.) have only had a very inadequate 25 minutes before that Cabinet subcommittee. If the Minister is to make a decision on this matter by the end of the week, it is essential that he should see A.F.I.C. executive members before a decision is made to enable the subcommittee to get a fair view of this very complex subject. Will the Minister give an assurance that the Cabinet subcommittee will see a deputation from the A.F.I.C. before a decision is made? The second point arises from the Minister's reply yesterday when he said, 'No effect on other prawn fisheries'. The decision that he intends to take is difficult to interpret.

Does he mean no beneficial effect or no adverse effect, because the existing operations of the fishermen in Investigator Strait are having an adverse effect on other prawn fisheries? If the Minister means that he is not going to take any decision at all, which is what many people in the fishing industry interpret that to mean, then he will certainly be causing the ruin of the St Vincent Gulf fishery. Does the Minister intend to take any action in regard to the Investigator Strait fishery to ensure that fishermen there are kept off the breeding grounds of prawns which are so important for the St Vincent Gulf fishery?

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

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE BUDGETING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Local Government inform the Council of the procedures to be adopted to assess performance in his department under the Government's policy of programme performance budgeting? If he considers that the procedures are advantageous, does he intend to recommend that programme performance budgeting be adopted by local government in South Australia and, if not, why not? If so, what action does the Minister intend to take to develop expertise in local government on the techniques of programme performance budgeting, particularly in the area of assessment of performance?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government is giving attention to programme performance budgeting in connection with specific departments, but local government has not come under the same close scrutiny as some of the other departments, particularly departments involved with public works and operating areas generally. We have had some discussions with the officers who are conducting the framework and conducting the general inquiries and planning in

connection with programme performance budgeting. We have not reached a stage yet where we have specific guidelines laid down for the introduction of this approach in our department, so it is too early for specific replies to be given along those lines.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable Question Time to continue to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

KEROSENE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about kerosene prices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have received representations from a number of people about the high cost of kerosene, particularly as the high cost of kerosene is causing pensioners much discomfort in this cold winter. I have been approached by pensioners who cannot afford to properly heat their houses. Kerosene is now more expensive than petrol with respect to at least some brands. In a survey that I recently undertook on the price of kerosene, some brands were 37.5c a litre or 37c a litre, which is more expensive than super grade petrol.

Retail price control was removed from kerosene in January 1980, and I believe that wholesale price control was removed from kerosene when the Liberal Government substantially dismantled much of South Australia's price control. In the 18 months since then the price of kerosene has increased by 50 per cent. Pensioners are hit by the Tonkin Government's increases in State charges, which are particularly severe on pensioners when no concessions apply, for example, in regard to electricity and gas charges but, with those charges increasing and with the price of kerosene escalating, pensioners particularly are having difficulty in heating their homes. The cost of heating is a large slug out of housekeeping expenses. First, will the Government institute an immediate inquiry into the price of kerosene and, secondly, reimpose wholesale price control and introduce retail price control if necessary?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The relatively high price of kerosene is largely due to the small consumption of that item as compared with, say, petrol. I, too, have had some complaints about the high price of kerosene and have directed that the question of the price of kerosene be closely monitored.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister answer the question? Will he investigate the price of kerosene and reimpose retail and wholesale price control?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Obviously, I am not going to say at this time that I am going to reimpose wholesale and retail price control. I have said that I have had some inquiries, and I am having the matter monitored. That I will continue to do, and the outcome and what I decide to do or recommend to Cabinet will depend on the outcome of the monitoring procedure that is going ahead.

TREES

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Public Works, a question about tree planting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: One day last week I read a letter in the Letters to the Editor column of the *Advertiser* written by a Mr Peter Gouldhurst of Rostrevor concerning Engineering and Water Supply Department regulations for tree planting in Adelaide streets.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is very hard to hear the Hon. Miss Wiese, because the Hon. Mr Dunford keeps on talking so loudly.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Mr Gouldhurst pointed out that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was largely responsible for the small ornamental trees that are planted in our streets instead of big shady ones. He pointed out, quite rightly, that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has responsibility for seeing that there is no interference from tree roots with water pipes, etc., and this concern is largely responsible for their rather strict regulations concerning tree planting.

Mr Gouldhurst believes, and it is a view held by many others, that there is room for greater flexibility in this area; that there must be some areas where the planting of tall trees would not be detrimental to underground water pipes and that there should be some mechanism for identifying those areas so that suitable planting can take place.

Mr Gouldhurst has suggested that the Engineering and Water Supply Department should set up a working party to include an engineer and a landscape gardener or an architect, who would be responsible for assisting, on request, local councils or residents associations to identify areas where tall trees might be safely planted. He suggests that this should be a relatively simple exercise since the Engineering and Water Supply Department has plans of all sewer pipes and their placement in relation to verges, reserves, corner blocks, roadsides, etc. First, does the Minister agree that current regulations concerning tree planting in Adelaide streets are sometimes unduly restrictive? Secondly, will the Minister consider establishing a working party along the lines suggested by Mr Gouldhurst to provide greater flexibility and more opportunity for variety in tree planting in the suburbs of Adelaide?

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

WIDE SHEARING COMBS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question regarding wide shearing combs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I want to bring this matter to honourable members' attention by way of a short statement. There is looming in the pastoral industry one of the biggest disputes, in my opinion, since 1956. Some honourable members may recall the 1956 shearers' dispute, when there was a reduction in the wages of shearers.

I was on the strike committee and was one of the leaders in that dispute, which, I am proud to say, the shearers won and during the course of which there was much disputation among working-class blokes in the towns. Indeed, scab labour was flown in from New Zealand at a cost far in excess of that of shearing the sheep and the amount of pay that the shearers were trying to retain. The shearers were striking not to increase their pay but merely to retain their wage rates.

The present dispute to which I have referred does not involve shearers going on strike for increased wages, improved working conditions or a shorter working week, which, if I was in the industry, I would want. However, it

is not for me to say what pastoral workers should be doing in their own industry.

