

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 October 1981

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated Royal assent to the following Bills:

Constitution Act Amendment,
Governor's Pensions Act Amendment.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Irrigation Act Amendment (No. 2),
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 4),
Community Welfare Act Amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**PETROLEUM SUBMERGED LANDS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DEMOLITION

A petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia praying that the House stop any further demolition of residential buildings for the purpose of commercial expansion in residential and semi-residential areas of Adelaide and amend the City of Adelaide Development Control Act accordingly was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 103 council, staff and parents of Goodwood Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to substantially increase the Budget allocation for education and provide additional funds for the maintenance of priority project programmes at Goodwood Primary School was presented by Mr Langley.

Petition received.

PETITION: SWIMMING POOL

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for a heated therapeutic swimming pool at the headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 47 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr Whitten.

Petition received.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the severity of penalties for serious crimes, especially rape, and grant the Police Department more power to act in such cases was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL COSTS

Petitions signed by 3 680 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs were presented by the Hons H. Allison, D. C. Brown, R. G. Payne, M. M. Wilson, and J. D. Wright, and Messrs Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, Becker, Max Brown, Glazbrook, Hamilton, Hoppood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Oswald, and Trainer.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to questions asked both in the Estimates Committees and in the House, as detailed in the schedule which I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all the questions on the Notice Paper except Nos. 5, 15, 73, 80, 88, 95, 139, 144, 152, 154, 156, 171, 176, 179, 191, 195, 196, 198, 201, 202 and 204.

LAND EASEMENT

In reply to Mr **OLSEN** (23 September).

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: The value of a transmission line easement is determined in accordance with principles laid down in the Land Acquisition Act. In the case of farming land the value is related mainly to any loss of productivity involved which depends largely upon the number of towers and their position on the property. The total costs for the various line routes given in the environmental impact statement for the proposed Port Augusta to Adelaide 275 000-volt transmission line allow for easement costs. In all cases these are small in relation to overall costs and are not a significant factor.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY LINE

In reply to **Mr O'NEILL** (23 September).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is Australian National's intention to sell 19 of the 25 steel cars now on broad gauge, as the need to maintain these cars no longer exists. The cars to be sold are nos. 500, 502/3, 601/7, 700/1, 706/10, 713/4 and those to be retained are 702/4, 711, 712 and 715.

An investigation of rolling stock needs present and future indicates that service can be maintained at the required level by holding six steel cars in service to provide accommodation on the rare occasions when the Bluebird rail cars cannot handle the passenger traffic offering.

Currently, the Victor Harbor service is operated by Bluebird rail cars and the steel cars are used on occasions in holiday peak periods to handle the abnormal flow of passengers. The last time this was necessary was during the Easter weekend earlier this year. The six cars remaining in traffic are sufficient to meet these needs. Steel cars have operated on various services over the years and are not maintained specifically for the Victor Harbor line.

The 19 cars have been offered for sale to two known interested parties, namely, Steam Age Australia Pty Ltd and Steam Ranger Tours. Steam Age are a Victorian-based organisation and have shown a keen interest in obtaining the 19 cars available, although they realise the interest Steam Ranger have in these cars and are prepared to settle for a lesser number in order that Steam Ranger can participate in the sale.

The final outcome of negotiations now hinges on Steam Ranger matching the Steam Age cash offer of \$7 500 per car. However, you can be assured that every effort will be made, bearing in mind A.N.'s commercial constraints, to satisfy all parties concerned prior to a final decision being made in this matter.

It is not the intention of A.N. to vary the service to Victor Harbor at this time, although the timetabling of these passenger trains is being reviewed with the idea of improving running times to make these trains more attractive to the tourist trade.

ALFRED STREET COTTAGES

In reply to the **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (24 September).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Because of the decision of the City of Adelaide Planning Tribunal to permit an application for an extension of a warehouse and carpark made on 14 August 1981, there is no way the Minister could intervene. The Heritage Committee was 'of the opinion that while it had stated that the two cottages were not of sufficient heritage significance to warrant entering on the Register of State Heritage Items, Alfred Street itself does have some heritage value, and is deserving of consideration as such'. The Heritage Conservation Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning is currently studying Alfred Street to determine whether it is eligible for declaration as a heritage area.

ROYALTIES

In reply to the **Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (16 September).

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The royalty based on production of petroleum (gas and liquids) from the Cooper Basin alone, is expected to be in excess of \$40 000 000 by 1985; of coal, \$1 500 000; and other minerals, \$1 500 000. The royalties which might be derived from other new mineral resource developments and which have been foreshadowed

(Roxby Downs, Beverley and Honeymoon) have not been included and will be dependent on a number of factors including rate and commodity prices prevailing at that time and the scale and timing of production.

WOMEN'S STUDIES RESOURCE CENTRE

In reply to **Mr TRAINER** (24 September).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Funding for the Women's Studies Resource Centre has varied in both source and amount over its six years of operation: initially a grant from the International Women's Year Committee, then the Education Department, the Schools Commission and lately the Education Minister's Miscellaneous Grants funds.

I have requested that a review be undertaken of the funding source and requirements. Representatives from the Departments of Education, Further Education, Premier's and Local Government and a representative of the Women's Studies Resource Centre are to be involved in a working party. The Executive Director of the Ministry of Education will be the Chairman of this Working Party. Further information will be provided when the findings of the Working Party are known.

MEDICAL RESEARCH BENEFITS

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (24 September).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The South Australian Health Commission has investigated the medical research benefits of the positive emission tomography scanner (P.E.T.). P.E.T. scanning is a new form of medical imaging that is essentially in a research and development stage, despite the fact that it is being used in some medical centres in North America and the United Kingdom and also despite the fact that first generation scanners are commercially available.

The uses of the scanner, as indicated in the *Time* magazine article are principally in research rather than diagnosis and treatment. It is likely that over the next few years refinements and developments will occur at a rapid rate and the equipment available today will be considerably improved. I point out that the radionucleo tides required in a positron emission tomography unit also require the adjacent availability of a cyclotron to manufacture the radionucleo tides for use in the P.E.T. scanner.

At present the minimal investment is in the order of \$2 000 000 and the uses to which a P.E.T. scanner could be put for the provision of medical care in South Australia at this time make it a low priority.

The South Australian Health Commission has sponsored overseas visits by two consultants this year to examine P.E.T. scanning and the information provided is on the basis of available world literature and the assessments of those consultants of the use of P.E.T. scanning at the present time. The matter is being kept under continuing review and when it is considered that such equipment will produce significant benefits to the South Australian community then the South Australian Health Commission will recommend that it be purchased.

GENETIC DISEASES

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (17 September).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The two universities in the Science Divisions undertake highly specialised basic research into various aspects of genetics and the teaching hospitals undertake clinical research and basic research into

genetic disease. Various paediatricians, obstetricians, haematologists and other specialists conduct ongoing clinical studies into the various genetic diseases which relate to their own specialties. Epidemiological studies into genetic diseases are being undertaken by the C.S.I.R.O. and the Public Health Services of the South Australian Health Commission into the incidence and aetiology of genetic diseases in the particular areas of Port Pirie and Mount Gambier. In general, epidemiological studies are also being undertaken by the Medical Genetics Department at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. In addition the Perinatal Statistics Unit of the South Australian Health Commission is collaborating with the National Perinatal Statistics Unit in the study of congenital abnormalities, including those due to genetic diseases, as part of an Australia-wide study.

Flinders Medical Centre, the Queen Victoria Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital have only recently completed a collaborative study on mutagenic effects of alcohol, drugs and smoking on fetus. This report is presently in press.

The Cytogenetics Laboratory at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is continuing genetic research studies in the following areas; chromosomal variants and abnormalities and reproductive failure; monoclonal antibody studies into neural tube defects and various chromosomal abnormalities; mutagenic effects of substance abuse on the fetus; chromosome study of families with Down's syndrome.

A collaborative study has been in progress since 1978 between the Department of Chemical Pathology at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and obstetricians at Flinders Medical Centre and Modbury, Queen Victoria and The Queen Elizabeth Hospitals into the pre-natal diagnosis of neural tube defects.

The Adelaide Children's Hospital Departments' of Cytogenetics, Chemical Pathology and Histopathology are also involved in a considerable number of research studies and they are as follows:

Cytogenetics Department

Prophase banding of Chromosomes; Population Cytogenetics and Clinical Significance of Fragile Sites; Studies on Families with Heritable Fragile Sites on their Chromosomes; Studies on Fragile Sites on Human Chromosomes from Skin Fibroblasts; D.N.A. Damage in Multiple Sclerosis; Genetic Marker Studies on Families with Fragile Sites.

Histopathology Department

Testing of Albino patients by Electron Microscopy of Skin and Hair Bulbs.

Chemical Pathology Department

The spontaneous occurrence of the gene for the Hunter Syndrome; Diagnostic enzymology of the Sanfilippo A, B and C Syndromes; Phenotype prediction in Mucopolysaccharidosis Type I; Inherited disorders of (muco-) polysaccharide catabolism: detection and identification of basic defects of uronic acid exo-hydrolases; Diagnosis of Morquio and Maroteaux-Lamy Syndromes.

Furthermore, preliminary work is also being carried out into the following genetic studies: enzymological diagnosis of adrenoleukodystrophy; enzymological diagnosis of sphingomyelin storage disease.

This is not necessarily a complete list of genetic research being undertaken in South Australia but I believe the honourable member will be as pleased as I am to know that so much concern and interest has been shown by the clinical research scientists in this State into the various causes and methods of diagnosis of genetic disease.

BLOOD LEAD LEVELS

In reply to **Mr KENEALLY** (19 August).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In my preliminary comment on the question asked by the honourable member, I alluded to the study being carried out by the South Australian Health Commission in Port Pirie to assess the relationship, if any, between marginally elevated blood levels and child development. This study is funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council and is considered of international importance. Whilst there is clear evidence that prolonged elevation of blood lead levels above 60-70 ug/100 ml may have harmful effects on the intellectual development of children, there is a great deal of uncertainty about any possible effects of levels in the range of 30-60 ug/100 ml. The scientific literature contains many conflicting reports arising from previous studies and the Port Pirie study has been designed with considerable attention being given to overcoming methodological criticisms inherent in previous studies.

From the results thus far no pregnant woman enrolled in the study has been found to have a lead level elevated into the harmful range; indeed very few have been found to exceed 30 ug/100 ml, which is regarded as the upper limit of the normal range.

Only one child in the study has been found to have a level above 60 ug/100 ml. This is a 15-month-old toddler living in an environment known to be lead contaminated. The child has been treated at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Some of the other 15-month-old children have been found to have levels between 30 and 60 ug/100 ml and appropriate environmental and dietary advice has been given to the families by the local board of health and the children's family doctors, according to recommendations prepared by the research team and the Public Health Service.

Judging by the data emerging from the study it would seem that the earliest age at which lead levels may cause concern is 15 months. This is the age when contamination from the soil is most likely due to the childhood habit of pica (eating dirt). Pica has been found to be by far the most common cause of elevated blood lead levels in children from any environmental source.

At this stage officers of the South Australian Health Commission are discussing with members of the research team the need for an extension to the study in order to undertake a further sample survey of children between the ages of 15 months and five years to assess the possible degree of elevated blood lead levels due to environmental factors, and their persistence.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Panorama Community College Redevelopment,
Port Adelaide—Wharf and Approach Channel (Eglo Engineering Pty Ltd.)

Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I wish to give to the House information about the Constitutional Conference which the Government is convening in Parliament House on 27 and 28 November of this year. Members will recall that at the 1979 election, called almost 18 months early by the then Premier, one of the key election issues was whether or not a Government should be able to call an early election purely on the basis of political expediency. Undoubtedly, the decision to call an early election, immediately following two very early State elections in 1975 and 1977, contributed to the defeat of the A.L.P. Government. During the 1979 election campaign the then Liberal Opposition undertook to investigate ways of preventing Governments going to early polls, and indicated that it would convene a Constitutional Convention to consider the topic.

Since that election, it has become clear that there are several other issues which could also be discussed at such a conference. As there has not been a substantial review of our State's Constitution for many years, it is appropriate that the issue of State constitutional reform in general with special emphasis on the role of the States, their status and powers be discussed. It is also appropriate, especially in light of the recent New South Wales referendum, media and general public interest in the question of four-year terms of office, that this be combined with the related issue of early elections at the conference.

His Excellency the Governor, Sir Keith Seaman, will open the conference and has kindly offered to host a reception at Government House for the conference members at 5.30 p.m. on Friday 27 November. Professor Alex Castles, a distinguished and well-known constitutional lawyer and academic from the University of Adelaide, will deliver a paper on State constitutional reform in general, and Dr Colin Hughes, an equally distinguished lawyer and political scientist, will present a paper on ways of preventing early elections and on the related topic of four-year terms of office.

There will be two commentators on each paper and there will be ample opportunities for questions and discussions on the issues raised. The Government hopes that the conference will not engage in political point-scoring but that it will be a sensible forum for airing constructive proposals. The Constitutional conference will have a membership of between 35 and 40 people, with participants from all the major political Parties, including representatives from the Commonwealth Parliament and from the Parties' organisational wings.

The Attorney-General has written to the appropriate persons representing each of these groups inviting participation. The membership from State Government will be: five from the Government Party, four from the Opposition, one Australian Democrat and one Country Party representative; from the South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament: one Liberal, one Australian Labor Party, one Australian Democrat; and one from each of the Party organisations of the Liberal Party, Australian Labor Party, Australian Democrats and Country Party.

In view of the importance that local government has within our community and its recognition in the Constitution Act, local government has been invited to participate in the conference. The Attorney-General has written to the President of the Local Government Association seeking the participation of eight representatives who are presently elected members of local government. In making that selection it is expected that men and women with a range of interests and from various parts of the State would be chosen. To enable members of the public with an interest in the topics being discussed to participate, but who are not represented in any other way, the Government has advertised for 10 members chosen from the general community.

When nominations are received, 10 persons will be selected to attend.

The Leader in another place has criticised the conference because it coincides with an A.L.P. Convention. I regret that this has occurred, but planning for the Constitutional Conference was already too far advanced when we became aware of the potential conflict. Considerable warning was given by answers to questions in this House and in the media that the Constitutional Conference would be held towards the end of November 1981. Unfortunately, it is not possible to change the dates of this conference, but I am confident that the Labor Party would be able to be adequately represented.

The Constitutional Conference is an important conference. It is the first of its type to be held in our history and it provides a unique opportunity for discussing reforms to our Constitution. Proposals which appear to have broad support at the conference will be carefully considered by the Government. In convening this conference the Government has honoured yet another election pledge.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BROMPTON HOUSING

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In this House on 1 October the member for Napier supported a question to the Premier with information that was incomplete and inaccurate. In the manner so often employed by the Opposition, he attempted to revive the dead issue of rehousing for tenants—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If members opposite listen to the statement, they will be appropriately embarrassed when they hear the facts. In the manner so often employed by the Opposition, the member for Napier attempted to revive the dead issue of rehousing for tenants of 14 substandard dwellings taken over by Detmold Pty Ltd from the Highways Department. The facts are these: two companies, Detmold and Gerards, were interested in locating new manufacturing operations in the Brompton area.

These moves promised new jobs, a new industry, and new manufactured goods produced in South Australia. The Government, through several of its departments, facilitated the sale of a number of old Highways Department houses to Detmold Pty Ltd to enable significant redevelopment to take place. At the same time, assurances were given that existing tenants would be given every assistance by the company and the South Australian Housing Trust to find suitable alternative accommodation.

Public announcement of the sale and intended demolition of the 14 houses was made in May of this year. I repeat that: in May of this year. At the same time, the Highways Department wrote to all tenants in the following terms and I quote from its letter, as follows:

It is likely that in due course your new landlord will require you to vacate the premises. C. P. Detmold Pty Ltd has given an assurance that you will not be disadvantaged by any such action. However, should you have any problem in obtaining alternate accommodation you should contact the South Australian Housing Trust for assistance.

The letter, dated 14 May, goes on to name a liaison officer in the Highways Department. Tenants were invited to contact this man should they have had any inquiries about their new housing status: hardly an uncaring attitude on the part of the Government and the Highways Department.

May I remind the House of a letter written by an ex tenant expressing gratitude for assistance rendered to him

in finding alternative housing. The text of this letter was included in my Ministerial statement on this subject on 18 August. Let me again quote from that letter, which read:

... We feel we must write and thank you for your respect and co-operation in this matter, above all, in your consideration to help rehouse we as tenants.