However, I have an obligation in relation to this matter, as it has been brought to my notice by Mr Jim Doyle, who is an organiser at Port Augusta and who has a vast knowledge of the pastoral industry and, indeed, of the dangers of industrial disputes and the horrific consequences, on both sides of the fence, that can occur therefrom.

In 1926, the graziers and unions agreed to include clause 32 in the industrial award, prohibiting the use of combs in excess of 2½in. wide. In a subsequent decision (I think in 1939), the consent of graziers was given and then withdrawn, as a result of which it became illegal to use wide combs.

Action has been taken by the Livestock and Grain Producers Association of New South Wales, which has a publication entitled *The Livestock and Grain Producer.* On 31 October 1980 that association circularised its members, warning them regarding the use of wide combs, as follows:

WARNING ON USE OF WIDE COMBS

Employers of shearers in New South Wales are warned that they are in breach of the Pastoral Industry Award, and thus liable to be fined, if they permit their employees to use combs wider than two and one half inches (63 mm).

Position in Western Australia—

In issuing this warning, LGPA industrial officer Mr Ian Manning, said that because of peculiarities in Western Australia, in certain circumstances the use of combs by shearing employees is not regulated by the award and in those circumstances in Western Australia any combs could be used without committing a breach of the award or rendering the employer and employee liable to prosecution.

Breach of Award—

Mr Manning said there was a danger that the Western Australian situation could lead some employers in New South Wales into the belief that they are immune from prosecution if they permit their employees to use combs wider than 2½in., despite the fact that in New South Wales such conduct constitutes a breach of the award.

I have mentioned New South Wales, because that State's employer organisation is the only one of which I know that has taken this action and which has had the foresight to see the dangers looming. They would be aware that on 1 June hundreds of pastoral workers, representing their colleagues all over Australia, met in Dubbo and condemned the use of wide combs.

The circular sent to me by Mr Doyle contains a certain amount of information to which I will refer. It gives the results of tests conducted in Western Australia showing the increases in the average number of sheep shorn per week, and the figure involved following the use of the wide comb. Details are set out regarding the width of the combs, the increases in the number of sheep shorn, and the shearing formula. It also states how much each shearer would lose on that formula. For instance, if a shearer used a 73 millimetre pulled standard comb, there would be a 6 per cent increase, involving 510 sheep per week. If a 76 millimetre New Zealand pacer comb was used, it would involve a 7 per cent increase, involving 515 sheep per week. As these figures are statistical, I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* for the benefit of those who are interested.

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member sure that the information is statistical?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

RESULTS OF SHEARING TESTS

Tests conducted in West Australia show that the following increases in the average per week would result from the use of combs of the following widths.

73 mm 'pulled standard comb'	6% increase 510 per week
76 mm 'New Zealand Pacer'	7% increase 515 per week
86 mm 'New Zealand Pacer'	14% increase 550 per week

All increases 'rounded off' to nearest multiple of 5.

Results of Shearing Tests—*continued*

Below is set out the present formula for shearing rates based on 480 sheep per week.

Present Formula

	$
Present total wage	192.90
Plus 20% piecework allowance	38.58
	231.48

	$
20 weeks wages at 231.48 per week	4 629.60
20 weeks fares at $7.96 per week	159.20
3 weeks travelling at $72.46 per week	217.38
17 weeks mess at $39.77 per week	676.09
17 weeks camping allowance at $7.82 per week	132.94
1 week lost earning time at home at $192.90 per week	192.90
Pro rata allowance in lieu of 4 weeks annual leave plus 17½% loading	460.85
Pro rata allowance in lieu of 1.8 weeks sick leave	162.92
	6 631.88
Less 17 weeks contribution towards the cost of meals at $25.07 per week	426.19
	6 205.69

	$
$\frac{\$6\,205.69}{17} \times \frac{100}{480}$	76.05
Plus comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus allowance for occasional daggy and fly-blown sheep	.56
Present rate per 100	$79.78 per 100

Over leaf is shown the effects on shearing rates that would result if any of the increases indicated by the West Australian test were approved by the Arbitration Court and the adjustment made to the average number of sheep shorn per week in the present formula.

Rate per 100 based on 6% increase in weekly average sheep shorn

	$
$\frac{\$6\,205.69}{17} \times \frac{100}{510}$	71.58
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Allowance for occasional daggy and fly-blown sheep	.56
	$75.31 per 100
Reduction in rate compared to present shearing rate	$4.47 per 100

Rate per 100 based on 7% increase in weekly average sheep shorn

	$
$\frac{\$6\,205.69}{17} \times \frac{100}{515}$	70.88
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus daggy and fly-blown sheep allowance	.56
	$74.61 per 100
Reduction in shearing rate	$5.17 per 100

Rate per 100 based on 14% increase in weekly average sheep shorn

	$
$\frac{\$6\,205.69}{17} \times \frac{100}{550}$	66.37
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus daggy and fly-blown sheep allowance	.56
	$70.10 per 100

Results of Shearing Tests—*continued*

Reduction in shearing rate	\$9.68 per 100

In 1974 the Arbitration Court, without any publicity, advanced the then weekly average of sheep shorn per week from 455 to the present figure of 480. An increase of 25 sheep per week.

At the time this effectively denied shearers an increase of \$1.35 per 100.

Set out below is the rate which would now prevail if the court had not approved that alteration, and the number of 455 was used in the formula, with all other components of the formula remaining as they are now.

Rate per 100 based on weekly average of 455 sheep shorn

	\$
$\frac{\$6\,205.69}{17} \times \frac{100}{455}$	80.23
Plus comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus daggy and fly-blown sheep allowance	.56
	\$83.96

The effective loss to shearers resulting from this increase, from 455 to 480, amounts to \$4.18 per 100.

When this loss to shearers is applied to 130 million sheep over a period of five to six years it becomes abundantly clear as to the reason why graziers are now looking around for a method by which they can increase the 'rip-off' of shearers and weekly-wage pastoral workers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is this an explanation of your question?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Is the honourable member making a point on this matter?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The point raised by the Hon. Mr DeGaris is valid. Leave has been granted for the honourable member to have the statistical information inserted in *Hansard*. However, I do not know who should be answering the honourable member's question, which he has made such a good job of explaining. Will the honourable member please get on with his question?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: There has been much disputation in Australia in the past, and there is even more of it occurring at present. I am therefore pleased to see that the Government is calling the trade unions together to discuss the matter. However, the strike in the pastoral industry to which I have referred will be a different sort of strike, aimed at defining shearers' working conditions, and at stopping not all but a lot of graziers and farmers, in collusion with scab shearers, from reducing the wages and take-home pay of shearers. The statistics that I have had inserted in *Hansard* do not show that, once a contract shearer loses his wages, he—

The PRESIDENT: Order! As Question Time has almost elapsed, I ask the honourable member to ask his question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, approach the Farmers and Graziers and Stockowners Association, the Shearing Contractors Association and any other employers of pastoral labour, and request those bodies to ensure that clause 32 of the award is strictly adhered to, and that similar provisions of the State pastoral award are strictly adhered to, also, so as to avoid the biggest industrial dispute in the history of our pastoral industry?

Will the Minister also impress on the aforementioned employers of pastoral labour that any action on the part of graziers to alter or amend clause 32 of the award could result in an Australia-wide dispute of major proportions, as pastoral workers throughout Australia—

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not an explanation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Well, I have said it now.

The PRESIDENT: Has the honourable member asked his question?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That is the question. Will the Minister do that?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, I will ask those questions of my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Where a testator makes provision for the payment of a pecuniary legacy, the legacy should be paid either at the time fixed by the testator in his will or, if no such time is fixed, on or before the first anniversary of the testator's death. If the legacy is not paid on or before the due date, then it bears interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. This rate was determined by the Courts of Equity in the early nineteenth century, and is now clearly too low in view of current interest rates. The judges of the Supreme Court have recently amended the rules of the Supreme Court to increase the rate of interest payable upon legacies subject to a judgment or order of the court to 10 per cent per annum. Obviously, there should be a corresponding increase in the interest payable generally. The present Bill therefore introduces a new section into the Administration and Probate Act providing that interest shall accrue upon pecuniary legacies at the rate from time to time fixed by regulation. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 enacts new section 120a of the principal Act. The new section provides that, if a legacy is not paid on or before the proper date, interest accrues at the rate from time to time fixed by regulation. The new section will apply to all unpaid pecuniary legacies, whenever they become payable, but will not, of course, affect the rate of interest payable on a legacy in respect of a period before the commencement of the amending Act. Clause 4 inserts a regulation-making power in the principal Act. This will enable the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of new section 120a.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PARKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for a Act to amend the Public Parks Act, 1943-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For many years it has been the policy of successive Governments to pay subsidies to councils in respect of the acquisition of land to be used and maintained as parks or recreational areas. These subsidies have been paid after investigation and report by the Public Parks Advisory Committee established under the Public Parks Act. It seems desirable for some formal statutory authorisation to be

given for this practice and accordingly the present Bill empowers the Minister on the recommendation of the advisory committee, to advance moneys to a council, by way of grant or loan, for the purpose of enabling or assisting the council to acquire land for the purpose of providing a public park, or to develop or improve land acquired for that purpose.

The disposal of land acquired by a council under the Public Parks Act is a subject that is attended by considerable doubt and uncertainty. Circumstances do arise in which it is desirable, in the interests of the overall development of an area, to exchange portion of a public park for some other land, or to dispose of portion of a park that can be more effectively utilised in some other manner. The Government takes the view that transactions of this nature should only take place after the most thorough scrutiny. Hence, while the present Bill does empower a council to dispose of parkland that has been acquired or improved by subsidy under the principal Act, no such transaction is to take place except upon the authorisation of the Governor.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers the Minister to advance moneys to a council, by way of grant or loan, for the acquisition and development of park lands. Clause 3 empowers a council to dispose of land acquired under the principal Act, or in respect of which a subsidy has been paid under the principal Act. However, the authorisation of the Governor is required for any such transaction.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 5 August. Page 281.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yesterday, during the first part of my contribution to the debate, I commenced to discuss the resources boom. I pointed out that, apart from a very brief mention by the Hon. Mr Carnie, no member of the Government had chosen to speak on what we on this side regard as a very important issue. I also pointed out my attitude to mineral development, when I stated that I am a strong supporter of mineral development and a strong supporter of any controlled and well managed investment, as it increases the amount of wealth to be distributed to the people in Australia and indeed throughout the world.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Roxby Downs?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am a strong supporter of the development of Roxby Downs as a copper mine. There is no problem with that at all. I was about to outline, when I sought leave to conclude, some of the problems that would confront Australia if the mineral boom was allowed to proceed without very stringent controls.

In recommencing my speech today, the first thing I want to query is the extent of the boom. No-one knows the answer to the question of how extensive the mineral boom will be. Suffice to say that the evidence we have to date shows that it will be very extensive indeed. Treasurer Howard's recent announcement that $6 000 000 000 of foreign capital has poured into Australia in the last year—about five times the in-flow of the previous year—is a clear demonstration that the boom will be extensive indeed. Whilst we can discount some of the more outrageous statements made by the Prime Minister and other politicians from time to time, there is no doubt that foreign transnationals are putting their money where Mr Fraser's mouth is.

The immediate impact of this is already being felt in at least three ways. First, because the local capitalists want a piece of the resources boom action, they are putting the capital they control into this area rather than the more traditional areas such as small business, home buying and the manufacturing industry. The law of supply and demand works in the finance area in the same way as in any other area, so interest rates are escalating at a frightening rate. People trying to buy a home or keep a small business going are finding that it is almost impossible to get finance. Ordinary Australians are in direct competition with these huge development projects for borrowings. Because ordinary people do not have the capacity to compete, the housing industry is depressed, to say the least, and the bankruptcy rate amongst small businesses has never been higher.

The second area that is already feeling some adverse effects of the capital inflow is the area of manufacturing and rural industries. The problems they are having are due to the appreciation of the Australian dollar, which has already appreciated by about 9 per cent over the past year. This makes our traditional exporting industries less competitive, so the rural industry will have a great deal of difficulty maintaining its rather shaky security. I would have thought that members opposite would address themselves to that particular side effect of the boom, as they claim some particular responsibility for rural people. At the same time, our exports will suffer because of the currency appreciation taking place. Imports are becoming cheaper and threatening our manufacturing industry. Over the past two years the appreciation of the Australian dollar has been the equivalent of a 28 per cent across-the-board tariff cut.