I would stress that the efforts of the company and Government departments mentioned in that letter were in train in May of this year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Just listen to these facts, because these are the pertinent parts, which I am sure the member for Napier is going to be embarrassed by. The clear implication of the question of the member for Napier to the Premier was that this Government was insensitive to the plight of a lady and her child living in substandard housing; in fact, the tenant to whom he referred moved into the house in June this year, after the houses had been transferred to the Highways Department, and after the notification that they were to be demolished. She moved in in June, in the knowledge that the houses were to be demolished and that she would have to seek other accommodation. The Housing Trust was aware of her need, and was advised by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security on 28 September—three days before the honourable member's question—that it considered this tenant a suitable applicant for priority housing. The trust interviewed her on 2 October to assess her requirements, and on 10 October she moved into a trust house in the suburb of her choice. In other words, the administrative process to provide priority housing to this tenant was well under way when the member for Napier asked his question.

Mr Hemmings: I dispute that.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I challenge the honourable member to deny the facts that I have raised here this afternoon. He knows only too well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister has sought leave to make a Ministerial statement, not to enter into a debate.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I specifically asked that any instance of hardship be brought to my attention. No such approach was made by the member for Napier. Had the honourable member bothered to contact the trust, he would certainly have been told of the moves already afoot to help this lady. However, I must confess that I choose to think that the members opposite will continue to raise matters which they know are being competently managed, as they clutch at straws in efforts to convince themselves and possibly even the public that they try to constitute an effective Opposition in this State.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Ethnic Affairs (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission—Report, 1981.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—Regulations—Various.
11. Education, Director-General of—Report, 1980.

111. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Resignation of Teachers.

114. Registration of Non-Government Schools.

115. Salisbury College of Advanced Education—Report, 1980.

116. Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—Regulations—Various.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Firearms Act, 1977—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Swan Reach Zoning.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1981.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—

1. Report, 1980-81.

11. Auditor-General's Report on, 1980-81.

111. Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976—Regulations—PET Containers.

114. Building Act, 1970-1976—Regulations—Inspection of Wet Areas.

115. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981—Metropolitan Development Plan—City of Burnside Planning Regulations—Zoning.

116. South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1980-81.

117. West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report on, 1980-81.

118. City of Salisbury—By-law No. 7—Control of Vehicles.

119. Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1980-81.

120. Museum Board—Report, 1980-81.

121. Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—

1. Crosswalks.

11. Carrying Dangerous Substances.

111. Highways Department—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1981.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—

1. Fees.

11. Fees for Services.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

That in view of the demonstrated incompetence and inefficiency of the Chief Secretary and the continued failure of the Premier to take any action to relieve him of his portfolios, this House has no confidence in the Chief Secretary and calls on him to resign forthwith.

It is usual, in cases when the Opposition seeks to move a motion of no confidence in either the Government or an individual Minister, for the Government to accept the challenge thrown down in that case and to allow debate to proceed. One of the precepts of the Westminster tradition of government is that the Government survives by the

confidence of the House and that it is the prerogative of the Opposition, and the custom for it to do so, for it to periodically test that confidence where particular circumstances require it by moving votes of no confidence.

In this instance, in relation to the performance of the Chief Secretary, irrespective of any opinions or views held by members as to the personal qualities and experience of the Chief Secretary, there has been continuing and wide-ranging criticism of the administration of his portfolios. It is for that reason that we seek to have Standing Orders suspended to move a motion of no confidence. In doing that we are acting in the traditions of this place. There is a wide expectation abroad that this matter be tested on the floor of this House, and it is the responsibility of the Opposition to so test it. In fact, the Government is refusing to allow it to do so, and in doing so is really demonstrating the ultimate cover-up that it is attempting to indulge in.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Who said so?

Mr Bannon: The Premier interjects 'Who said so?' That is very interesting. The person who said so was the Minister in charge of Government business in this place, namely, the Deputy Premier, who informed my Deputy, on being advised of the no-confidence motion, that it would not be allowed. If, in fact, after listening to my reasons in support of the motion, the Government does see its way clear to allowing such debate, well and good. There are certainly many matters to be canvassed at some length in relation to this matter. However, our advice was that the Government would be refusing us the opportunity to debate the matter. If that position has changed we will be very glad to hear it. I must say that, in that instance, one would see that the Government would be responding not just to the uproar among the press and in public opinion on this issue, but responding to the constitutional requirements, the normal courtesies of this House.

We will see whether the ultimate cover-up is to occur or whether it is not. It was stated by the Leader of the House in response to my Deputy that there would be ample opportunity for us to canvass the matters as they came from the Estimates Committees and to move a reduction of a line or a vote of no confidence in the course of that debate. We have not chosen to take that course of action, because in these circumstances that is quite inadequate.

It is inadequate, first, as to timing: it is vital that this matter be debated immediately, that the debate be concluded, and that a vote be taken so that we can test the matter firmly today. That is not possible under the procedures of the third reading debate on the Estimate Committees reports, and the Premier well knows that. We will go through a debate on two Committees, a conjoint debate which will allow every member an opportunity to speak, if he so wishes. In the course of the debate we can move such motions and they will be debated and voted on at the conclusion of the debate. That is how the procedure has been handled. That procedure has the immediate disadvantage that the matter cannot be fully canvassed and concluded today, and it is vital that it is, because it is a matter of urgency. The Opposition totally rejects that excuse for the cover-up that the Government intends to promote.

The second very important point involved is that, if we are not to have a debate in the formal no-confidence sense, the Government is not really required to answer. Certainly, at the end of the Budget debate the Premier can speak, to summarise and answer the points raised, but there are many, many points, and by that time the matter of the Chief Secretary will have been lost in the general issues raised, the many issues that came out of the Estimates Committee procedures. What is required by this House is, first, for the Premier to stand up and justify directly, and

to the point, why he has chosen to overlook these complete failures, these blunders, these incompetencies—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Leader has sought leave to suspend Standing Orders—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! He has been given ample opportunity to canvass the reasons. I would ask him not to get into a debate on the issues that he will raise if suspension is granted.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Without canvassing the issues that would be raised, the point I was making was that the Premier would be required to deal directly with those issues. The second thing is that the Chief Secretary himself, as the subject of the motion, would also be required to answer, immediately and directly, any accusations made and the substance of the motion. That is the crucial point of this no-confidence debate. If such a debate is held, we will get the attempts at those answers. We may even get the Chief Secretary's resignation—who knows? But that is what would occur. However, if we are required to do it under this totally inadequate procedure of the Budget Estimates third reading debate, the Chief Secretary can simply sit on his hands, as, unfortunately, he has done so often in so many such circumstances.

He will be able to sit it out and remain silent. So, he is not required to stand and personally defend his record, as he would be if the debate were to proceed in the usual way. Clearly, that is why the Government is not acceding to this suspension of Standing Orders; clearly, it is a protective mechanism. The excuse given that we have some other procedure, some other form, is totally without substance. We are challenging the Government, by this motion for suspension, to stand up in this place and justify why it is prepared to see this vital area of public administration so badly handled.

That, I believe, is our prerogative as an Opposition to move and have answered, and it is the public's right to hear the Government state its reasons, and attempt to muster its defence. That is what this Parliamentary procedure is all about. For that not to be allowed in the proper and usual constitutional way indicates how hopelessly inadequate are the Government's arguments; how insecure it is in that it is not prepared to stand up and be counted in this way, in direct face to face debate; and how weak its case for support of the Chief Secretary must be if, first, Government members will not answer it directly through the Premier and, secondly, if they will gag the Chief Secretary himself. It exposes once and for all that this Government is not able to stand up to the surveillance of this Parliament, the press or the public.

I challenge the Government to accept this motion, to reverse the decision that was conveyed to us and to allow the suspension so that we can proceed to debate the matter here and now, have it answered here and now, and have a vote taken, so that we know where we stand.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole—

Mr Langley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley will cease interjecting whilst the Speaker is on his feet. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders. In doing so, I would like to correct the Leader of the Opposition in a number of obvious misapprehensions that he has about the traditions of this House. He accuses the Government of not

accepting the challenge by not carrying on with the no-confidence debate at present. I make the point that we are allowing the debate at the proper time; that will be in something less than an hour from now.

Normally, there would be no question. Even when we were telephoned as late as 12.55 p.m., as we were today, under normal circumstances there would be no question at all of not allowing such a debate to proceed, although I must point out to the Leader that one of his predecessors, when in Government, did refuse a motion of no confidence, and also deferred another motion of no confidence until the following day. So, the Leader is in error there.

He is in error when he refers to the discussions that will come on in this place, the motions that reports of the Estimates Committee be noted, as third reading debates. They are not. There will be ample opportunity for any matter that needs to come forward to be debated.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Finally, as the member for Mitcham, who has been here for so many years that his beard is now grey, well knows, a move to reduce the amount of one line is traditionally regarded as a motion of no confidence.

Mr Millhouse: Are you going to give ample time—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He knows perfectly well that that is so. He also knows full well that the debate that will be coming on is scheduled to last some three days, if the Opposition wants it to. It is up to the Opposition when the debate will finish, when a vote is taken on the matter of reducing the Chief Secretary's line, and when it has ventilated all the matters it says it wants to. Three days is available for debate and when the vote is taken it is entirely up to the Opposition. There is no point in duplicating that now, when three days of debate has been set down for that purpose, and will be available in something less than three quarters of an hour.

The Opposition is grandstanding. There is no justification at all for depriving honourable members of Question Time. I find an amazing lack of consistency in the Opposition's attitude. Members opposite want to sacrifice Question Time, something which they say that they treasure very highly, when an ample opportunity exists for them to do all the other things in less than an hour.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no question that this is purely grandstanding. I am fascinated to see from the records of the Estimates Committees that the Opposition was goaded into taking action at that time by the member for Mitcham, and he obviously is in for his chop now, too. He will have every opportunity at the proper time, and not before.

All I can say is that this is clear evidence that the Opposition is purely grandstanding. Obviously, it does not expect the House to agree with the suspension of Standing Orders which it has moved. It also brings into very serious question its motives for introducing a motion of no confidence, either now or at the appropriate time a little later in the afternoon. Members opposite have grandstanded now, and they will obviously be obliged to proceed at the proper time. Let me give an undertaking that, as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I will most certainly be answering the disgraceful allegations that have been made by the Opposition about the South Australian Police Force.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'. I believe the Noes have it. There being a dissentient voice, a division is necessary. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE FORCE

Mr BANNON: Did the Chief Secretary deliberately and consciously mislead the Parliamentary Estimates Committee last week when he said that allegations of police corruption were made to the Attorney-General and not personally to him? I have been reliably informed today that allegations about police corruption were made to the Chief Secretary and his department between eight and 12 months ago but that the Minister, in a gross dereliction of duty, did not act. I understand that information concerning these allegations of police corruption came from citizens and police officers, as well as from people who had themselves been convicted of offences. I am told that one police officer was so concerned about a matter involving several of his colleagues in relation to drugs that that officer tried to see the Minister privately, but this was refused. I also understand that earlier this year a business man went to see the Minister personally with allegations about a relationship between a drug dealer and a police officer and that the Minister promised to investigate. I understand, however, that no proper investigation was undertaken.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The answer is 'No'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will assist the House if he is silent.

RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Transport clarify the uncertainty presently felt by some of my constituents in relation to the Government's proposal for a rapid transit system to service the north-eastern suburbs? I have been approached by constituents who are somewhat concerned at allegations made by both members of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham. These allegations tend to conflict greatly both with statements made on behalf of the Government and with statements previously made by members of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham. For example, some members of the Opposition are advocating a return to l.r.t., and others are stating that no rapid transit system is needed. The member for Mitcham, when the previous Government was in power, was a strong critic of l.r.t. Now he supports l.r.t. Many constituents have also expressed their concern about the effect that the combined opposition of the A.L.P. and the Democrats could have on the future of a rapid transit system to service the north-eastern suburbs.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not blame the honourable member's constituents for being confused on this matter. There is no doubt that at the moment the Opposition does not have a clear policy on the situation, although I do not know whether we are talking about the official Oppo-

sition or the member for Mitcham, who tends to be leading the Opposition at this stage.

Mr Becker: The tail wagging the dog.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The tail wagging the dog, as the member for Hanson reminds me. At the last State election the policy of the Opposition was that an l.r.t. was to be built from the north-eastern suburbs to the city, travelling along the same route as the present Government's proposed busway, then at Park Terrace deviating from that route, travelling through the parklands of Lower North Adelaide and along King William Street, and entering a tunnel near the parade grounds. That proposition is worth about \$140 000 000 in today's values. That is what the people at the last election understood. They also understood that this Government would introduce a different form of rapid transit system, a guided busway, at half the cost. That is what this Government has done.

On the appointment of the original shadow Minister of Transport, the member for Elizabeth, I understand that the honourable member addressed a meeting in St Peters, and I admit that it was while I was away overseas, but I understand from press reports of that meeting that the member for Elizabeth showed that he would be prepared to investigate again the proposition involving the Northfield railway extension. I think he said—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I said you may be so far down the track by the next election that we would not be able to do anything but proceed.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I agree that you said that, but I believe you also said that the Northfield railway extension deserved further investigation.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The transcript of that meeting shows that.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Let me put on the record that the cost of the Northfield railway extension today is about \$96 000 000. If any member thinks that that is a cheap system let him think that. Since the appointment of the new shadow Minister, I understand that the new shadow Minister has veered back towards the l.r.t., at least, that is the impression I got from speaking to him on a talk-back programme the other day. I think that that is the Opposition's policy, but I cannot be sure, because I understand that there is a gentleman running around St Peters who is a member of the Labor Party's State Conference and who is saying otherwise. He is saying that the Labor Party would do away with the l.r.t. and the busway and have no rapid transit system at all. That is what has been reported to me.

Mr Langley: Why don't you name him?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Unlike members opposite, we on this side of the House do not name people under the protection of Parliamentary privilege. Mr Speaker, you cannot blame the residents of Tea Tree Gully for being confused, because if the Opposition is not going to provide a rapid transit system for the people of Tea Tree Gully let it say so, and let the people be in no doubt about what will happen. The member for Mitcham has just announced in the last few weeks that the Australian Democrats will run a candidate in, I think, the seat of Todd. The Democrats have made great play of the fact that they will run a candidate in the seat of Todd. Let me recapitulate on the member for Mitcham's attitude to the previous Government's l.r.t. scheme.

About 3½ years ago the honourable member said that the former Government's l.r.t. scheme was not on and that the State could not afford it. We on this side agree with that statement: the State cannot afford it. Whatever the benefits of that scheme, the State cannot afford it. The member for Mitcham made it plain that the Australian

Democrats were opposed to the l.r.t., and recently he said that he also opposed the busway. What does the member for Mitcham want for the people of Tea Tree Gully? Does he want any rapid transit system at all to the north-east, or does he not? Does he want the Northfield rail which is now costed at \$96 000 000, or does he want an upgrading of bus services on the North-East Road? Once again the people of Tea Tree Gully need to know what the candidate for the Australian Democrats in Tea Tree Gully, in the electorate of Todd, supports. Is it no rapid transit system? If so, let them say so.

POLICE FORCE

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Chief Secretary say whether he was ever informed by a fellow Cabinet Minister, other than the Attorney-General, about allegations of corruption by several officers in the Police Force, and, if he was, what action, if any, did the Minister take to investigate these allegations? I understand that some 12 months ago a Cabinet Minister was given information that he thought important enough to raise with the Chief Secretary, but once again I understand that no proper investigation was undertaken until the *Advertiser* provided the Attorney-General with information and published material about allegations of police corruption, and it was the Attorney-General who finally was forced to initiate inquiries, not the Minister responsible for the Police Force, who last week, in a bizarre admission of his dereliction of duty, said he did not know the terms of reference for the inquiry into police corruption because they had not been relayed to him.

He said he did not know what the terms of reference were for an inquiry concerning grave allegations about officers in his own department, and then, in a strange turn-around, a Government back-bencher told the Committee that, in fact, there were no terms of reference. Apparently, that back-bencher knew more about what was going on than the Minister himself knew.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Obviously, members opposite are continuing to carry on this witch hunt, which reflects on the police in this State. The Deputy Leader (and I would have thought better than that of him) is asking me whether I was informed by a Cabinet colleague of allegations of corruption, and I do not recall ever having any such conversation with any of my colleagues about this. The honourable member and his Leader are suggesting that I have been derelict in my duty.