We hear in the news media today that Mr Fraser is referring to the Industries Assistance Commission a proposition that there should be a tariff cut across-the-board of about 10 or 15 per cent. On top of the currency appreciation that has taken place, which I have said has already been the equivalent of a 28 per cent tariff cut, it is obvious that manufacturing industry will be under severe strain. I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Laidlaw, who claims some responsibility for manufacturing industry in this Chamber, did not address himself to this question, either. Rather, he gave us a travelogue on some very pleasant places that he visited during an overseas study tour.

The end result of following the present Federal Government's non-policies in the resources area is obvious. Rural industries will become depressed, and a lot of primary producers will have to rely more and more on subsidies or become nothing more than peasants. Manufacturing industry, both the efficient and inefficient, will go to the wall, resulting in widespread unemployment. On top of the currency appreciation, this Federal Government is talking about a significant tariff cut and increase in import quotas. If the Government goes ahead with this (and it appears from what we hear today that it will), it will mean the finish of manufacturing industry as we know it, for South Australia is the State which is most dependent on manufacturing industry, with its large rural base. It is obvious that unless some sensible controls are placed on resource development, South Australia will be depopulated to a degree where we just will not be able to sustain a viable economy.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: They will never cut tariffs like Whitlam did, by 25 per cent.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I assume that by 'They' the honourable member means the Federal Government. Had he been listening, he would have heard a couple of moments ago that I told him that the capital currency appreciation over the past two years has been an effective 28 per cent tariff cut across the board. The present Federal Government is contemplating a further open tariff cut of

10 to 15 per cent and our currency is tending to appreciate all the time so, on simple arithmetic, even the Hon. Mr Davis should be able to work out that this is considerably more than the 25 per cent tariff cut across the board that was a result of the decision of the Whitlam Government.

I am dealing with currency appreciation, and we should realise what this will do to the tourist industry. The Hon. Mr Laidlaw has taken the mantel off manufacturing industry and put it on the tourist industry. The tourist industry is one of those areas that allegedly will soak up some of the labour displaced from manufacturing industry owing to technological change. That has been a fashionable idea over the past 12 months. However, with a high-priced currency overseas, tourists will give Australia a miss, as it will be too expensive for them. At the same time, it will be cheaper for Australians to go overseas, so that the tourist industry also is being, and will continue to be, adversely affected by the side effects of the boom.

The Hon. Mr Laidlaw spoke of his ideas of promoting some substantial botanic gardens in South Australia, allowing tourists into golf clubs, and things like that. Even if those pleasant things are done, I suggest that the currency appreciation will affect them somewhat and I do not see what the Hon. Mr Laidlaw suggests as offering much hope.

Thirdly, Sir (and this is by no means an exhaustive list of some of the problems and challenges of the boom), the large inflow of capital will fuel inflation in this country as nothing else has since the Korean war. This flies in the face of Mr Fraser's stated policy of trying to control inflation. The huge inflow has so far added at least 10 per cent to the growth in the Australian money supply. Under normal conditions, this would mean an increase in interest rates, but how far can you go with that? Interest rates are already damagingly high, and, anyway, if you increase interest rates even more, you run the risk of attracting even more capital looking for the highest possible return. The result of doing nothing is increasing inflation.

So far, Mr President, I have given only a brief outline of some of the problems that the resources boom is creating. The examples I have given are only that—examples. Some of the other problems that I have not dealt with include environmental considerations, and a contraction of the economy from a relatively broad based economy to one overly concentrated in mining with little or no depth. There are many other problems as well. In fact, Sir, the more you look at the problem the more you come to appreciate that, unless the Government comes to grips with the whole host of problems the resources boom will create, then the whole style of our society will change, and for the majority of Australians that change will not be for the better. It may appear that I am arguing against resource development, but, as I said yesterday, I want to make clear that this is not so. For the reasons stated earlier, I am a strong supporter of development and economic growth, but it must be controlled growth so that all Australians benefit from it, not just a few transnational corporations.

As in all things, it is easy to point out the problems, but less easy to suggest solutions. I want to spend the next few minutes detailing some of the actions that we can take to minimise some of the adverse effects of the boom and make sure that all Australians benefit from the vast wealth that will be generated.

The first thing that should be done is to make as many people as possible aware of what is happening and what are the options. This will occur in time, anyway. The adverse effects are already hurting, and that in itself is a great educator, but it is a hard and painful way to learn. Opinion leaders in the community can play a very significant role, and some are already doing this. We are seeing more and more statements and articles detailing the adverse effects of the boom, and I believe that this is gradually getting through to people. People are much more receptive when they are on the receiving end of an ill thought out policy. When their house repayments go up, it is relatively easy to explain the competition for money. When such groups as the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures and the building industry associations spell out what is happening in these particular areas, then people do eventually listen.

The Labor Party, and to some extent the Democrats, have been sounding the alarm bells about the resources boom. I believe that, because of these actions, an increasing number of Australians are at least becoming aware of the problem. However, as yet I do not believe Australians are giving sufficient consideration to alternative policies for dealing with the problems. At the last Federal election, the Labor Party spelt out a programme for responsible resource development. Although not successful, we came pretty close and I predict with confidence that the policies we have in the resources area will ensure that we will have the opportunity to put them into practice after the next election.

Well, what has to be done after the Australian people have decided that these resources are to be used for their own benefit? First, we have to stop offering our resources to foreign capitalists at bargain basement prices. We have to stop this stupid competition between the States to see who can get the most development regardless of the lack of overall benefit to the total Australian economy. In other words, the Federal Government has to start acting like an Australian Government; it must take control of our resources and ensure that all Australians benefit, not just one or two States or one or two political Parties. Because of the control the Federal Government has over exports this is not difficult. It only requires some political backbone, something which is sorely lacking in this present Federal Government. Once a Government has firmly accepted its responsibilities, it can then plan an orderly development of our resources at a rate which does not distort our economy to the stage where more people are suffering rather than benefiting.