Certainly, one has a lot of complaints, and they have always been passed on to the police but, in reply to the Deputy Leader, I say that I have had no discussions with any of my colleagues about the issue, as he puts it. The member for Mitcham, in the Estimates Committee, referred, among other things, to the terms of reference: this is an internal inquiry and I think I said that, if there were any, they were not known to me. As I have said, this is an internal inquiry, assisted by Crown Law officers.

ONKAPARINGA ESTUARY

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether the Government has any plans to develop the Onkaparinga estuary as a power-boating area? I have been approached by several constituents who are passive recreation users of the Onkaparinga estuary, and they have been alarmed by rumours in the area that the Government may have plans to develop the estuary into a power-boat area. With that sort of rumour about, I would like clarification from the Government.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I, too, have received advice that rumours are about regarding future development of the Onkaparinga estuary, and I would want to put a couple of those rumours to rest. The Government's policy is quite clear in regard to future development of that area. It was brought down in October 1979 in a report prepared by a joint steering committee for the State Planning Authority and the City of Noarlunga. The development principles defined in that report clearly describe the value of the river area and the flats for conservation and for recreation that would not degrade the natural character of the river. Therefore, I am pleased to be able to tell the member for Mawson that in no way would we be prepared to support any proposal for the development of the estuary that would encourage, for example, power boats. I know that concern is being expressed about the use of power boats in that area.

In fact, it is stated in the report to which I have referred that the river and that area of the estuary should not in fact be used for power boating. The member for Mawson can assure his constituents who are concerned about the matter that it is not the Government's intention that that area be developed for power boating, and that in accord with the report that was brought down the Government is very anxious that that should not happen.

POLICE FORCE

Mr KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Transport at any time over the last 12 months or longer had occasion to express to the Chief Secretary concern about alleged corruption in the South Australian Police Force, regarding, among other issues, the problem of drugs?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, but while I was in Opposition I did draw my concern to the attention of the Police Commissioner at that time.

BUFFALO MEAT

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture provide the House with details of the controls on the importation of buffalo meat for human consumption and pet food? Many people have been concerned about the substitution of meats on the export market and fear that this could also happen on the domestic market in relation to meat imported from other States.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am pleased that the member for Hanson has raised this subject because, since evidence has come to our attention that certain meats exported from Australia have been substituted by other meats, there has been a certain amount of stigma surrounding the meat industry in other States. I mention that, because most of the flak so far has been directed towards Victoria. It has been in that climate that the South Australian Government has indicted to the Commonwealth that, should it proceed with its inquiry into the States not yet identified regarding the substitution of beef, and should South Australia be involved, we will co-operate in the investigations.

Buffalo meat is recognised under our State legislation as being a source of meat for human consumption, and it has been entering South Australia from the Northern Territory for about 18 years. During the past 12 months 279 tonnes of meat has come into South Australia's meat trade from that source. I understand that this product is mainly used in the manufacture of small goods, in meat pies and beef mince. Under the provisions of the Meat Hygiene Act of 1980, buffalo meat entering this State must be accompanied

by the appropriate certification issued by an inspector of the Northern Territory Department of Primary Production and, accordingly, it may be examined at random by inspectors appointed under that Act. In addition to the legal trade, some illicit use has been alleged. So far none has been identified by our inspectorial system, but in saying that, and in the interests of the good name of the South Australian meat industry, I would appreciate any reports of evidence, or any suggestions, of malpractice in the processing, transporting, manufacturing and/or marketing of products that are a substitute to the label.

Buffalo meat for human consumption has entered South Australia after processing at some seven abattoirs in the Territory which are provided with meat inspection services. I am pleased that the level of those inspection services in the Northern Territory is identical to that in South Australia. Accordingly, we are the only two States that use the inspection system provided by the Department of Primary Industry. Buffalo for pet meat is either shot and packed in the field and not subjected to inspection, or is processed in an abattoir.

According to the Northern Territory code of practice, all pet food should be denatured with yellow dye, tartrazine. The code also requires identification of cartons and issue of the movement of meat certificates to accompany the consignment. Prior to the implementation of the Meat Hygiene Act in February 1981, buffalo meat as pet food was not permitted into the Samcor area. Since then, and since the elimination of the Samcor area boundaries, dyed buffalo meat from the Northern Territory, or pet food, has been shipped into South Australia by a pet food processor. On each occasion prior notification has been given to the Department of Agriculture of this intention, thereby enabling inspection of the consignment if appropriate. However, there is no legislative requirement for prior notification.

If the current initiative to develop uniform legislation covering pet meat is successful, which I hope it is, it will be possible to draft suitable regulations under the Meat Hygiene Act to reduce the risk of pet food, including buffalo meat, entering the human food chain in this State.

Having dealt with the subject specifically raised by the honourable member expressing his interest in the matter of buffalo meat coming into this State, I believe it is important to point out that other meats are used in the pet food chain. We are one of the States which allows the sale, for example, of kangaroo meat at domestic retail butcher shop level. While that sort of thing is allowed in South Australia, and there is no real evidence to prevent the public from having access to these other meats, it creates a very real potential risk of substitution occurring. It is in that light and against the background of our present very flexible system that we should seriously consider co-operating with all other States and denaturing our pet food at slaughter time, and I mean denature whole carcasses, not just strip-branding or marking that can be removed from the carcass. Meat designed for production or manufacture of pet food can then be identified at any stage from the time of slaughter and when it goes into the can, packet—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The member for Stuart is apparently agitated about the time I am spending on this subject, but I believe it is an important one—important to consumers and to the member for Hanson, and it is extremely important to me, especially as it affects our export trade. The industry has acted responsibly, as far as we can ascertain in South Australia, and our aim is to co-operate with the Commonwealth to ensure that that continues.

EAST ADELAIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Education take the necessary steps to have restored to the current year's schools works programme the upgrading and redevelopment of the East Adelaide Primary School, scheduled to commence last financial year but now deferred for three or more years? Many months ago the old and unsatisfactory classrooms and facilities at that school were vacated, and necessary demolition work was undertaken to enable redevelopment to commence. As a result of temporary arrangements, the school is now faced with totally unacceptable conditions, which include congested class areas, temporary library facilities which have no fire escape, children having to enter toilet blocks to obtain drinking water, the handicapped persons' toilet being used as a sick bay, a public address system that has been permanently disconnected, unsatisfactory school telephone facilities, much of the audio-visual equipment not able to be utilised, school buildings that are in a state of disrepair and now left vacant and likely to be so for many years, and open space play areas below acceptable standards. Needless to say, many parents and staff who have spoken to me about this matter are outraged by the Government's priorities for education.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to the latter points about the present apparently derelict state of some of the buildings. The primary school was not included on the initial three-year priority, which was recently the subject of the Budget debates, but that programme is subjected to a half-yearly review. Although I cannot promise to have the matter reinstated, I will certainly give it some consideration and respond directly to the honourable member.

AMOEBC MENINGITIS

Mr OLSEN: Can the Minister of Health advise the House of plans for the Government's programme to reduce the risk of amoebic meningitis in South Australia this summer? The need for a continuing public education campaign was made evident last summer following the tragic death of a child at Whyalla. At the same time, I understand that the 1980-81 summer campaign was criticised by swimming pool operators, on the grounds that it caused a fall-off in patronage in public swimming pools. How does the Government intend to reconcile the need for universal swimming instruction for children with the need for appropriate warnings against amoebic meningitis?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member's question is important, because last summer's campaign certainly highlighted the difficulty of reconciling those two important issues: first, health warnings to the public about the risk of contracting amoebic meningitis; and, secondly, the wish of us all to ensure that children are given proper instruction in swimming and water safety. In the intervening months, the South Australian Health Commission has given very careful consideration to the way in which these two goals can be achieved without one adversely affecting the other.

It is interesting to note, and it is perhaps a commentary on the sensitivity of South Australians to any issue concerning water quality, that amoebic meningitis has in other States where it has occurred not had much public impact at all. In fact, last summer a child died of amoebic meningitis in New South Wales and I understand that the death was not even reported in the newspapers, whereas when the same thing occurred in South Australia there were quite dramatic headlines and a great deal of political debate.

Similarly, in Western Australia and the Northern Territory there have been instances of amoebic meningitis which have not caused the same level of public concern. Nevertheless, the Health Commission has addressed the problem and we have decided to tackle it on a series of fronts—educational and, of course, the continued chlorination of water and monitoring of water supplies for the presence of *naegleria fowleri*. It should be stressed that the risk of contracting amoebic meningitis from reticulated water supplies in South Australia is immeasurably low statistically. It is also important to stress that the risk cannot be eliminated entirely. The disease is endemic in the same way, for example, as Murray Valley encephalitis is endemic. On that note, it is equally important that people should realise that where they are travelling near the Murray River this summer it is most important to be protected against mosquitoes, because the bird life (and this disease is carried by birds) will be prolific following a very wet winter. Similarly, mosquito breeding grounds will naturally cause a more severe level of mosquitoes this summer than is normally the case.

But that is incidental to the question the honourable member asked. The elements of the public education campaign will be directed to what is felt to be the most important area: that is, water safety in general. Included in that campaign will be messages concerning primary amoebic meningitis and the risks of swimming in uncontrolled and unchlorinated water, and I would like to give the House some details of the elements of the public education campaign that will be launched in November.

There will be television commercials concerning clean water for swimming, and enjoying swimming in regularly maintained pools; there will be shopping centre displays and promotions concerning pool care, maintenance and the use of disinfectants; there will be newspaper feature articles concerning pool care and safety; there will be information leaflets, both basic guides to swimming pool care and general information about primary amoebic meningitis for professional workers. On 26 October a conference of key health education teachers will be held in the Whyalla region. The purpose of that conference is to enable health education teachers to integrate messages concerning primary amoebic meningitis with swimming pool maintenance into the existing education syllabuses. At the same time, there has been a budget allocation for funds to be used on commercial radio concerning amoebic meningitis. This campaign will be directed to the North of the State which, of course, is the area at risk.

So, between the two goals of ensuring universal swimming instruction and water safety and ensuring a high public awareness of the risk of amoebic meningitis, we believe that the campaign of the Health Commission has been tailored to meet those needs. Again, I stress that all the care, all the effort and all the money in the world spent in South Australia to eliminate that disease could not be successful, because it is endemic. We must simply try to do our best to reduce the risk.

SACRED SITES

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Deputy Premier investigate the claim by the Aboriginal Southern Lands Council that evidence has been found of damage to sacred sites in the Roxby Downs area of South Australia's Far North? According to a report in yesterday's *Advertiser*, the Aboriginal Southern Lands Council has pointed out that there is now evidence to suggest that sites of significance to Aboriginal people have been damaged, and that further damage will be likely to result if there are no adequate safeguards. The

council called upon the Deputy Premier to take immediate action against Roxby Management Services for breaking the conditions of its exploration licences in the Roxby Downs area. In the letter dated 1 July 1981, the Kokatha Committee wrote to Dr Bryan Jenkins, the Regional Director for Environmental Studies of Kinhill Pty Ltd, noting that his company has been employed to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Olympic Dam project and wished to employ a Dr Peter Sutton to prepare the anthropological aspects of that study, presumably with particular interest in sacred sites to Aboriginal people. The letter states:

We are not prepared to accept the prospect of an anthropologist gaining access to secret and sacred information on matters of Aboriginal history when our people have no control over the use to which that information will be put and when we have no guarantee that information given by us will be used to ensure the preservation and proper protection of Aboriginal sacred sites.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not time to give an adequate answer to the question, because it is right on 3.15 p.m., when Question Time ends, and there are several points I would like to make in response. We are talking about Crown lands which have been held under pastoral lease for many, many years. The exploration activity started at Roxby Downs under terms agreed to by the former Administration, of which the honourable member was a part, back in about 1975. Let me abbreviate the answer by saying that I am not aware of any damage to sacred sites in recent times, but quite a few other points could be made no doubt and will be made in the near future.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr GUNN: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr RUSSACK: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes of proceedings.

Motion carried.

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

That Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable the reports of the Estimates Committees to be considered together and one question put in relation thereto.

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

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I take it that the effect of this will be to cut down from two to one the opportunities which members will have to speak in this debate, as I remember what happened last year—

Mr Gunn: You were in court. You were not here.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No jolly fear I was not in court, I was here. There were two opportunities last year. There was a debate on Estimates Committee A, in which any member could speak for 30 minutes. Then, following the disposal of that, there was a debate on Committee B, in which members had the chance to speak for 30 minutes again. The purport of this motion will be, as I understand it, to give members only one opportunity to speak for 30 minutes.

That is not good enough, if I may suggest it, with the utmost respect to those who have worked out this little plan. I protest most vigorously against cutting down the time of members to speak. Every member of the House, presumably except the Leader of the Opposition on this side, will have only 30 minutes instead of an hour to deal with this. That is a step very definitely in the wrong direction. We brought in this system so there would be plenty of time for debate. I have a few protests to make about the way in which the Committees worked. It was much better than last year, but it is jolly difficult for anybody in my position to rush from one Committee to another, to try to question two Ministers, if you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE:—want to question one in Committee A and one in Committee B.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: This is making it worse.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has sought the opportunity to speak against the suspension motion currently before the Chair.

Mr MILLHOUSE: My very word, I speak—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will speak to the suspension motion, and to that only.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Of course, I meant to do nothing else. I would not think of doing anything else but speak against it.

An honourable member: You don't think very much, do you?

Mr MILLHOUSE: I get by.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to the suspension motion.

Mr MILLHOUSE: If we allow this suspension of Standing Orders, then undoubtedly the motion will pass, and we will have only one debate. I hope that members on this side of the House will support me in this, because their rights as well as mine will be affected. I do not believe that we should allow the suspension of Standing Orders. If we do not, then there will be two debates, one following the other, and we will have twice as much opportunity to speak to this matter as we will get if the suspension is allowed and a subsequent motion is passed.

I cannot put it more plainly to members of the Labor Party. I hope that they have enough gumption to support me. 'Guts' was a word used by the member for Hartley a little while ago when speaking of the Government, and I hope that on this occasion the Labor Party will have enough guts to support me in opposing this motion, so that we get our full time to speak on both Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the motion for suspension. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against, 'No'. I believe the Ayes have it. There being a dissentient voice, it is necessary to have a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (44)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Abbott, Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin, McRae, Olsen, O'Neill, Oswald, Payne, Plunkett, Randall, Rodda, Rusack, Schmidt, Slater, Tonkin (teller), Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (2)—Messrs Millhouse (teller) and Peterson.

Majority of 42 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B be agreed to and that the resolution agreed to by Estimates Committee B in relation thereto be noted.

I thank all honourable members who participated in the Estimates Committees. This is the second time that this system has been used and has worked, and I believe that there were considerable advantages and improvements this year. The smooth running of the Committees owes a great deal to the work that was done by the Standing Orders Committee. I thank members from both sides of the House who worked so effectively on that Committee to bring forward Sessional Orders which resulted in the improvement.

Much has been said about the questions asked at the Estimates Committees and the information sought. I believe there was more information made available to honourable members, by reason of the papers distributed beforehand, than has ever been the case in this Parliament previously. To me, the concentration on matters of policy, and sometimes of political point-scoring were more noticeable than were questions simply seeking information.

I want to refer to a matter which was brought up by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today and which has been raised by members of the Opposition in this place and outside of it. I refer to various statements made in relation to the Chief Secretary and the South Australian Police Force. I have complete and absolute confidence in the Chief Secretary and in the South Australian Police Force.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If honourable members do not share my confidence in either the Chief Secretary or the Police Force, then all I can say is that they are mischievous and have an attitude that is not worthy of them.

The Chief Secretary is one of the most experienced members of this Parliament and is one of only four members who served in the previous Liberal Ministry in 1970. I do not think there is one man or woman here who would in any way question his integrity, honesty, and service to the Government, Parliament and the people of this State. His service is above reproach. I must say that I resent attempts by the Opposition to stain the unblemished character of the Minister, who is a credit to this Chamber and this Parliament.

The accusations made against the Chief Secretary by the Opposition, and I suspect very strongly stimulated by the member for Mitcham, for what personal reason I do not know, are very difficult to follow. The Opposition's case appears to stem from a Labor Party witch hunt designed to undermine the morale and standing of the South Australian Police Force. The Opposition has accused the Chief Secretary of not being conversant with the details of the current internal police inquiry into alleged activities of certain police officers.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader was out of the House when an answer was given to a question which suddenly stopped Opposition questioning on this line a little

earlier. I would advise him to listen. As the Chief Secretary told the Estimates Committee, this inquiry is being conducted by high-ranking officers of the Police Force who will be reporting to the Attorney-General in the near future. It is well known that the portfolio of the Attorney-General does overlap certain areas of responsibility handled by the Chief Secretary, and this has been the case for many years. I understand that accusations of impropriety were made to the Attorney-General, not to the Chief Secretary, and they may involve people outside the Police Force.

The member for Mitcham, among others, claimed in the Estimates Committee that the Chief Secretary was not directly involved in the decision to have an inquiry. May I just remind members, and particularly members of the Opposition, that in 1972 there was an inquiry into certain accusations about alleged activities of officers of the Police Force. The Labor Chief Secretary of the day had very little involvement in that inquiry. It was the then Attorney-General (the present Chief Justice) and to a lesser extent the Premier who made the decisions, handled the reports and made the public statements. Presumably, the Attorney-General also took the running then because of simplicity of administration, and yet members of the Opposition are suggesting that the same type of situation, nine years later, is some form of political cover-up. What nonsense! What hypocrisy!

A little earlier this afternoon, members on the other side tried to involve the Minister of Transport, suggesting that he had expressed concern to the Chief Secretary about possible corruption in the Police Force. They got that one wrong, too, because the Minister of Transport, in 1978, long before we came to office—I am not sure if it was not earlier than that—approached the Commissioner of Police regarding allegations of possible corruption that had come to his notice. The Minister was assured then that an investigation would be held, and he was interviewed by senior police officers to obtain his information. He did not go public; he acted responsibly. He did not go to the media, and he did not slam the police on unsubstantiated allegations, as the member for Elizabeth has done. He did the right and proper thing in those circumstances and went to the Commissioner of Police.

I simply make the point that the inquiry was undertaken then without any publicity, and I cannot quite understand what the Opposition is now trying to do. Are members opposite now claiming that their own Attorney-General or Chief Secretary at the time acted improperly because that course of action was followed then? Of course, they are not. Yet now they are berating Ministers of this Government for adopting exactly the same approach that they themselves adopted in 1978. What a contrast it is, when one considers the grandstanding of the member for Elizabeth in this most recent example: when he has gone public, there have been headlines and interviews, all on allegations for which he has not volunteered one shred of evidence.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Premier resume his seat. I ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to withdraw unconditionally the word 'lie'.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I withdraw that unconditionally, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Opposition, in seeking to embarrass the Chief Secretary and to denigrate him and this Government this afternoon, implied by way of question that it was our Chief Secretary who had been approached by the Minister of Transport, and that is totally and absolutely wrong. They got their time period wrong, and they got the approach wrong. If that is an indication of the accuracy of the information which the member for Eliza-

beth says he has, all I can say is that that information cannot be worth very much at all.

The Opposition has also suggested that there is something sinister and unusual about an inquiry into allegations against the police which does not have specific terms of reference. That, again, has been referred to this afternoon in Question Time. Why should it have terms of reference? It is, after all, an inquiry conducted by senior police officers, and to restrict the activities of those officers in carrying out their investigations by imposing hard and fast guidelines would be absolutely counter-productive and be absurd. The Opposition knows that. I suggest that, if the Government had applied any terms of reference, the Opposition would have been the first group to stand up and complain that we were trying to hamper the activities of the investigating officers. We are not in any way hampering their activities. On the contrary, we are determined to allow the current inquiry the widest possible freedom to ensure that any malpractice or impropriety in the Police Force will be detected and eradicated.

The Government does not believe that there is any widespread or deep-seated corruption or impropriety within the Police Force, as apparently is suggested by the Opposition. As with any group in the community, the opportunity does exist for abuse. I do not resile from the fact that dishonesty or impropriety within the Police Force would be more serious than in any other walks of life, but the action which must be taken is exactly the same. If there is a bad apple in the barrel it must be detected and removed before there can be any suggestion that the problem will spread.

The Government is determined on this matter. As yet we have not received the final report. We have no more proof than the Opposition has about activities in the Police Force, although the member for Elizabeth has been tireless in his campaign to denigrate the members of the force. One surprising element in the present debate is that the Labor Party as a whole, with their Leader, has been drawn into the arena by the member for Elizabeth. Several weeks ago the surrogate Leader captured the newspaper headlines with a series of vague and unsubstantiated accusations about police corruption.

Mr Hamilton: You should start looking over your back.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was a remarkable attack on the credibility and standing of the Police Force, but I must say it was not totally unexpected from the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You said this about the prisons, too. We'll wait and see what that Royal Commission produces.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think everyone in this Chamber knows the member for Elizabeth's deep and abiding hatred of the Police Force in this State.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Let's just wait and see what happens with the Royal Commission into prisons.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We know that the member for Elizabeth, for his own political ends, wants to stir up trouble, and he does not care whose reputation he drags down with it, even though it is the reputation of one of the finest Police Forces in the world. I remind the House that in that attack the member for Elizabeth claimed that corrupt South Australian police officers had taken bribes, had sold drugs and had framed people. He claimed the police had stolen, lied and cheated. He said officers were likely to face criminal charges while others would be retired from the Police Force or, to use his own term, put out of harm's way.

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

has been no suggestion since the accusations were made, of the member coming forward with names and specific evidence. He is condemning the Police Force in the vilest possible way by innuendo.

It is intriguing to note that the Opposition Leader now feels compelled to throw his weight behind the accusations made by his former transport spokesman. The question that begs an answer is why the Opposition feels any need to attack the integrity and public standing of the Police Force. It is, of course, not a new tactic for the Labor Party. It was Labor that hounded the former Police Commissioner, Mr Harold Salisbury, out of office and finally out of this State. That action will be long remembered by the people of South Australia. Labor's unprecedented attack on Mr Salisbury was another step in what seems to be almost an endless campaign designed to denigrate and discredit the Police Force of South Australia.

The views of the member for Elizabeth about the police, as I have said, are well documented. His recent statements make his attitude clear enough, but now the Opposition Leader feels the need to come into the fray. It may be that he feels that he has to make up some lost ground because the member for Elizabeth has been making the running, but I think he could have found a better issue on which to demonstrate his prowess. Let me say here and now that South Australia has the best and most efficient Police Force in Australia. It has a record of integrity that is the envy of every other State.

As I have said, the member for Elizabeth, who has been spearheading the campaign to destroy the good name and high reputation of the Police Force, was a prime mover in the attack against the Chief Secretary in the Estimates Committee. It is interesting to note that there was no moving for a no-confidence motion in the Estimates Committees until Opposition members were prompted by the member for Mitcham, who was sitting in the back row. When the member for Elizabeth was bluntly challenged to reveal any of the information he claimed to have, he refused. I will quote the exchange. The question asked by the member for Elizabeth was:

Have any police officers been suspended, resigned or otherwise indicated their intention to leave the Police Force as a result of this inquiry?

The Chief Secretary replied:

I cannot answer that question. I understand that no names have been mentioned, only a spate of allegations. That is one of the sad things about this matter.

The member for Elizabeth went on:

Is the Minister inviting members of this Committee to sit here and name a whole series of police officers who are only the subject of allegations?

The Committee would not be the place to make such accusations, and it is strange that the member has not revealed the details that he claims to have about the impropriety. If he has details or proof about impropriety in the Police Force, he has a public responsibility to bring them forward. I have already outlined the claims he has made, but let me repeat them. According to the member for Elizabeth, the South Australian police have sold drugs, taken bribes, framed, stolen, beaten, lied and cheated. They are accusations that are damaging to the high standing and reputation of the Police Force and accusations that, I repeat, he has not been able to substantiate by a single shred of evidence.

Now we have the unseemly spectacle of the entire Parliamentary Labor Party joining in this very sordid and ghastly witch hunt. It has sprung from the Estimates Committee deliberations. The Labor Party was undoubtedly dragged into the no-confidence approach in the Chief Secretary, and, I would suspect, against its will. The members

who have put the Opposition in this curious position today are the member for Elizabeth and the member for Mitcham (a very unlikely political marriage, if I may say so), but it was the goading, I think, of those two people that triggered the shadow Chief Secretary initially to move that motion of no confidence in the Chief Secretary in the Estimates Committee.

It is quite clear that the Labor Party itself, from the reading of those Estimate Committee proceedings, had no intention at all of moving a vote of no confidence; it was the persistence of one or two members opposite who forced its hand, and it is equally clear that those two members would have forced such a move, regardless of the views of the remainder of their colleagues. The questioning as reported in *Hansard* shows a complete lack of competence, that the Opposition had failed to study the Commonwealth legislation and that it had failed to read press statements made by the Minister. The Opposition was not interested in seeing what the Minister had to say on the matter, in the same way as the attacks on the Minister of Health, for example, clearly demonstrated a shocking lack of understanding by members opposite.

Again, the questioning as reported in *Hansard* shows a lack of competence in that sphere. It shows that they have not read the press statements, and had not read information that was freely available to all members. Criticisms of the Chief Secretary are no more than a thinly disguised motion of no confidence in the South Australian Police Force, and it is difficult to think of a more unnecessary and damaging move that the Opposition could make. I should like to record my absolute confidence in both the Chief Secretary and the Police Force. I conclude by quoting from the last annual report prepared by the former Police Commissioner, Mr Salisbury, as follows:

It was gratifying to note from the Gallup poll completed in December 1976 that, in the opinion of people in South Australia, 73 per cent consider we do a good job. This is 9 per cent more than a similar survey revealed in 1973. In the latest survey, the Australian force polling the next highest result recorded 59 per cent and the lowest 34 per cent. Of particular interest was that, of the number of young people between the ages of 16 and 29 who were interviewed for the poll, 42 per cent believed their police did a good job, and a further 47 per cent felt that we did a fair job.

It is considered quite significant in view of the fact that a large proportion of persons from this age group could be expected to have some contact with police and not always in harmonious circumstances.

That was Mr Salisbury's report for the year 1976-77, and he confirmed what we all know, namely, that South Australia does indeed have the best Police Force in the nation. At the same time, the Commissioner also had to report that during the year there had been 312 complaints made by members of the public against the police, and of this number 38 had been found to be substantiated. A reading of Police Commissioners' reports over a long period demonstrates that a very small minority of officers do fail to meet the standards expected of them, as is the case in any other calling. This has occurred under successive Governments of all persuasions, but it is no reason or justification for the sort of generalised attacks we have had on the Police Force in recent weeks from the Opposition, in particular from the member for Elizabeth. There has been a damaging and dangerous attack by the Opposition on the Police Force, which can do nothing but harm the high standing and morale of that force. I totally reject that attack and the grounds for it, and I restate my continued confidence in the high reputation and standing of our Police Force, and in the Chief Secretary, who has been responsible for the force.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier's contribution to this debate indicates and illustrates precisely why it was vital that we had a no-confidence motion directly

on this matter involving the Chief Secretary earlier today, a debate that was refused us by the Government. The Premier has said that this is the appropriate place to raise it, and the opportunity is provided to do so. I certainly do intend to move a vote of no confidence. I move:

To amend the motion by inserting after 'agreed to' first occurring 'except that the vote "Premier and Cabinet, \$2 958 000" be reduced by \$100'.

In moving that amendment, I am broadening the no-confidence vote from the Chief Secretary and his abysmal performance to the Premier himself who, as head of the Government, must take ultimate responsibility. In doing that, I am in no way conceding that this is an adequate procedure or opportunity to canvass this matter. Every member of this place knows that, in the form of this debate, a number of members are going to speak over three days; the votes are taken at the end of that time, and by then the whole effect has been dissipated, and most of the argument has been lost. What is more important is that no-one has to reply, and that goes for the Premier, his Deputy, the Chief Secretary, and anyone else. That is what is wrong with that procedure, and that is why the Government has demonstrated clearly its lack of confidence in the Chief Secretary.

The Premier quite clearly has demonstrated his inability to defend his Administration and his Ministers by ducking away from the debate earlier today. We are forced in these generalised debates to try to home in on this matter. I shall do so, but I think the Premier's speech illustrated quite clearly the dilemma that we are in. This debate is meant to look at the procedures through which we have just gone and it is meant to encompass all of the Committee's deliberations. The Premier says that that is the appropriate place to move a motion of no confidence in the Chief Secretary.

That is nonsense, and his own opening remarks indicated that, as he had to spend some considerable time in talking about the fact that the Committees had done good work, that the various Standing Orders had achieved their purpose, and so on. All of those matters must be discussed, and I have something to say about them, and I will have to make those comments and general remarks as well at the end of this section of remarks which relate to the performance of the Premier and his Chief Secretary. One can see immediately how the effect of that is totally dissipated, how it makes the debate quite useless as a way of calling the Government to account.

I now want to tackle directly some of the points the Premier made in talking about the Chief Secretary and trying to defend him, after the event. I would remind members again that the Premier had his opportunity to stand up and defend his Minister, and his Minister had an opportunity to stand up and defend himself, but they ducked away from it. It is interesting to note that at no time did the Premier claim competence on the part of the Chief Secretary or defend him in his general role. He said two things: one, that the Chief Secretary has an unblemished character and that he has served the House long, well and faithfully, and, secondly, that all the Opposition is on about is undermining the police.

Let me deal with both those points, but in doing so let me say that they have absolutely no relevance to the motion we were moving this afternoon or to the question of whether the Chief Secretary is fit to retain his portfolios. I do not think any member on this side of the House would disagree with remarks that the Premier made about the Chief Secretary's character, service, and so on. That has been universally accepted, and in previous debates when the Opposition has had to raise the Chief Secretary's administrative record it has always made that point. It is not a personal attack that we are mounting on an individual; it is an attack

we are mounting on the Government's administration and on the administration by a Minister of his portfolio. It is a matter of public concern and public importance, and if the Minister, or his Premier, or anyone else, thinks that this is improper, then they should not be in politics. It is not a personal attack, but an attack on the competence and ability of a Minister to run a portfolio.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda interjecting:

Mr BANNON: No doubt they will be pointed out to me, long and fulsomely, by anybody. I will stand up and tackle them, too.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: They were disgusting, absolutely disgusting.

Mr BANNON: Let me continue with this point about the Premier; that is what is at issue.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda interjecting:

Mr BANNON: With deference to the Chief Secretary, let me simply say that I believe that, in a sense, we are missing the main target in this matter, because in many respects I do feel sorry for the Chief Secretary. In large part it is due to the decisions of the Cabinet of which he is a member, and for which he cannot be held wholly responsible.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: After Friday night, after what you have got to say to South Australia—

Mr BANNON: After Friday night?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: You ought to feel sorry—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Trainer: What sort of smoke screen is that?

Mr BANNON: I have been temporarily diverted by the Chief Secretary. I will ask someone to check with him about what I am meant to be doing. Let me continue in a more serious vein: it is about the administration of the Government, and really ultimately it comes back to the Premier himself. It is he who is not prepared to stand up and defend the record, and he who ultimately must be answerable, and this motion I think makes that quite clear. I think the member for Hartley was quite right when, in earlier proceedings, he drew attention to the fact that any Minister would probably welcome the opportunity to stand up and defend himself, but decisions were made by the Premier and by his Deputy that the Government did not want to be embarrassed by that motion. The Chief Secretary was given no such opportunity, which is typical of the way in which he has been treated, not just by the Premier but by the Attorney-General, presumably announcing things that he has not been told of; by the Minister of Transport, taking matters out of his hands; and by the Minister of Agriculture shadowing him and hassling him over his administration of fisheries. In many ways one must see the Chief Secretary as something of a victim of this dreadful system of incompetent Cabinet irresponsibility led by the Premier, and that is why the motion has been brought.

I turn now to the question of the Opposition's attempt supposedly to undermine the police. The Premier says that it is all about an attempt to undermine the police. That is definitely not so, and we on this side reject that completely. In fact, I would have thought that it had been made abundantly clear by our spokesman on this matter, the shadow Chief Secretary, the member for Stuart, who is the official spokesman on this matter. During the Committee procedure the member for Stuart made this quite clear. In fact, I think it is important that I quote from the record to give the lie to what the Premier is attempting to suggest. Before proceeding to questions concerning the police the member for Stuart said this:

We think it is a matter of public importance that questions should be asked of the Minister about the Police Force and its activities. This is not to suggest that the Opposition believes there is intrinsically anything necessarily wrong with the Police Force.