The criteria for giving any new project the go ahead should be well thought out, widely advertised and adhered to. The criteria should ensure that the project includes a significant amount of Australian equity. If private Australian capital is not available for one reason or another, then the A.I.D.C. should be used to supply the required amount of Australian equity. Organisations should also be required to provide most, if not all, of their own infrastructure, and this infrastructure should include sufficient housing, schools, hospitals, and so on so that we do not get any more Gladstones. The problems Gladstone is having were detailed by the Hon. Miss Wiese in the Council on Tuesday. Offset arrangements must be entered into so that a significant amount of the wealth generated by the resources boom will remain in Australia and can be used to revitalise our manufacturing industries. In other words, the open-door policy that applies now to these projects must stop and developers will only be able to go ahead if they act in a more socially responsible way.

It will of course be argued by some members opposite that the course I am suggesting is impossible. My answer to that is to look at Norway if they want a precedent. In Norway in the mid-seventies the equivalent of our mineral boom was starting to pick up momentum. Oil from the North Sea fields became a large and growing part of Norway's exports. In a country that, like Australia, had a large manufacturing and rural base the results were economically disastrous. Inflation, currency appreciation, and the leverage able to be exerted by the skilled labour force almost destroyed Norway's labour intensive industries. Norway became the most expensive labour-cost country in the

world. Production costs went through the roof and exports—excluding oil—declined dramatically. The highly efficient Norwegian manufacturing industry was just about killed. Rural industry likewise could no longer compete in its traditional export markets.

Norway has since changed its economic course dramatically. It now restricts any new oil production until oil companies agree to 'buy Norwegian'. Further, oil companies are forced to invest in Norwegian industrial development. One oil company is now involved in the very important fishing industry and through 'trade off' agreements new industries are being started in rural areas (something, incidentally, desperately needed in Australia). Norway also has a State-owned oil company which plays a valuable role as a 'window' into the industry as well as entering large amounts of profit direct to the Norwegian Government.

I think we should compare this to what is happening in Australia. The resource-rich States of Queensland, Western Australia and New South Wales are actually underbidding each other to give our resources away to foreign capitalists; they are actually competing against one another to see who can sell for the cheapest price. They are using the taxpayers' money to provide infrastructure to those companies that can well afford to pay for their own. Two or three years ago it was assessed that, in effect, Australia was actually paying foreign multi-national corporations to take away our resources. We were paying for the privilege of having very few jobs.

I would argue that we have to follow Norway's example. If we do not do so, the problems already emerging in our economy will intensify. We will become another United Kingdom, with all the problems that country is having due, in a large part, to the currency appreciation caused by North Sea oil exports and a Government philosophically opposed to controls that would ensure that private oil companies acted for the benefit of all sections of the United Kingdom economy.

I want to conclude on the political implications of this Federal Government's 'do nothing' working policies in the resources area. It will not take long, because there are really only two options. Either Australia suffers the Liberal Country Party policies of uncontrolled development resulting in the destruction of our manufacturing industries and further problems for the rural sector, or it takes up the Labor Party option of controlled development of Australia's resources so as not to distort our economy. I am absolutely certain that in the not too distant future the Australian elector will opt for the Labor Party option.

The crude Friedmanite philosophy of this Federal Government is in fact hardening. I have given examples of that today. Foreign oil companies that exploit the North Sea oil are forced by the Norwegian Government to buy Norwegian products to compensate for the money that they take out of the country. Any equipment that the foreign companies use in their prospecting ventures and oil extraction ventures must be purchased in Norway. We heard on the air today—and the Hon. Mr Laidlaw is looking even more gloomy than usual—that the Federal Government, as a Government, has stopped buying Australian. The Federal Government has announced a policy that it will no longer accept certain defence equipment manufactured in Australia.

If the Australian Government is not prepared to buy Australian products from Australian manufacturers and made by Australian workers, then how long can we expect foreign transnational corporations to play any socially responsible role in that area? Not only do we have foreign transnationals being totally irresponsible, we also have a Federal Government that is being totally irresponsible. I would go so far as to say that it is in fact traitorous, and it is certainly being traitorous to the manufacturing industry. During the Budget debate, or whenever the opportunity arises, I look forward to the Hon. Mr Laidlaw, as the representative of the manufacturing industry in this State and in this Council, telling us what he thinks of the Fraser Government's policy in the area of resource development and its policy as announced today that it will no longer buy Australian.

I repeat that the crude Friedmanite philosophy of this Federal Government is in fact hardening, and I have given examples of that. The Frasers, Anthonys, Bjelke-Petersens and Courts are in complete control and the few rational people in both the Liberal and Country Parties have not a hope of changing their Parties' philosophies because the Parties are bought and owned by the resource developers. They have outbid the manufacturers. They used to be controlled by the manufacturers but money talks and the political Parties are now owned by the highest bidder, which is now the resource developer.

Australia is indeed a lucky country. We have enormous amounts of wealth to share amongst our population. This wealth will be generated and all Australians will benefit from it by the Australian Labor Party's having the opportunity to govern and show that it is a Party owned by, and working for, all Australians. I support the motion.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I want to commend the Hon. Mr Blevins for his phraseology and his use of the term 'developers'. From where I stand, I refer to them as nothing more than capitalistic rapists, and I do not think that those words are too strong. I will come back to that matter later. Also, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Mr DeGaris on receiving an honour—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: An Aussie honour.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I know that. I do not like to use the word 'Imperial' which is a terrible word. The service of the Hon. Mr DeGaris to this Council was worthy of an honour. In regard to the Governor's Speech, I think we are all aware that it is written by the Government of the day.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: By Ross Story.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, perhaps by the Hon. Ross Story. Did he decide to keep that prefix when he left this Council?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You'll keep yours.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I never accepted it. It is a prefix, and I have always referred to it as such. The Hon. Mr Hill may wish to keep his prefix for the odd occasion that he brings his dog in here, but I think that is taking his love of dogs too far. He tells me that since he brought his dog here it has gone deaf. I do not know whether that was the fault of Mr Hill or of Bruce Eastick. I hear that the dog has drowned in Mr Hill's swimming pool because he was too mean to give it mouth-to-mouth resuscitation!