We repeat what we have said on many occasions. We in South Australia are very fortunate in having the best Police Force in Australia. Nevertheless, we, along with the Government, I am sure, and the Police Commissioner, I am certain, want that high reputation to be maintained, and the best way to ensure that is to convince the public generally in South Australia that everything that can be done is being done to ensure that the high standards apply. The Police Force as we know can only be effective when it has the confidence of the community. It has that confidence now, but I think there has been some publicity that has reflected on that confidence, and we would be happy to ask questions of the Minister that will enable information to be provided that will retain that confidence, or regain that confidence, if in fact that needs to be done.

Can there be a clearer statement of the Opposition's position on this matter, and why we asked the questions that we did? I would have thought that, set in that context, such questions would be welcomed by the Police Force, by the Police Commissioner, and by the Chief Secretary himself—but no, not a bit of it.

The Opposition is accused of trying to undermine the Police Force. The member for Elizabeth is challenged to name people, but he made it quite clear on the record that that was not his intention. Again, I will quote from the record (*Hansard*, page 484). The member for Elizabeth asked the question 'Have any police officers been suspended, resigned or otherwise ...?' The Chief Secretary said, 'I cannot answer that question.' The Chief Secretary did not know. The Chief Secretary went on to say 'I understand that no names have been mentioned, only a spate of allegations.' The member for Elizabeth responded by saying 'Is the Minister inviting members of this Committee to sit here and name a whole series of police officers ...?' The honourable member stated that quite clearly; he was not suggesting that any persons be named. Earlier in the record the honourable member said 'I am not anxious to have a list of names, but could we have a list of the number of persons who have resigned?' Could that be clearer?

The Chief Secretary, either deliberately or purely because he could not understand, did not answer that question. He responded to it by asking the member for Elizabeth some other question, one which was not at issue, and that had been made quite clear. So, do not let anyone try to attempt to smear the Opposition over this matter. The Opposition has made its stand quite clear, and the Premier had better be careful about how he goes on in regard to this matter of undermining the Police Force. Let the Premier read the record and understand the position from which we approach it. The Premier is attempting to obscure the basis of the whole debate. In that Committee the Chief Secretary created the confusion, and the no-confidence motion moved in the Chief Secretary was, as the Premier said, not intended to be moved at the beginning of proceedings; it was brought about by the answers, or rather the non-answers, to questions.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda interjecting:

Mr BANNON: No names were asked for; no names were in question, and the Minister knows that quite well. He was asked to give straight answers to straight questions. He refused to do so, and a vote of no confidence in him was moved because of that. Quite clearly, that was the reason; it was not because he was not naming names, but because he would not give straight answers to straight questions. Indeed, he contradicted himself in the course of the debate. What about the final point the Premier makes that this is all about the police and an attack on the Police Force? Having laid that firmly at rest, let me say that the attack is not only related to the Chief Secretary's administration in that area; it is related to his administration in a whole range of matters.

Let us look at the catalogue. Let us look at the question of the remand centre. I will just read out the headings at this stage. Some elaboration is needed on these matters, but the names will conjure up some disaster, some headline, some expose, or some wrong information. There is the remand centre; the Correctional Services inquiry; the question of prison regulations; escapes from prison and means taken to do something about that; reports made to the Minister, which he claimed he had not seen, on prisoners, yet evidence was given and presented to him directly. There is the question of the police inquiry and the Chief Secretary's inability to know its terms of reference and give straight answers. Questions were asked on random breath tests and guidelines to be given to the police, of which the Chief Secretary professed total ignorance. He said, in a rather splendid pun, that he was not 'a full bottle' on it. He gave police crime statistics to Parliament.

The full Fire Brigade, with shiny boots and full uniform, marched in an unprecedented fashion in protest at the Government's mishandling of the Fire Brigade. The Chief Secretary had to call on my colleagues the member for Hartley and the Deputy Leader, and on the role of the Select Committee to do something about that. A good result may have been obtained. It is to the Chief Secretary's credit that he was able to go along with that, but his initial handling of that matter was a total disaster. Another area was fisheries, the question of prawn licences, on which he was stood over by the Minister for Agriculture; manning regulations relating to fishing fleets, wrong regulations issued, which meant that the whole fishing fleet was illegal at some stage; netting regulations; the *Joseph Verco* capsizing, and the resulting action by the Minister to try to do something about that.

Turning to the marine and harbors area, we come to the southern boat ramp, which had been taken to implementation by the previous Government, on which the Chief Secretary commissioned a report by consultants, at great expense, which stated that there seemed to be a need for a boat ramp, and that perhaps the southern region was the best place for it. The Minister claimed that there had been no increase in boating regulation fees since 1977, when about 12 months before he had signed an increase in the fees. There was the *H.C. Meyer* and *A.D. Victoria* fiasco. From day one, there was the Football Park lights problem. It is interesting to read through the clippings on that fiasco, which has not reached its termination. We see that at first when the Government decided not to implement the decisions made by the previous Government, the Chief Secretary was reported as making statements, yet suddenly his name disappeared from all reference to it, and the Minister of Transport had the carriage of the matter. That is typical of what has been going on.

That catalogue (and it is only a catalogue) surely makes it clear that we are talking about something more than just the Police Force and the Chief Secretary's administration of it. It is quite extraordinary that the Chief Secretary has lurched from problem to problem, and I stress that it is not all of his own making. If he had been left to get on with some of these things himself, no doubt there would have been a better result, but his Premier lacked the ability to tell some of the other Ministers to pull their heads in and leave him alone, and let him get on with his job.

There has been fiasco after fiasco, and nothing has been done about it. No Minister has been more accident prone. There should be a simple area of good administration and good explanation to the public, yet failure after failure occurs, and the Chief Secretary is still in his place. It is little wonder that, when all these events culminated in last week's performance before the Estimates Committee, we,

as an Opposition, wished to have them confronted and brought up directly in the Parliament.

It is little wonder that the Government so lacks confidence in its Chief Secretary and his performance that it gags that debate and does not allow it to be held in the way that it should be held. If the performance of a few minutes ago is the best that the Premier can do to defend his Minister and his Administration, this Government is in very deep trouble indeed. But I think it is symptomatic of a Premier who has absolutely no room for manoeuvre. He cannot afford to offend anyone. He has a few old debts to pay and he is attempting to do so. He has pretenders to his throne, active members of the Public Accounts Committee, who cannot just be bought off with a car. They still cause a little bit of trouble, despite that advantage, and there are others who are quite prepared to talk about their aspirations and ambitions. That is the best sort of defence the Premier can talk about.

The Chief Secretary talks about albatrosses. They have been round his neck in profusion. I will not go chapter and verse through all the various issues. I think the mere reciting of them is sufficient reminder to members of this House of some of the disasters in which the Chief Secretary has been involved. It has reached the stage where the Premier himself and his administration of Cabinet are called into question.

Let us turn to the general question of Estimates Committees procedure, which we have just been through, and the main purpose of this debate. Consideration of the Estimates by Parliament traditionally fulfils two functions. It provides the opportunity for members to examine the components of the lump-sum expenditure sanctioned by the Appropriation Bill. It gives Parliament the opportunity to review the way in which the Government spends the funds it was voted in the previous year. So, it is an important exercise in auditing the Government's performance. It recognises that the Budget sets out the Government's priorities. It details the progress towards fulfilling commitments made to the electorate. It recognises that the Budget is, to a large extent, a statement of the economic and social progress, or lack of it, made in this State.

So, we need an opportunity to question the policy and performance, and again this year we have done it through the Estimates Committees procedure. I believe that all members would agree that in many respects the new procedures worked much more smoothly this year, but they were certainly far from perfect. A number of problems remained which were very clearly shown last year, but which have persisted to this year; for instance, I refer to the proper role of advisers. Some were made to act like off-stage prompters; others were used to deflect criticism; fortunately, most were allowed to play some useful role, but some Ministers still were not prepared to let their advisers convey information directly to the Committee. I raise this point because some Ministers, including the Premier, appear to believe that the Estimates Committees are not the appropriate place to ask questions concerning policy or the administrative competence of the Government. At one stage, the Premier even suggested that a question was not appropriate because it concerned policy, and not, as he termed it, facts. It may be a problem for this Government that the two are dissimilar. Policy does not really line up too often with the facts, so perhaps one cannot question them in the same way. However, I do not think that should be written into our procedures, because that would negate the whole process.

This selectivity when answering questions often became contempt. Legitimate questions for information were refused. The matters raised, particularly in the Chief Secretary's Committee, I think are important in this respect, and will

be covered by subsequent speakers who participated in that Committee. In fact, the Premier would not answer questions under the Treasurer's lines relating to transfers of expenditure, which he has made clear on other occasions are central to the Government's Budget strategy.

The Chief Secretary, in Committee B, also believed that questioning should be restricted. He made a very pathetic defence of his performance when, in the *Advertiser* of 17 October, he referred to questions that should not be raised in the Estimates Committee. He was angry, he said, because the Committee wanted to question his administration and competence rather than listen to him read out departmental briefs about the dollars and cents of his budget. Another set of problems arose from the detailed programme papers, the yellow books. We have already complained that that information was provided too late to give members the proper opportunity to study it in detail. If the Budget is really being based on these programmes, it is difficult to see why they cannot be presented at the same time as are the other Budget documents.

They gave a lot more information, but it is doubtful in many cases whether that information is useful. They were certainly not always reliable. They often confused issues rather than clarifying them. For example, to choose one minor matter, which came up within minutes of the commencement of proceedings in the Premier's Estimates Committee, the Premier himself could not discover from the programme presented in the programme book just how many people were actually on duty in the Agent-General's Office in London.

It is not always a simple matter to reconcile the allocations shown in the programme book with the vote on particular lines, so in terms of providing information even on programmes, those yellow books were quite deficient. The problems of reconciling the information in the yellow books with the Budget documents did not relate only to expenditure. There was also considerable confusion concerning manpower levels.

The Premier has made no secret of the fact that a large number of jobs will be lost as a result of this Budget. Indeed, he boasts about it. Extraordinarily, he claims that this is some sort of virtue on the part of his Government. As our unemployment rises and our economic performance drops, he calmly points to the fact that we are the only Government in Australia that is actually reducing the size of the public sector. One day he will understand something about economics and something about why there is a direct connection between our being the worst-performing State and the only State that is reducing public employment. Putting that aside, even the figures cannot be properly discerned from the information given. Sixteen hundred jobs were lost over 12 months, he said, and that is headlined in one of the newspapers. The yellow book, on the other hand, gives a figure of just over 2 000. If we consider the number of average full-time equivalents, or if we use the calculation of the actual full-time equivalent as at the end of June, then the number is 1 300. What is the correct figure? By how many jobs does the Premier actually want to reduce the public sector? How many more unemployed, in effect, does he wish to create? I think he ought to make that quite clear. It is certainly confusing, and we need some clarification on that matter.

Obviously, programme budgeting has not proved to be the easily implemented administrative panacea that the Government said it would be in its election propaganda. It is worth recalling that, during the Estimates Committees last year, when questioned on the Government's growing Budget deficit, the Premier claimed that programme budgeting would bring savings that would play a significant part

in bringing the accounts back into balance. In fact, at page 227 of *Hansard* in that session, he said:

I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that a significant percentage will be saved by the adoption of programme and performance budgeting, simply because all costs which hitherto have been hidden under the line budgeting system must be brought out and considered in a general balance sheet for each programme and each section of a department, and, as such, can be identified.

That was his large bold claim last year for programme and performance budgeting, which, incidentally, was certainly an expensive exercise this year, when we look at the hundreds of thousands of dollars of consultants' fees and the hundreds of thousands of dollars more in public servants' wages tied up in various departments attempting to implement the new system.

So, this year the Premier was more cautious. It is too early, he said, to arrive at any firm cost benefit analysis or figure; indeed, the benefits of this programme will not be properly quantified for probably another two or three years. There is an accurate admission after the event. There is certainly still a considerable gap between knowing the details and doing something about them. In the case of most Government programmes, knowing the details does not remove the necessity for that expenditure to take place.

The Premier also admitted that there has been difficulty in establishing programme indicators for performance budgeting. However, there is no doubt that the new format, and the yellow books associated with it, do have advantages. In terms of auditing of dollars and cents, to which I referred earlier, there has been some improvement. But I believe they fail when it comes to examining expenditure within the wider context of the Government's policies, its promises, and its performance.

This debate gives us the opportunity to raise those wider issues, but not—and I think this is important—to directly question the Premier and his Ministers. The debate allows us to move the traditional motion for the reduction of a line of expenditure, as I did at the beginning of this speech, to highlight particular areas of the Government's administration, but we must do so far removed from the context of actually examining the area of expenditure with the relevant Minister himself before us for questioning. In this debate, the relevant Minister need not even be in the Chamber. It is undoubtedly an improvement to follow the procedure that we now have adopted and to consider the reports of these Committees together. That is why the Opposition supported the motion, despite the objections of the member for Mitcham, who has disappeared from our midst; he may be around. Despite his opposition, that is why we supported the combining of these two Committee lines. We were concerned that, by separating the lines into different Committees, this debate would become of even less relevance than it is. For example, later in my remarks I intend to take up the relationship between the State Development Office and the Department of Trade and Industry. The programme was arranged so that these lines were considered by separate Committees, but obviously they are closely related and are therefore better dealt with in the one debate. Similarly, a number of my colleagues are concerned that the Chief Secretary's administration of his portfolio is incompetent. We have made that abundantly clear. They want to speak about that and ask for explanations. The Attorney-General seems to have had as much to do with the administration of the Chief Secretary's portfolio as has the Chief Secretary himself, and again—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Very much more.

Mr BANNON: Very much more, as the honourable member points out. Again, these lines were before different Committees, and it would have been difficult to debate the issues separately. However, we are obviously not convinced

that the motion for the reduction of a line under these new procedures is the appropriate way for the Parliament to decide whether or not it wishes to continue to have confidence in the Chief Secretary. A number of charges have been made against his administration. Some are directly and immediately related to Estimates, others deriving more as a culmination of inefficiency over two years. They needed to be discussed, as I stressed earlier, in a confidence debate specifically on the Chief Secretary's administration. They require his immediate response, and they demand, most importantly, the immediate vote of Parliament. We have to debate the whole of the lines and Estimates.

Now let us consider them in their proper context. They represent the expenditure side of a Budget introduced by a Government which, after two years, has brought this State to the most grave financial crisis of this century. As I pointed out in my second reading speech, it is reasonable to expect that after two years this Government would have something to show. Instead, we have a Budget full of excuses for mismanagement and incompetence. It stands not as a record of progress, which one would have hoped from any such document presented by a Government, but an account of failure. It is a Budget which contained the second successive deficit on the consolidated accounts, and a further massive deficit in recurrent expenditure, which set a new record over last year's figures.

That is a nice combination for any Government that claims to have some sort of ability in financial affairs. It is a dreadful indictment of the inefficient formulation of its policies and its incompetence in administration. It is a Budget which made another record transfer of capital funds, and condemned the State to another year of squandering those vital capital funds to prop up the Government's recurrent account. It is a Budget which represents a complete repudiation of the promises which the Government made two years ago. As a statement of economic policy, it demonstrated just how little the Government understands about the relationship between its own activity and private sector growth, a point I made earlier in relation to the reduction in numbers in the public sector.

Surely the Government is aware of the change that has taken place in our economy since its election. All the key economic and demographic indicators show that we are slipping behind the rest of the nation and, in some cases, going in the opposite direction. We have recounted these indicators on many occasions, but each week when new figures come out they add up and confirm the same picture. Unemployment from September 1979 to September 1981 fell nationally by 3.1 per cent. In South Australia it grew by 4.1 per cent—7.2 per cent worse than the rest of Australia. Registration of new motor vehicles nationally has grown by 5.4 per cent over the two years, whereas in South Australia it has declined by 12.4 per cent. Look at the enormous difference there.

Then, there is the growth in employment of which this Government has made great play. Certainly, employment in South Australia has grown, but the key fact is that this growth is well behind what is happening nationally. From August 1979 to August 1981, employment in South Australia increased by 1.6 per cent, and over the whole of Australia the increase was 5.2 per cent. Our increase was less than one-third of the national growth. That is an appalling performance. For the past 21 months, nearly two years—all in the term of this Government—South Australia has had the highest unemployment rate in the nation. That is an extraordinary and unprecedented record. That is the record of this Government in its two years in office.

Possibly the most worrying statistic is that of population, which shows that people who are leaving South Australia are not pensioners going to the Gold Coast to enjoy their

retirement; they are the young people who are leaving South Australia because there are no jobs for them. In the face of this, the Government strategy is to continue its attack on the public sector in the belief that it is creating private sector jobs. The loss of 1 600 jobs (or whatever the number is—perhaps 2 000 or 1 300; let us have the correct figure) because of this Budget was a proud boast for the Premier. Quite obviously, that is one of the key factors in South Australia's dreadful economic performance and the damage that this Government has done to the economy. Only last week, when addressing the Financial Executives Institute of Australia, the Premier announced that his attack on the public sector was to continue in the face of all this evidence. He told that meeting that South Australia was the only State to record a fall in public sector employment and that this would continue.

Those States that have maintained and, in some cases, extended the level of their activity, including Labor, Liberal and Country Party governed States, as well as the Fraser Federal Government, have improved their economic performance. This Government is the only State Government to record a fall in public sector employment and to record increases in unemployment and the economic malaise to which I have referred.

The Premier has consistently proved incapable of understanding the relationship between the public and private sectors. He has destroyed the partnership between those two sectors, and he has ensured that it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for Government agencies to maintain the level of service that the community expects and on which, indeed, the private sector thrives. In some instances, the Premier may even have created grave and dangerous problems affecting the health and welfare of this community.

During consideration of the E. & W.S. Department Estimates by Committee A, it was shown quite clearly that efficiency, effectiveness and staff morale in that department were being severely affected by Government cutbacks, denied, of course, fulsomely by the Minister during questioning in the morning and hastily backtracked during the afternoon when evidence to the contrary was presented to him from within the very department in which he said morale was so high. The member for Stuart read to the Committee from an official departmental report, which summarised the implications of the current Government's policy on the E. & W.S. Department in the following terms (and this could be applied to other areas):

Those functions inadequately staffed due to the redeployments associated with the department reorganisation will not be properly staffed for the foreseeable future. Provision of staff for essential operations positions now vacant will be delayed until staff from well staffed areas leave or are successfully redeployed. New Government initiatives will receive a slow and inadequate response at the expense of functions such as planning and technical policy. This will increase a backlog of problems and lost productivity improvements for the future.

The weekly-paid work force will be inadequately supervised with a reduction in efficiency and effectiveness. Staff morale is at risk and reduced effectiveness or even industrial action is a distinct possibility. Service to the public will decline as growth in services is demanded without any possibilities for staff increase. The necessary increase in the use of consultants on less appropriate tasks will increase costs and diminish on-the-job training opportunities.

There is a clear, concise condemnation of the Government's policy and a clear expose of what the Government is doing to essential public services. The report showed and, in fact, specifically referred to the fact that there was a possibility of danger to public health and safety. I am not sure that the people of the Northern Spencer Gulf cities, who rely so heavily on the E. & W.S. Department to ensure that their water supply is safe during the summer months, would be very impressed by the Premier's boasting of staff cuts when they read of the severe stress of the massive overtime

that is being worked in areas such as the State Water Laboratories.

It is obvious that the next stage of the Government's attack on the public sector will be to sell off community assets, and it is working hard on that at present. It is a blinkered vision, which leads to senseless denigration of innovative projects and allows no time or ability for those projects to prove their value. At least until this Government took office, those projects showed that public enterprise could work effectively and work together with the private sector. Look at what is happening to some of the community services! The Minister of Local Government, who described the Parks Community Centre as one of the most wasteful projects in Australia, had better sit down and do his sums to see what the cost would be to provide those services and facilities in that area. He will find that he comes up with a very much larger figure than the capital cost of that centre.

The only way that that project could be considered wasteful, in the Minister's terms, is if a number of those services simply were not provided, as they were not provided for about 30 years in that area of social deprivation. The Minister would save plenty of money then; of course \$16 000 000 would not have to be spent. The Minister describes the Parks as a wasteful project, because he resents those services and facilities being provided in an area such as that. That is the underlying tone of his remarks. It was a costly project, that is true, but it contains those ranges of activity, such as high school, community college, health centre, child minding centre, sports gymnasium, swimming pool, library, theatre, cinema and cafeteria, that would have to be provided somewhere in some way and at far greater cost than in that integrated, important community project. To provide those services separately would have cost at least \$40 000 000, and most likely, of course, and particularly if this Government had been in office, those services would not have been provided at all.

So to describe the centre as wasteful was an outrageous statement. But of course it is all part of the campaign to make public facilities ineffective, which then justifies their sale to private entrepreneurs. Those entrepreneurs, incidentally, must believe that there is something good about the facilities and that there is some way in which a profit could be made or they would not take the facilities off the Government's hands. What is the effect of that? The effect, of course, is to reduce the participation by the community in those facilities, to raise their cost, and thus deprive large numbers of people of access to those facilities. A profit can be made, no doubt; a profit is made at the expense of the community, and that is not what the Government should be on about. The Government has cut back funds that were intended to promote the facilities at the Parks among the local community, involving the vital network project. The Government has not allowed positions to be filled that were designed to co-ordinate those services in a most efficient way. The co-ordinator left, and that position has not been filled. Further, the hours of use of the facilities have been restricted. The Minister then has the audacity to turn around and claim that the centre is not being fully used.

It is patently obvious that the Government wants to sell off the Parks. The Government has been receiving the wrong advice from the board and from the community in that area. They keep telling the Government that such a sale should not be made and that it would be bad for the centre and the facilities. The Government does not want to hear that. In fact, the Minister's very words were, 'We have endeavoured to interest the General Manager in these propositions.' He has had his response from the full board, and he knows what it is saying. Later, the General Manager was asked, in a minute from the Minister's permanent head,

for an objective report. What does that mean? We know very well. It means a report that will tell the Government what it wants to hear, that it will be efficient and possible to sell off those community facilities. The Government also claims that this Budget continues its policy of reducing State taxation, and this was another boast made by the Premier in his speech to financial executives to which I referred.

It is patently false: the Budget is a high-tax Budget. The Budget contains eight separate increases listed under taxation, which will collect an additional \$15 100 000 in 1981-82. The Budget is a culmination of a process of back-door taxation by increasing State charges, which will gain an extra \$23 200 000 to the Government in this financial year. The back-door taxations are indirect and regressive taxes being paid by all South Australians, irrespective of their means or capacity to pay. Their burden far outweighs any so-called relief from the much publicised cuts of earlier Budgets. The measures, about which the Premier boasted, that he returned \$30 000 000 to some people but not to every section of the community, have been matched by measures which take back about \$38 000 000 from every one and proportionately more than from those least able to afford it.

This was put to the Premier during the consideration of the Treasury Estimates, but he ignored the question and we had another boring repetition of his boasts. He did not want to answer that specific point. In the area of pay-roll tax the hypocrisy and deceit of the Premier are most evident. Since this Budget was brought down it has become clear that it severely disadvantages small business in this State. In this Budget, for the first time in many years, the general exemption level has not been raised. It stands at \$84 000, which is well below the \$125 000 level in Victoria and the \$120 000 level in New South Wales. This means that many small businesses will be taxed for the first time this year. The financial statement of the Premier makes clear that the total increase in the collection of pay-roll tax will be by inflation and not changing the exemption level. That is how he will collect more money. It will not be by more economic activity. He is hitting the same people much harder and is drawing into the net a number of small businesses that have so far been exempt.

During the discussion of the Treasury Estimates we asked the Premier what the effect of his failure to alter the exemption level would be. His reply showed how little he understood of his own Budget. In reply he said that the change would not take place until 1 January and that therefore it would make no difference to small business. He did not seem to understand that what he had done would make no change at all. Nothing happens after 1 January; that is the point. He seemed to believe that he had done something that was going to come into operation at a later date. As with the Federal Budget, he seeks to praise his own Budget for something it did not do. He says to South Australian business, 'How lucky you are that you did not get a surcharge placed on you as happened in New South Wales and Victoria.' This is an interesting argument from a Premier who suggests that he is lowering the burden of taxation. He congratulates himself for not raising taxes when, by leaving the exemption level at the rate it was at, he is imposing a taxation burden on a number of people who did not have one before.

This is an extraordinary case of illogical argument and one for which, unfortunately, some of the major employer organisations fell originally. The metal trades industry congratulated the Premier on not applying a surcharge to pay-roll tax. It was not aware that a large number of its members were going to be affected by the failure of the Government to change the exemption level. On closer ques-

tioning, the Premier said that he was reviewing the situation and that these levels might be raised at a later date. If that is true and not just mouthing some sort of sop with a hope of dampening down public criticism, if the Premier is going to change it at a later date, how are we to approach this Budget? Is it a preliminary document? Do the financial predictions and calculations in it have to be altered in some form in the new year? That can be the only conclusion when the Premier said that the largest revenue source of the Government, outside Commonwealth funds, is to go under review, only a few weeks after he has brought down the Budget.

It is clear from questioning the Premier that beyond a general hope that the royalty income to the State will increase, he has no clear plan to improve our economic performance. This Budget is remarkable for its complete lack of vision. On a more day-to-day level it appears that there is some confusion in the Government when it comes to organising and planning for the development of the State. The Premier told us this was a major thrust and initiative. During the Committee stages I told the Premier that a number of people in the private sector had told me that they were confused about whom they should approach in relation to discussing economic development in this State. It appears that, simply to pander to the ego of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a separate group is being maintained whose functions largely duplicate those of the State Development Office. I imply no criticism of the Department of Trade and Industry in saying that. It is disgraceful that the expertise of this department has been so poorly used by the Government. Obviously, there should be one single portfolio of Economic Development or State Development, not a number of separate departments and locations.

The Premier claimed that these reports were patently untrue and ridiculous, yet within a day, independently of any comments I had made, the political correspondent for the *Adelaide News* reported that Adelaide businessmen were expressing frustration with the approach of the Government to industrial development. The administration of the industrial development area by the Minister of Industrial Affairs also gives cause for grave concern.

In his defence, we should point out that he has been given the responsibility of implementing the Premier's so-called 'bold new initiative' to create jobs through pay-roll tax rebates and exemptions, which we now know has been a complete failure. The 7 000 jobs that the Premier promised to create was later raised to 10 000 jobs. The pay-roll tax rebates that were meant to secure this were allocated \$2 000 000 in 1979-80 for a part of that year and only \$129 000 was spent. In 1980-81, \$1 000 000 was allocated and only \$371 000 was spent. In 1981-82 only \$400 000 is to be allocated. There will not be many jobs created by this.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has also been caught out in his administration of the motor vehicle industry assistance scheme. This is one area in which the Minister believes himself to be an expert and he is prepared to lecture anyone on it, including angry workers attempting to hold on to their jobs. The Government arranged a special debate in Parliament so that the Minister's ego, bruised by that confrontation, could be soothed. Let us not forget that the motor vehicle industry assistance scheme was announced in 1979 by the Corcoran Government to facilitate structural change in the motor vehicle components industry. In the 1979-80 Budget, \$1 000 000 was allocated but only half was spent by the current Government. In 1980-81, according to the Auditor-General's Report, only \$443 000 was spent, in the face of higher costs. This was a running down of the scheme.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs told the Estimates Committee that, in 1980-81, \$843 000 was allocated for the scheme. He said the total commitment was \$843 511.28. He clearly meant to imply that this amount was spent. Otherwise, why did he give a precise figure in terms of cents? The Auditor-General's Report indicates what happened. Is the Minister trying to say that that was an error? Is he saying that there was a \$400 000 error in that report, or has the money simply not been spent? He has been caught unaware of the expenditure, which had been put on public record. He now boasts that \$1 000 000 has been allocated for the next financial year. This is exactly the same amount as was allocated originally by Premier Corcoran. There have been massive cost rises since that time. The scheme plainly has not been used properly by the Government.

The most disappointing and worrying aspect of the performance by the Premier in the Estimates Committee was his point blank refusal to answer questions about the massive transfers from Loan funds to prop up the current expenditure by the Government. It is not surprising that he is sensitive on this subject. In the Estimates Committee 12 months ago, in answer to a similar question concerning what was then seen as a record \$15 000 000 transfer (a minimal amount on those facts), the Premier said:

I can give an assurance that there is a very good prospect that we can be much closer to a balance in Revenue Account at the end of this financial year than we thought, at the beginning of the financial year, would be the case. The indications are that it is being contained and that the Revenue Account will be in a relatively healthy position at the end of the financial year.

Finally, on the subject (*Hansard*, page 226 of last session), the Premier said:

I think from what I have said that the Leader can understand that I am confident that the situation which was begun last year will continue and that, in spite of the tax cuts, the general Revenue Account is going to be in a very healthy position indeed and there is unlikely to be any great dependence on the overdraft accounts (that is, the Loan funds). Only time will tell, but I can assure the Leader that the trends of the present time are most encouraging.

The reality is that, just 12 months after making those statements, the Premier's line showed not a \$15 000 000 transfer but a \$37 300 000 movement of funds to pay for his mistakes and miscalculations. What did the Premier say when asked for details of which projects were to be delayed or abandoned to enable that transfer to be made? He said, 'It is not appropriate for this Committee.' For whom is it appropriate? How will we ascertain that information? Taking up his invitation, I wrote to all the Ministers concerned, and I hope that they will provide the answers. But, the Premier, in charge of this transfer, which has done tremendous damage to the building construction industry in this State, tells us that it is not appropriate for that Committee to be given the details. I think more than anything that that highlights the problems in this procedure.

The Estimates Committees procedures can work only if full information is provided and if Ministers are prepared to answer questions directly. That brings us in a direct circle back to the Chief Secretary, his administration, and the Premier's failing to give him support, decisions or back-up in that administration.

I have therefore moved this motion. Unfortunately, the debate thereon will be sprawling and will not be directed specifically to the point because the procedures of this House do not allow it. That is very unfortunate, as these matters must be answered directly and voted on. We will not be able to do it. At the end of this debate, in three days time, we will have that vote and, in voting for that reduction in the Premier's lines, the Opposition will be making quite clear and reinforcing the arguments which have been made not only by myself but which will also be

made by subsequent speakers, namely, that we have had enough of this Government and its incompetence in administration and, the sooner that the people of South Australia have an opportunity to pronounce on that and to change the Government of this State, the better it will be for all concerned.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): The Leader of the Opposition has waxed long and eloquent about one's inabilities, and has attached great play to the point that I should be the first crack in the armour. I hasten to assure him that we have no crack in the armour on this side of the House. The Leader raised questions regarding the police in South Australia. Let me say something about that.

I understand that the Leader at a press conference this afternoon gave rise to what he calls a catalogue, about which I will say something if time permits. The member for Elizabeth played quite a prominent part in the proceedings before Committee B last Thursday. We recall that there was a run-up to this, as it was rumoured about town on the preceding Wednesday that the matter was so hot that the journalists could not hold it any longer. It was going to be released and, indeed, was released on the Thursday morning. The Leader was on record as saying that Mr Rodda would be closely questioned when he faced the Estimates Committee.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That was just a little interlude.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: An interlude? It went on for three hours.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It was an interlude to what transpired. Coinciding with this was a *News* headline 'Duncan slams police', in which Mr Duncan was reported as saying that he believed that some police are corrupt. The report continued:

Corrupt South Australian police officers had taken bribes, sold drugs and framed people, a former Labor Attorney-General, Mr Peter Duncan, claimed today. In a series of sensational allegations, Mr Duncan said some police also had stolen, lied and cheated.

Mr Duncan, who has been compiling evidence of alleged police corruption for more than 12 months, said: 'I am not saying all or even many South Australian policemen are corrupt. But I believe some are—and they should be weeded out.'

He also believed some officers would be charged with criminal offences. Mr Duncan's claims followed revelations today that the State Government was conducting an inquiry into allegations of police involvement in drug rackets.

That was after the journalists English and Ball had made this statement in the *Advertiser*. Also, the member for Elizabeth saw fit to make a scathing remark. He was reported to have said that he had raised the matter with me and that I had laughed him off. As I said in the debate before Estimates Committee B last Thursday, that has been the honourable member's wont during this past 12 months or two years in relation to the police and other matters.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We'll see about the prisons in a little while.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That matter is *sub judice*, so we will not break the rules, in which the honourable member is well versed, by referring to it. As a result of public statements by the member for Elizabeth in relation to the Creed case, Deputy Commissioner Giles approached Mr Duncan. An appointment was made for the member to see Deputy Commissioner Giles on 16 September at 3 p.m. At the meeting, the member's statements were discussed but no information of substance was forthcoming.

After the member's subsequent statements to the *News*, in which he accused certain unnamed police of selling drugs, bribery and other serious charges, a further attempt was made to contact the member. Deputy Commissioner Giles was told that the member was in Tasmania and unavailable. Deputy Commissioner Giles asked that the

member for Elizabeth contact the police on his return. There has been no attempt by the member to provide police with any information to substantiate the serious allegations made in the *News*. This shows how genuine the member for Elizabeth is in his allegations.