The Governor's Speech is nothing more than a copy of what is handed in by the Government and that is the case with all Governments. Concern has been expressed in this Council regarding the passing of the late Sir Thomas Playford. Much has been said. I led many industrial deputations to Sir Thomas Playford when I was President of the Trades and Labor Council. Certainly, Sir Thomas had an affliction for which he never received compensation—he was industrially stone deaf.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He did not believe in workers compensation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. Although I do not want to derogate from what has been said about the honourable gentleman, honourable members who are present today can reflect upon the fact that he was a man of the moment. I would not deprive him of that, but he was also a person of circumstances in respect of the industrialisation of this State. Honourable members should not lose sight of the

fact that the vast armament works at Philips and at Finsbury were directed to this State by John Curtin and Ben Chifley for nothing so that industry could be attracted to it.

Sufficient has been said in that respect. All politicians who take it upon themselves to praise another after death, or who praise themselves whilst in office are like army generals—their success is usually brought about by circumstances or through absolute personal favours. Sir Thomas Playford dealt with one side of the industrial scene and one side only. The only time that I can recall the late Sir Thomas making any statement in respect of trade unions was with a sort of idle boast that he rang Ben Chifley and said, 'The Miners Federation looks like getting in at Leigh Creek. You had better alert the Federal boys of the A.W.U., so that they can take over the coalfields at Leigh Creek.' This is the case, as the Hon. Mr Dunford knows, because the A.W.U. covered the workers at Leigh Creek. The reason for that was because Sir Thomas believed that the Miners Federation was too far to the left to be given a foothold in this State. I never agreed with that, and it is only fair that that situation should be mentioned here today.

In regard to industrial expansion, if the success and honour of that expansion has to be heaped on the head of the former Premier, I must indicate that, as far as I am concerned, it was at the expense of the blood and the pockets of those who worked in industry in this State from the mid-1940s to the late 1960s. I can recall a deputation that I led to the then Premier regarding the equality of service pay in a railway union. We met with a 'No' response for a long time.

Indeed, I can recall having to demonstrate for the right of an Italian worker's family to workers compensation after the worker lost his life on a railway siding near Finsbury. This worker left a widow and a number of children, but no compensation was paid to people engaged in industry. One can say that it was only after the demise of the Playford Government in early 1965 that a number of industrial concerns that had been developed through sweat, especially in relation to the success of industry in this State, were recognised and accorded rights in wages and conditions similar to those applying in the Eastern States.

If that is the way that we have to progress, then all members should be saying today that we should see all industry go offshore. If members agree with what I have said, it would mean that industry would have to go to Taiwan. In that regard, many companies have gone overseas and taken industry with them. If that is condemned today, one could also say that that was the same ruse that was used to attract industry to this State in its move from an agriculturally based economy, to which it has now returned.

I wish now to comment about this Council, of which I have been a member since 1975. As yet, I have not faced the electors of this State and, prior to my coming here, it is true to say that some members sat in this Chamber without facing the electors for about 15 or 18 years. I am pleased to say that that situation is no longer the case. I wish now to refer to the role that this Council could or should play. The policy of members on this side of the Council is that it should be abolished. I do not believe there is anyone on this side who would not be sufficiently intelligent to know that, given the Constitution of the State, it is not likely to happen. Certainly, before it can happen the Labor Party has to win a majority of seats in this Chamber even to put into motion the constitutional requirement to hold a referendum on this matter.

Only one Upper House has been abolished in Australia—in Queensland—and Bjelke-Joe thinks that it ought to be brought back. The then Queensland Government put the question of abolition to a referendum, somewhere between 1915 and 1920, and lost heavily in the referendum, which was the result of a similar constitutional requirement as applies in this State.

That Government then discovered that it had power to enlarge Queensland's Legislative Council and, therefore, took upon itself the right to put enough people in there to enable that Legislative Council to be abolished. As our Constitution does not allow that, I think it would be fair to say that, given the tide of electoral results over the past few years, this Council will be a tied House for some time and, as such, should have a role to play. That role could be on the basis that this Council ought to conduct a closer scrutiny of some legislation, without detracting from the power of the properly elected House of Assembly, which is the people's House. There should be a provision for delay to enable Bills to be examined properly in this Council.

Governments of both political persuasions have said that they are willing to initiate a Bill, and on some occasions they have got even further to the drafting stages, only to withdraw the Bill because it met with an unpopular reaction from the community. A provision should exist enabling financial Bills to come under closer scrutiny than the present system of debate allows, but without unduly delaying such measures. I consider that a period of three sitting months ought to be accorded to this Council to enable it to perform that sort of role. If the Council wanted more time to consider certain legislation, it should be given it only if the extension is agreed to by another place.

This Council is being inhibited in respect of Select Committees, because the Executive Government, through the Treasury (the people in which are not elected to this Parliament), is providing insufficient money to allow the Council to appoint and conduct certain Select Committees in the light of matters that come before us from time to time. This Council should be independent financially to that extent only.

Also, there seems to be a great frustration by a large number of organisations in respect of not only State Parliaments but also the Federal Parliament. Ombudsmen having been appointed in the Federal sphere and in most State spheres, people tend to be frustrated and can see no outlet in which they can express their feelings. Let us be fair about this: honourable members send to the Ombudsman only those matters that they cannot follow. Certainly, I would not want to be on that end of the line, having to satisfy the complaints and allay the frustrations of individuals and groups.

Even though this Council takes on itself the power to call persons before the bar, and then constitutes itself as a court, it does not have the power to provide personnel to enable setting up its Select Committees. In the next 20 years, which is not long in Parliamentary terms, people may see Parliament as being no longer necessary as a form of expression.