On 2 October, at 3.40 p.m., Mr Duncan rang Deputy Commissioner Giles and suggested that he might see a Graham Eason (I understand that he is a prisoner) at Yatala concerning an alleged shot gun incident. Deputy Commissioner Giles duly saw prisoner Eason, who refused to talk to him.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: So much for confidentiality!

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: How confidential were you with the media?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Talk about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In relation to Mr Creed, I also remind the House that on 27 August, in a Ministerial statement, I invited the member for Elizabeth to contact the Commissioner if he had any evidence. On that occasion I said:

The member should divulge to the Commissioner the information he variously claims to 'believe' Creed has and he 'understands' Creed has. . .

I made that Ministerial statement in answer to other wild allegations that the member for Elizabeth has made about the Police Force. On 25 August the member stated:

... the greater concern I have relates to the information that he—

referring to Creed—

may have about other members of the Police Force and other activities of an illegal nature that have been undertaken by other police officers in South Australia. . .

The member then went on to suggest that, because of this information, Creed may be murdered by police officers, or agents acting on their behalf. The member did not substantiate his allegations at that time. He has still not done so. Yet, his allegations are so vague and so generalised that, until he either gives the evidence to justify them or withdraws them, he is casting a slur on all members of the finest Police Force in South Australia.

Mr Keneally: In Australia, Allan. They're the only ones in South Australia.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I meant Australia. After this most regrettable debacle in the Estimates Committee during the past week, I have no doubt that Opposition members and the member for Mitcham (who is not present) are in concert in a strong and deliberate effort to undermine the confidence of the South Australian public in this State's excellent Police Force.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Chief Secretary please resume his seat? I ask the honourable members on my left at this junction to cease interjecting. Their opportunity to participate in the debate will arise at a later stage, subject to their being in the House.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Sir, in the preamble about how the Committee would function, we sat back for half an hour while the debate took place on the pros and cons of time. The member for Stuart, who was leading for the Opposition, was adamant that the Opposition wanted a long time for the police. When discussions resolved, it was decided that it would be 3 p.m. That was quite unacceptable to the honourable member; he said that would probably go to 5 p.m. or 6 p.m., and the Fisheries and Marine and Harbours votes would have to continue in the evening session. That was the situation; that was the stage being set.

I ask whether these people are trying to cast doubts on the ability of these men who carry out the investigation in a most professional manner. I am talking about Mr Giles

and the Assistant Commissioner, Mr Hunt, who are working with Mr Cramond, of the Crown Law office. I would not be surprised, Mr Speaker, if that were the case. After all, these people seem most anxious to bring the investigation into the public eye and make a public spectacle of what is properly an internal investigation. I fail to see any rationale behind the unreasonable demands.

I am proud of our excellent Police Force. Its record is impeccable and to make vague hints that alleged corruption involves more than a maximum of eight men out of a Force of around 4 000 smacks of a complete lack of respect for the people in our Police Force. Then again, members opposite often show a lack of respect for the forces and for law and order. In retrospect, I am not at all surprised that this whole regrettable debacle has come to light. When this matter was brought to the attention of my colleague, the Attorney-General, he called for an immediate investigation. There were no delays; no committees were formed to examine the terms of reference and no commissions were called, or selections made. My colleague, the Attorney-General, got on with the task immediately and I have been kept continually abreast of developments.

How did those on the other side assess this regrettable situation? Did they say that this was extremely important to the welfare of our community, that perhaps a handful of officers may be involved in illegal activities, and that this could jeopardise the fine image of our Police Force? Did they say, 'Let us support the Government and get this most unfortunate task over with as quickly as possible, so that the majority of the Police Force can once again carry out their appreciated duties without having to work under the unfortunate shadow of a few law breakers'?

Mr Speaker, this has hurt the Police Force; it has shaken their morale and it has made them wonder. Of course, the Opposition did not say that. That is how responsible members could have viewed that tragedy, but the Opposition members said, 'What is in it for us?' They asked, 'How can we benefit from this regrettable situation? Damn the community. Let's blow the Police Force's image. We don't care about 4 000 police who are not being investigated. Let's see if we can cast doubts on them all. Why not? Why not try for a Minister or two while we are about it?' I am in that category.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Sir, it is patently obvious to every member of the House that the Chief Secretary is reading a prepared speech, which is against Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable Chief Secretary reading a speech?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Sir, I have copious notes and dotted points.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: One can be excused for thinking we are on a two-way radio. I do not uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member for Elizabeth. I have indicated on previous occasions that, other than in the case of a lead speaker, it is in my opinion not correct for any honourable member to read a speech, but in technical matters it is important that they have access to adequate notes. The honourable Chief Secretary has indicated that they are dot points and I take his assurance on that matter.

Mr RANDALL: It has been evident across this Chamber from time to time, Sir, that the member for Albert Park has consistently referred to the Chief Secretary by his Christian name, not by his district. I wish to take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Henley Beach or any other member is required to take a point of order at the time of the transgression, if it is to have any credence whatsoever. The honour-

able member for Albert Park would know, as would other honourable members, that, in the case I have given to the House, the use of terms other than 'the honourable member' or the honourable member's district is totally out of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to my point of order, Sir, in light of the large number of big words that the Minister has stumbled over, I ask you to inspect the notes that he has to ensure that, in fact, he is not reading from a prepared speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the intention of the Chair to read any honourable member's speech. It is for the honourable member to answer a question put by the Chair and, if it is the opinion of those who are in the Chamber or elsewhere that the answer given by an honourable member is different from what is actually applying, it will be for other persons to decide as to the attitude expressed by the honourable member.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am sure the House can see through this puerile grandstanding and I intend to use my notes. If I am paying too much attention to them and it is getting under the skin of the member for Elizabeth, that shows how guilty he feels. What I have said is what a majority of people feel about this awful situation. Heaven knows, Sir, it is bad enough to have this matter thrust upon us and to have these points of order taken.

The average policeman in the course of his daily duty is called upon to do, as his daily tasks, what most of us would balk at. That is his profession and it is pretty poor here that we are spending all this afternoon discussing the matter in this form. One would expect that at least the police would get support from all members of the House. After all, it is the general public who are involved and I know that they pledge support to the Police Force in all ways.

Certainly, some of us whinge a little if we are fined for speeding or if we get a traffic infringement notice, but I would like to know how much we would whinge if we were told to attend a horrendous traffic accident in the early hours of the morning, such as many of our police officers do. The only reaction by the Opposition to their unenviable task is to call to the public, relating to this investigation, facts that the Opposition fully realises should remain confidential until the investigation is over.

If, Mr Speaker, there are findings from that investigation that officers have stepped over the bounds of propriety, they will most certainly be dealt with. The Government has said that the completion of the investigation should be reached in only a matter of weeks. I think I indicated that to the Committee the other day but that does not seem to satisfy the member, who led for the Opposition, and his Party. Instead, they are asking, 'What mileage can we get from it now? We will take a responsible role when we may be able to scrape something from it that will reflect well on us.'

That is the only impression that one can get from this side of the House from what we have heard this afternoon. Members opposite have certainly tried but have only managed to scrape derision from a thinking and responsible community. To be perfectly sure, I am a little surprised that those on the other side managed to reach enough agreement among themselves to orchestrate this whole pitiful affair, because only two months ago there seemed to be a lot of fluttering in the dovecot when again the member for Elizabeth was putting a lot of pressure on the Deputy Leader and also on the Leader.

Personalities of those with big ambitions soon protrude and become apparent. We all know that amongst members of the Opposition there are those wishing to have a crack at leadership. It sticks out like a pikestaff over there today. Who would want to be at the helm of a Party that seems hellbent on deliberately wreaking havoc within the structure

of our most honourable Police Force? This whole business has gone on long enough, and is just another time-wasting ploy by the Opposition.

I cannot help but feel that those honourable members are revelling in their muckraking. That became evident to me early on Thursday morning. I believe that the member for Elizabeth must fancy himself as a bit of a private eye; in other words, a gun shooter. Unfortunately, from what I have seen he would not acquit himself too well in that area. In the Estimates Committee we saw him quoting from an internal document leaked from the Auditor-General's Department, which was a despicable thing.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You had no knowledge of it.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Why should I, and why should you? If you kept those sticky fingers and those prying eyes in your trousers or somewhere else you might be a lot better off. Unfortunately, what the member quoted was not consistent with the document presented to the Auditor-General's Department executive by his staff. In other words, he was basing his comments on a document that had been revised several times. It was just a draft, and this explains why he was so long winded. The Opposition's actions are thoroughly disgraceful.

On the whole, our Police Force is made up of dedicated, irreproachable men and women who perform their duties in a most professional and responsible manner. Their record is unimpeachable. Their day-to-day behaviour has always been exemplary, and they are men and women of integrity. I know that the public has tremendous respect for the Police Force and recognises its vital contribution to the security, safety and well-being of our community. The Opposition is attempting to tarnish this image. That is what it should look at. It must wear that if it supports what has come from that side today.

From 1900 to 1981, 35 police officers lost their lives performing public duties. Is this a witch hunt by members opposite? Is that the way to recognise the sacrifices made by these people? I could not describe it as anything but absolutely disgusting. I believe that the Leader, amongst other things, had a press conference today. He had a catalogue, the Rodda catalogue, to talk about the remand centre and two years on inaction, after the Labor Party had selected a site and convinced the electorate of a need for such a centre. The site determined by the Labor Party was at Regency Park. However, as soon as this Government came to office, the Federal Government approved the extension of the Australian National line from Crystal Brook to Adelaide.

That site chosen by the Labor Party became prime industrial land; the Government had no choice but to look for and select an alternative site. We have had great trouble in getting agreement to this site. After looking at many areas, we selected a site at Brompton. My colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has had to face some very angry meetings, at which a number of members opposite have been present.

The Public Works Committee is looking at the matter, and it will proceed. I remember that when I came into this House, which was too long ago for some people opposite, I heard that the then Premier, Frank Walsh, God bless him, said that one of the first things his Party would do was get rid of the Adelaide Gaol, return it to park lands, and have a remand centre and small gaol.

He had the best of intentions, but undoubtedly he, too, found that it was not quite as easy as all that. Here we are, 17 years later, getting this served up in the catalogue. In the area of correctional services, I do not want to say a lot. I cannot, because it is the subject of a Royal Commission, which has already been referred to by the honourable member. I only want to say that we have spent a lot of money.

We have taken some positive moves there that have made the place much safer for people to be retained in. The member also talked of prison escapes. I think that comes within the ambit of the Royal Commission, and I do not want to canvass that.

We have dealt with police corruption. Regarding random breath tests, he has had a lot to say about that. That is functioning, and I think people understand what it is all about. On the Fire Brigade, he gave me some of the long handle about that and about the Select Committee having to be appointed. That was the unanimous vote of this House, but I remind the Leader that the Bill for which he blames me was the creation of his own Government. We picked it up, and his Government would not wear it. I am certainly not going to take the odium for that.

Talking about prawn licensing, he takes on board that the Minister of Agriculture interfered in this matter, but let me remind the shadow Minister of Fisheries that his own Government put these people down there in State waters, as did the Commonwealth. They are a creation of his Government and are an albatross around the neck. Those people have been there for a long time, and they have a place in the sun. This is something that is not going to be solved easily. The only way to do it is to take some time to have some management plans, and to have some rationale to look at the fisheries. There is no point in blaming the Minister of Agriculture.

A question was raised about manning regulations, in regard to the fishing fleet going to sea. That is under an Australia-wide shipping code. We took immediate action to pass regulations so that these people could go to sea. What it does do is point out the requirements for people to become competent in taking vessels to sea, especially at this time of the Australian 200-mile zone. If people are going to go out in bigger vessels, these regulations must be part of it. It is going to take a very long time for them to become proficient and to meet the requirements. Our regulations, which were passed, will apply to them in the interim. They will have to be renegotiated or regazetted each year.

The Leader talked about netting regulations and said there was a public outcry. Let me give the former Government some credit. It set up a committee under the chairmanship of Dr Jones. The committee looked objectively at the scale fishery, and made recommendations that our Government supported. The Leader speaks with a forked tongue when he says that a public outcry arose from that. He also mentioned the *Joseph Verco*. That is subject to a certain amount of litigation at this present time, and I do not want to raise that issue any further. I refer now to the southern boat ramp. This is very dear to the heart of the member for Baudin. The Government had engaged a consultant to examine this matter. It was said that we had a site. That is all very well. That site was a most expensive one, and the consultancy is well on its way with its report.

The member for Florey objected about time to discuss the Department of Marine and Harbors. If it is any consolation to him, I say that we allocated \$500 000 for small craft. It is my wish that a big proportion of that will deal with that boat ramp. There was some argument about increasing boating fees. It was said that a notice in the *Gazette* was rescinded. I have seen a series of those, and there were more in the day of the honourable member's Government than under this Government.

In regard to the *H.C. Meyer* and *A.D. Victoria*, I have reported to the House the reasons surrounding the decisions. The matter of which was the better proposition was canvassed at some length and the department is convinced that that was the best proposition for the State. Moreover, it will keep the dredging programme going. In regard to the

Football Park lights, that was the dizzy limit, when the member raised that.

Mr Keneally: They haven't been raised yet.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: They never would have been raised either, if we start arguing about breaking debentures. I was involved in the debenture. Too many cooks spoil the soup. The Minister of Transport has reached an amicable agreement and this matter is proceeding. This is a sorry debate. It is unfortunate that the Police Force, this highly respected body of people who are out looking after all our interests 24 hours a day, 365 days a year has to be dragged into this debate in this House. I make no apologies for any actions I have taken on their behalf. I am pleased to be the Minister. I give the Opposition my assurance that I am not going to have them rubbished or denigrated in any way, because they are a fine bunch of men and women and they are doing sterling service for the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr Lewis: What happened to the shadow Chief Secretary?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): You will hear from him in a little while, fear not. I want to take my limited time this afternoon to deal with some of the matters raised in the Estimates Committee that dealt with the Chief Secretary's lines, the disgraceful contribution by the Premier this afternoon, and the lamentable contribution by the Chief Secretary.

First, I start by referring to an article which appeared in last Saturday's *Advertiser* and which was headed 'Rodda raps Labor over "witch-hunt" on police'. Any reading of that report and a comparison with the official *Hansard* report of the committee debate will show that the press report is a complete and utter fabrication—nothing more and nothing less. I believe it was cynically designed to be so by those people who put it out. The report states:

The Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, said yesterday he refused to allow internal police department enquiries to be turned into a 'public witch-hunt' by the Opposition.

Quite simply, the demands for the naming of police officers at this stage cannot be justified, he said. The character and reputation of any officer could be impugned unfairly and unnecessarily if investigation details were revealed prematurely.

It further stated:

Labor Party demands for the names of individual police officers who may be under investigation for alleged improprieties are unreasonable and irresponsible.

Further, the report states:

He said the reasons behind Opposition demands for names could only be the subject of supposition, but certain members of the Labor Party had previously demonstrated disrespect for the Police Force through their continual hounding.

I nail that article as an absolute fabrication. Any reading of the *Hansard* report that was published long before that article was put out to the *Advertiser* would indicate clearly that Labor Party members and, for that matter, the member for Mitcham who took part in the cross-examination and questioning of the Chief Secretary and the Commissioner of Police in that Estimates Committee did not in any way seek to have the police officers named.

It is an outright fabrication and I am very angry about it, because each and every one of us took great pains and care as we went through the debate to say (it was said time and time again in my case) that we were not seeking names. I did not seek the identification of individuals within the Police Force, and I intend to read from the *Hansard* report to demonstrate that. The *Hansard* report is as follows:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Have any police officers been suspended, resigned or otherwise indicated their intention to leave the Police Force as a result of this inquiry?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I cannot answer that question—

that was his answer all the time—

I understand that no names have been mentioned, only a spate of allegations. That is one of the sad things about this matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is the Minister inviting members of this Committee to sit here and name a whole series of police officers who are only the subject of allegations?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is asking me a question about which I have no knowledge. As far as I know, there have been no suspensions.

Clearly, I stand by the way I have been reported, in that I was not seeking names in that instance. In another case I said this:

Can the Minister say how many police officers (and I appreciate that this is detailed information) and under which ranks, have applied to terminate their service with the Police Department or applied for leave of absence during the past three months, in other words, since June?