Last week, or perhaps the week before that, I raised a matter under Standing Order 193 and was ruled out of order. On reflection, I thought that that was a little rough. I understand that I am not allowed to make a reflection on any member of Parliament, or on the Queen or royalty; nor am I allowed to make a reflection on any judge. However, despite that, Standing Orders permit the Council to call a judge before it and to sentence that judge to imprisonment for the lifetime of this Parliament, which position was not clearly defined until the constitutional changes that occurred in 1975. If the concept of this Parliament is as I have stated, the Chief Justice could, before the constitutional changes occurred in 1975, have been called before this Council and sentenced to gaol for an indefinite period. As that seems to be a contradiction in terms, the Standing Orders Committee should have a good look at some of our

Standing Orders. Indeed, it would be fair to say that almost every Parliament in the Westminster system (perhaps it should start in the United Kingdom) should examine its Standing Orders.

There are 400 Standing Orders in our red book. That is even more impressive than Mao Tse Tung's red book. I have always objected to Standing Order 1, which provides:

In all cases not provided for hereinafter or by Sessional or other Orders, the President shall decide, taking as his guide the rules, forms and usages of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in force from time to time so far as the same can be applied to the proceedings of the Council or any committee thereof.

That is almost a blockbuster in terms of the other Standing Orders. I am not saying that because of what happened here recently in relation to the role that I and other members played concerning a rather petty Standing Order and the attitude taken by the Attorney-General on the withdrawal of what he considered to be a particularly offensive remark.

On reflection, and considering what occurred in the Federal House of Representatives in April 1970, I am sure that, if one is named, there is only one course that can be adopted. If it is not adopted, it is putting aside the constitutional arguments regarding what the President and/or the Speaker in another place may do. Although certainly I do not insist that Standing Orders should be adhered to all the time, having experienced the situation in which the Parliament becomes unworkable as a result of this aspect, I think that it should be considered by the Standing Orders Committee.

It is one thing to use numbers in a particular House to brutalise legislation. That is bad enough. That is what happens with an executive-type Government. That is what is happening in Canberra today, what has happened to some extent under Labor Governments and what is happening under the Government today. Government by regulation is when you can govern how you like, when you like, without calling the Parliament together other than in those periods of time that the Constitution demands that it be called together. That is not the way to govern. Not only has it become a habit of Governments, State and Federal, to do that but also it has become a matter of some very great concern in local government. The Hon. Mr Hill may pay attention.

Local government is getting to the point of absolute strangulation over regulations. The Minister nodded assent and I appreciate that. If compulsory voting was to come in as it ought to in respect of local government elections, not many would survive today. I can cite a classic example of a regulation that applied to a small number of people in Campbelltown. The matter came before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. All sorts of evidence was taken, the committee went on its inspection and met with the council, the town clerk, the residents, and so on. The Houses of this Parliament decided that the regulations would be disallowed. What did the Campbelltown council do? It made no reference to the ratepayers or to Parliament and reintroduced the regulations. Who forms the Parliament of the State? Who is the arbitrator by way of legislation or regulation? I have not had time to seek an interview with the appropriate Minister to find out what is going to happen in this matter. It is not good enough.

The Adelaide City Council has been in all sorts of trouble in respect of parking regulations. It is much the same in many areas as far as planning regulations are concerned. The frustrations of people in the suburbs and indeed in country areas are great. They often want to put up only a simple structure, and the delays are amazing. It would need more than a Philadelphia lawyer to keep up with the number of regulations, planning Acts, planning regulations, and so on. All originally were of good intent because they were trying to seize upon a situation that was in a shocking mess and put it on an orderly road of planning and understanding. It is time that that should be looked at just as closely as the original concept of those regulations so that a lot of rubbish surrounding them can be completely trimmed back. Another aspect in complying with the regulations is in regard to what the Council does. Notices are put in the back page of the *Advertiser*. People are not often aware of it and do not realise that something they may want to object to has appeared and is well on the way. They are then told that time has run out because the notice was in the paper at some previous time.

One elderly gentleman wanted to reconstruct a shed that had been there for years. I am yet to see the correspondence but apparently he was required to spend about $70 in advertising to enable people to object. It has got to a ridiculous situation. It is a squandering of finance by those least able to pay for it. The Council ought to look at whether or not it can set itself up as an expanded body in some form of the Subordinate Legislation Committee so that people may make known their objections and opinions in respect of a matter of legislation.

A matter of grave concern to me is that the Government is working overtime quite secretly. I am not referring to secret documents, as all Governments indulge in that. It is good enough to say that it is a document that fell off the back of a truck, but it means nothing to the public and never has. In the Federal House I came into possession of the whole of the Liberal Party's industrial documents over some considerable period of time. We never made a great thing of it but we most certainly said that we had it in our possession. I was able to tell the then Minister what he was all about or what he intended to do. One would not have to be all that astute to gather that there is an Indenture Act probably being drafted on behalf of Roxby Downs. Indentures are things that taxpayers pay for and not the multinationals—the international rapists. I do not see fit to call them developers.

There is no benefit in the sale of gas to Japan for the ordinary people that will walk past this building to catch the train to the western suburbs tonight. There is nothing in it but the penalty of tax. If we go down to Port Noarlunga we find that the oil companies pay no tax. Parliament from time to time raises that sum of money the oil company pays by the indenture. I do not know what the Noarlunga council gets out of it. I think it is a lousy amount. What is interesting and has been overlooked by the Parliament is that the previous Government saw fit to have a Royal Commission in respect of an indenture. It was not an indenture of a multinational mining company but rather that of a football ground in the western suburbs because the Government had underwritten $2 000 000. That judgment is very interesting indeed.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, Sir John, you may well take that aboard. It was considered that Parliament never had the power to interfere with the indentures, but more important were the royalties of the B.H.P. way back when they started to get iron ore on Eyre Peninsula. That judgment gives the Parliament rights and clearly confirms and supports the view that Parliament now has the right to increase the royalties. If we are going to think about giving indentures to Roxby Downs to allow all sorts of things to be built, minds can boggle. It can be for mines, harbors, roads, air fields and all sorts of things. All of the taxpayers' money is going in to support a multi-million dollar programme which is intent only on obtaining wealth for that organisation. Mr Davis now comes into the Chamber and

no doubt he will tell me that it is good for the State and that Roxby Downs will be a goer. It was only last year that every multi-national company in the world was beating a path to the doors of this country and the Stock Exchange to buy Rundle shale shares. It was the great multinational success story. The Hon. Mr Davis cannot even flog his shares.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: He has not got any.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: When we were interstate, between the two of you, you were beating a path to the Stock Exchange in every capital city. The Government ought to recognise that headlines telling us that billions and billions of dollars are pouring into the country and that there will be a separation of that wealth that will trickle to the masses is fanciful thinking.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Do you support Roxby Downs?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I cannot support it, because it is a hole in the ground. So-called development can be spelled out clearly when one looks at Queensland, from which coal is exported in huge quantities. The State Government gets its revenue not from royalties or payments under indenture agreements but from contracts with the Queensland-owned State railways.

If I suggested that this State ought to own Roxby Downs, members opposite would say that I was on the old socialist waggon again. This Government is not going to strangle the programme that has B.P. money in it, but that company is owned largely by British taxpayers.

I refer now to the Murray River and the attitude of the leaders of this State to it. Mr Tonkin referred to commemorating the sesquicentenary of the State. He said that we should make a great study of the Murray River and relate it to the next celebration. That is as far as the Government has gone. It appears that the problems of the Murray are receding because more water is likely to flow in in the next few months as a result of the abnormal winter interstate. There should be a debate in the Parliament about a Bill seeking a firm and proper undertaking by the Federal Government to accept its responsibility under the Constitution for the principal waterway in the country as far as South Australia is concerned.

Much has been said about leaked documents. People have been finger-printed and now they are to scrawl their signatures and write an essay. Every time the Opposition raises a matter, the Government seems to think that the information has come from a leaked document. During the recent court case on wages, which was initiated by Cabinet through Mr Brown, in an endeavour to deny the workers of this State a .9 per cent increase in their wages, the Government brought Professor Donovan, Mr Ruse, and others to give a great deal of evidence, but the Government found that all the answers given under cross-examination blew its case. Statements were made on what the departments from which the witnesses came were about, and much of the information is available in the transcript of those proceedings for everyone to read. There can be no suggestion that that information fell off the back of a truck.

I will end on the note that unemployment in South Australia is almost double the official figure. In fact, unemployment in the whole Commonwealth is almost double the official figure. That is an extremely sorry state of affairs. The social security bill is staggering and it is almost time there was an input into the funding in those areas to allow proper increases in a wide area of age benefits. The Government stupidly removed the wealth tax. This allowed people to walk into a Stock Exchange and make $16 000 000 without paying 1c in tax. They seemed to me to be greater criminals than persons appearing before the Criminal Court. That amount was made in one deal in Elders.

The wealth tax ought to be paid directly to education, where it is necessary. If revenue is lost by the Federal Government because of what it is doing in respect of the number of individuals who do not pay tax, it is time we thought of imposing a tax where high technology is displacing the labour force. Is it any wonder that people consider that they are less important than the machine?

The State has some limitations in respect of this matter. There should be a higher export tax on live sheep, because slaughterhouses all over the country are closing down. I challenge members opposite to set up a Select Committee to examine the matter of the export of live sheep. If they do, they will be amazed at what they are told.

In fact, I urge members opposite to look at a letter published in this morning's paper from a group of very well-respected, intelligent and leading trade unionists in this country. Members opposite should meet Arthur Tonkin, who is accepted by many as an authority on this industry.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: He was not accepted by the union during the last dispute.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In the last dispute the union was broken and harrassed by a stupid group of leaderless cockies. I went to Wallaroo and saw what was happening there. If people had been walking down North Terrace with crowbars down their trouser legs, members opposite would have been screaming for six months. When I was in Wallaroo I saw people with barbed wire wrapped around wooden poles. The police should have arrested them. There would have been no trailer moved from Bolivar to Wallaroo if I had been an industrialist on a picket line. The bolt-cutters would certainly have been out. That trailer would not have been moved, but would still have been there.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You were there.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, I was not. That was after I was in Wallaroo. It was not true, as a newspaper reported and later retracted, that live sheep were loaded by cockies' sons in Wallaroo. The sheep were loaded by waterside workers. During the early 1960's, when Mr Playford was still in power, I was working on the waterfront. At that time we never worked on Sundays but we broke a long-standing agreement and worked on that day to load live sheep for the first time. Playford talked to Elders, and the waterside workers were not to have a man on the job. We then went on strike and were allowed to work. That was the first time live sheep were loaded for that particular purpose. The live sheep trade has now reached mammoth proportions and is now quite out of balance.

The balance was struck by agreement: so many live sheep and so many carcasses. Of course, two or three unscrupulous members of the farmers and graziers organisation prostituted that particular agreement to such an extent that the live sheep trade is now all out of proportion. The industry and this country will rue the day that that happened.

I come back to the point that the Hon. Mr Carnie is a responsible member of the Government who has served on a previous Select Committee in relation to the abattoirs. I recommend that the Hon. Mr Carnie be Chairman of any similar Select Committee because he has some knowledge of the issue. This is a matter that will come before this State with all its false emotionalism. It is an issue which represents the export of jobs out of South Australia. Live sheep export in its present proportion represents the export of jobs and salaries and wages out of South Australia. It is a mammoth loss.

I would like to see the Government take the initiative on this particular question and not leave it to the boasting of someone who thinks he broke a strike. In a strike situation workers may well gain their point but it costs them a great deal to do it. They have no redress but to strike. That does not only apply to workers but to all professional groups. No

matter what the profession, they all get what they consider to be their share of the cake.

The Government is in for a very torrid time during the remainder of its term. It now has to deliver the goods and come up with a system that will distribute more evenly the salary and wages of this State. When the Premier goes to Canberra next week he should not be going over there to do Mr Fraser's dirty work. The Premier has a problem in his own State and he should pay very strict attention to that instead of going on about stolen or leaked documents and the harassment of public servants. I point out that if public servants want to take the risk and indulge in that practice they are aware of the consequences if they are found out. In conclusion, I ask the Minister of Community Welfare when he is likely to tell the true story of why an officer of his department was moved from Oodnadatta. Was that move connected with the pastoral land report that I recently referred to in this Council?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 18 August at 2.15 p.m.