I did not ask for names of any police officers. The details that I sought, as is clear, were the number of officers and which ranks, nothing more. Again, I asked a long question and the report is as follows:

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will refer this matter to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I cannot answer with an absolute knowledge of each individual case, but my view is that they—

these are people who have retired from the force, 'under a cloud' was the term I used—

have received normal payments.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not anxious to have a list of names, but could we have a list of the number of persons who have resigned and in each case, without naming them necessarily, the total amount of money that has been paid out as leave payments?

There has never been any suggestion by the member for Stuart, by me, by any other Labor Party member, or by the member for Mitcham that names should be used. The only person in this particular sorry event this afternoon who has named anyone is the Chief Secretary, and the reason why he named that person was the fact that I supplied names to the Police Force investigation officers. The Chief Secretary has chosen to selectively name one of those people.

It is notable that he did not name any of the police officers whose names I supplied to the inquiry committee. I want to deal with that committee. The reason why I did not contact the Deputy Commissioner again and why I did not see him again was twofold. First, when the Deputy Commissioner sought to see me originally, he said that he was there as an internal investigation of the Police Force. He did not tell me that the inquiry had been set up by the Attorney-General. He did not tell me that he was reporting to the Attorney-General. He did not tell me that the inquiry was being undertaken in conjunction with Mr Cramond from the Attorney-General's Department: he led me to believe that it was an internal police investigation with which I was dealing, not a Government investigation that would be reporting to the Attorney-General.

In those circumstances, as a member of this House, I believe I was certainly not treated particularly well by that inquiry. Later, I found out that it was an inquiry that had been set up by Cabinet, by the Attorney-General. The second reason why I did not get back to the Deputy Commissioner, after he had telephoned me, was that I had supplied him with certain information on the first occasion and arranged to have other information supplied to him.

In one instance arrangements were made for a person to meet with the police officers concerned after their *bona fides* as a secret inquiry had been made known to the particular person to be interviewed. As I understand it, useful information was made available to the police at that inquiry. Confound me, on another occasion, a name having been supplied to the police officers concerned, what happened? They simply turned up at the front door of this

particular individual, cold, without any preliminary warning of their arrival, and without their *bona fides* being made known to this particular person, and sought to ask him questions. Needless to say, he did not want to have anything to do with them. They muffed it. It is for those two reasons that I have not been prepared since then to co-operate with that inquiry by supplying any further information, and I do not think I could be blamed for that.

I totally object to the naming by the Chief Secretary in this House this afternoon of one of the persons whose names I supplied to the Deputy Commissioner. It reminds me very much of the sorry affair in the Federal House where that fool, Viner, got up and named one of the construction companies that had been supplying information to the Federal Government in relation to the builders labourers. It is a similar comparison which is there for all to see. I am very angry about the fact that the Chief Secretary was so foolish as to get up in this House this afternoon and name that person. Incidentally, it is another example of what I believe to be either incompetence or stupidity, or whatever it is. The fact was that without any further contact about this particular person the police officers concerned simply went out to see him, cold, without making the necessary arrangements to be introduced. Obviously, people of the sort whom one might expect to have knowledge of these sorts of things are what might be described as fringe characters; some of them do reside at Yatala; some of them are not particularly desirable types but, nonetheless, if they have important information about illegal or improper practices by South Australian police officers, then that information ought to be investigated—and investigated properly.

The correct and proper manner by which to seek information from those sorts of people is not simply to turn up cold, as it were, and say, 'We're here from the South Australian Police Force; we are investigating this, that and the other thing, what do you know?' Of course, such people will say that they know nothing; any fool would know that that is the most likely outcome of such an approach. I believe that in those circumstances I did the proper thing. I believe that there are serious matters that need investigating in the South Australian Police Force. The Attorney-General to his credit originally set up an inquiry after he had been approached, as we now know, from two sources. First, reporters from the *Advertiser* went to the Attorney-General and raised matters with him. They did so, in my belief, because they did not have any confidence in going anywhere near the Chief Secretary to raise these matters. In those circumstances the matters were put quite properly to the Attorney-General, who set up this inquiry. Subsequently, what happened was that the inquiry proceeded apace and for certain reasons, which they have stated in print, the *Advertiser* reporters decided that they would publish some of the information that they had on this matter, and they did so. Following that, the matter had already become public knowledge. I was not responsible for the original publication, and to suggest anything otherwise is, again, a fabrication.

I was not responsible for the original publication of information in this matter, and once it had been published, once it had become known that there was an internal inquiry, then there was no reason why other matters could not be put on public record. It was interesting, and I believe important, that such matters were, in fact, put on public record, because the next day in the *Advertiser* we ascertained that the Attorney-General had ordered the inquiry to widen its ambit of activity. I use the words 'ambit of activity' simply because of the fact that the Chief Secretary was so confused as to whether or not this inquiry had terms of reference that to use those words in this context has become completely meaningless. So, I use the term 'ambit'

of the inquiry. It was widened 'to examine alleged improper, as well as illegal, police behaviour'. If people doubt that the Police Department from time to time has not investigated improper behaviour itself and has not acted upon this, then again I suggest that they look for evidence of this in the Police Commissioner's replies to questions that I put to him in the Estimates Committee. There people will see that when I used the words 'clouded resignations' in asking a question relating to how many officers had resigned under a cloud, etc., the Commissioner said that he would get the information for me. He did not deny that this had happened; he decided that he would get the information.

The other reason why I decided to publish in the circumstances was because of the quite deplorable interference by the Premier of this State in the affairs of the Public Accounts Committee of this House, an interference not denied by the Premier. The *Advertiser* reported as follows:

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, admitted he had moved to discourage a separate inquiry by the PAC into allegations of police drug rackets.

The Premier did not move to discourage me. As I understand it, he did not move to discourage the member for Stuart. He did not move to meet the committee properly and raise any concerns that he had about it, but he simply chose to treat the matter as a political question. He went to the Liberal members of the committee (they have the majority, of course) and he said to some of them, no doubt, 'I don't want this inquiry, you had better kill it at this stage', or words to that effect, and there it is reported for all to see in the *Advertiser*. Once the Premier had made this a political matter in that fashion, I saw no reason for continuing to maintain my silence. Some members opposite know that I have been in possession of some of this information for a very long time. I had not completed the inquiries that I wanted to make before I acted upon the matter. Events overtook the investigations that I was undertaking. The reason why it is necessary for a back-bencher to go to great pains to conduct these investigations was brought before the House this afternoon, when the Chief Secretary, in his foolish way, kept saying, 'The member for Elizabeth never brought any documented evidence before me.' That is the very thing: in these sorts of matters one does not get things in black and white, chapter and verse, necessarily. One has to go about painstaking investigations to patch all the little pieces together. It is a jigsaw puzzle that one must put together; it does not come in documented form, and this foolish reply by the Chief Secretary, 'I invite anyone to put documentation before me'—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: You had stacks of it. You just had a wheelbarrow load of it—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Chief Secretary is the principal object of the discussions this afternoon, and I will come back to him later. I want to deal with the allegations of the Premier which were raised this afternoon. In referring to me, he stated:

He was assured then that an investigation would be held, and he was interviewed by senior police officers to obtain information.

In referring to the Minister of Transport, he said:

He did not go public; he acted responsibly and he did not go to the media. He did not slam the police on unsubstantiated allegations as the member for Elizabeth has done. He did the right and proper thing under those circumstances and went to the Commissioner of Police. I simply make the point that the inquiry was undertaken then without any publicity and I cannot quite understand what the Opposition is now trying to do.

As I understand it, an inquiry was then undertaken internally in the Police Force and no satisfactory results transpired; in fact, quite the contrary. If anything, apparently there was a cover-up then. I understand that since then, on subsequent occasions, the Minister of Transport has raised either those matters or others with the Attorney-General.

The fact that he raises the matters with the Attorney-General and not with the Chief Secretary (the Minister in charge of the Police) is a clear indication of the fact that some of his Cabinet colleagues do not have much confidence in the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That is absolute rubbish.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Maybe the Minister will have an opportunity to comment in due course. He may have confidence in the Chief Secretary but he certainly did not take the opportunity to go and see him with the complaints that he had.

I wish to deal with two or three other matters. I want to relate to the question of the Duncan report in 1972. The initial investigations into that were undertaken under the Chief Secretary by police officers within the Police Department. The community at large and the Government were so unhappy with that investigation and that method of investigation that the Government itself decided to import two officers from the British constabulary to undertake those investigations. The inquiry was conducted by the Attorney-General at that stage because by then sufficient concern about the likelihood of an impartial inquiry within the Police Force under the Police Minister had been expressed publicly that it was desirable to have another Minister conduct the inquiry. That is what was done. In this case it was not quite the same.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: One of those policemen has been in gaol himself in the intervening period.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed, that is correct. That is another indication of the fact that—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You chose well for your second inquiry.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did not choose the officers concerned, as I was not in Cabinet then. The Government made the best decision that was available to it.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They hadn't recognised your talents at that stage.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was not even in Parliament at that time. The Government made the best choice that it could in the circumstances. This case is quite different, because basically this is an inquiry, not one which at that stage was being conducted in the full light of the public glare—it was a private inquiry at that stage. It is an indication of the fact that the Government did not have much confidence in the Chief Secretary that it had the Attorney-General set up that inquiry. Either the Premier or the Chief Secretary used some words to indicate that the inquiry was full blown and left the Police Force's reputation unsullied and unsoiled. I do not want to go into those matters, but any Government Ministers who read the report of those two police officers (which is no doubt still in Government files) will note from it that the reputation of the South Australian Police Force was hardly left untarnished by the matters set out in that report. There were certain reasons why no prosecutions were ever undertaken, and I am aware of those. That report does not reflect well on certain individuals in the Police Force at that time. No doubt in years to come, when the archives are opened up, that will become available.

I want to deal with the incredible allegations that have been made that I am 'anti' the Police Force at large. On every occasion when I have had the opportunity to make statements concerning the police I have made quite clear that I am not suggesting in any way that the South Australian Police Force is rotten to the core or anything of the sort. On the contrary, the very reason why I believe we should have a full-ranging inquiry into the Police Force and into the allegations surrounding drugs and other matters at the present time is that in the South Australian Police Force, unlike some of the forces interstate, corruption has

not yet reached the top. Before it does, we should take action. Before it does, we should take steps to root out all the corrupt elements.

Corruption in Police Forces is a very cancerous growth. Once it is established at the highest level, we as a Parliament will be able to do little about it, except act like the Chief Secretary and simply mouth all those platitudes about what a wonderful Police Force we have, etc. Nobody argues about the general Police Force in South Australia being a very good Police Force. I want to see it stay that way. Personally I am very angry about the slur that the Premier has tried to cast on my character. As Attorney-General in this State I took more steps, in my belief (and most people would recognise this), to try to fight organised crime in this State and root out corruption wherever it might have been occurring, in the Government or elsewhere, than has anyone else. For the Premier to stand this afternoon and cast a slur on my character over these matters hurts me very greatly.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You are not bad at casting slurs, are you?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We can see what the Police Commissioner had to say in the *Advertiser* quite recently, as follows:

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

I am not alone in this, but I am apparently alone in expressing concern about it when it comes to members on the Government benches.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Plenty of people on this side are concerned about this matter.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You have got them in line. Congratulations! When are you going to make your run?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is the sort of disgraceful approach that the Deputy Premier would take.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I believe that there is no more important issue that can be dealt with by the Parliament of this State than corruption and organised crime, particularly corruption when it involves police officers. Some attempts are being made internally in the force to root out corruption.

I was accused by the Premier again of making statements about the danger to Mr Creed's life. He may not have read the *News* but there was a report a few days later headed, '\$15 000 to kill Creed, Victorian Police believe'. The report stated:

Senior police believe a \$15 000 murder contract has been taken out on former South Australian fraud squad detective, Colin Creed.

That was published after I had made my statement on the matter. I believe that there are very serious matters involved in this and that the Chief Secretary is treating the matter with contempt. I am not surprised because, prior to setting up the Royal Commission into Prisons, he treated the calls for that Royal Commission with absolute contempt. I look forward to the publication of that report and to quoting back his inane stupid comments prior to its establishment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is not in the best traditions of the House to refer to another member as stupid. I ask the honourable member to rephrase his comment.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I said 'his inane and stupid remarks'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will allow the honourable member to continue, but the Chair will not allow reflection on members on either side.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I point out to you, Sir, that a few moments ago he said that I had my eyes in my pants.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that I was not in the Chair on that occasion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I appreciate that, but that disgraceful interjection was allowed at the time, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is not reflecting upon the Speaker. If the honourable member has any objection to comments made by a member, he should make the objection at the time he believes he is aggrieved. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As I was saying, I have taken it upon myself on a number of occasions to try to make clear that I do not make allegations against the whole of the Police Force by any means—I am talking about a small (tiny, if you like) minority. For the Premier to say this afternoon that my dislike of the Police Force is well documented is an utter falsehood and an untruth. I would be very interested to hear the Premier state where such views are not documented, because they are documented.

Mr Millhouse: Let's have a look at the documents.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, let us see the documents. I recognise the value of a Police Force to a society such as ours as much as any other member of this House does, but I do not necessarily recognise the value of some of the interstate police forces, given the level of corruption which has crept into those forces. I do not want to see that happen here. I believe that we, as a Parliament, should take it upon ourselves to ensure that that does not happen. I want to finish by quoting what I said in the *News*, as follows:

In a series of sensational allegations—
that is their comment—

Mr Duncan said some police had also stolen, lied and cheated.

If anyone wants evidence of that, one only has to look at recent reports in the newspapers of two police officers facing larceny charges at Christies Beach, another police officer on trial at Whyalla, and Creed running loose. There was a report of a police officer selling drugs—not just selling them in the street but selling them in Angas Street Police Headquarters. Is that an indication of a Police Force in which all is well? That is what the Chief Secretary tells us. I rest my case.

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

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Elizabeth, in his speech, intimated (in fact, did more than intimate—said) that I had made information available to the Attorney-General on this matter because I had no confidence in the Chief Secretary. I do not think that I have misquoted the honourable member but, if I have, that was certainly the import of his remarks. I want to make it quite plain that that is not the case. I did make information available to the Attorney-General; that is so. It was some two to three months ago. I cannot recall the exact date. It was not because I had no confidence, or lack of confidence, in the Chief Secretary. I will briefly relate what happened. Some people came to me with allegations of corruption in the Police Force. I believed that they came to me because they had heard that I had had some part in an investigation that took place while this Party was in Opposition—

Mr Keneally interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: —because the evidence needed to be assessed. The member for Stuart asked me whether I had cause to go to the Chief Secretary. I am telling him what happened. Because the evidence needed assessing to see whether the allegations were well founded and needed investigating, I immediately made arrangements for those people to see the Attorney-General.

Mr Hamilton: You should have been a lawyer.

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

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: That is the end of it. After making arrangements for those people to see the Attorney-General, I had no further part in the question at all. The reason that that was done is as explained and was not because I had a lack of confidence in the Chief Secretary. It was a matter of the assessing of allegations made against the Police Force.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): We have had an interesting afternoon. One of the more interesting features is that the A.L.P. is now solidly behind the member for Elizabeth. I think it was about two months ago that one would have been excused for thinking he had leprosy.

Mr Trainer: Take your hands out of your pockets.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what the import of that interjection was. It was not all that long ago in this House that we had the spectacle of the honourable member who just interjected—the fellow without much hair but with a beard—moving briskly to our left so that he would not be anywhere near the member for Elizabeth; one would think he was a leper. It was at that stage that the member for Elizabeth accused his Leader of treachery. The member for Elizabeth was certainly a non-person as far as the A.L.P. was concerned.

Mr Trainer: You're nuts.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We were not nuts. It was perfectly obvious that the poor member for Elizabeth would have been up that pole if they could put him there. The member for Mitchell was sitting on Mr Hamilton's lap just to get away from him.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Premier has just stated that I was sitting on the lap of the member for Albert Park. At no time can I recall having done that.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member would fully appreciate that those with eyes to see would know precisely what the situation was.

Mr HAMILTON: I rise on a point of order. I understand that it is required in this Parliament that I be named by my district and not by name.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I have it sorted out—Ascot Park was on the lap of Albert Park.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. You previously ruled in the case of Ministers on the front bench that displays of affection are out of order. I want it clearly on the record that I was not on anybody's lap.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I ask members on both sides of the House to think of the decorum and dignity of this House. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Elizabeth had had leprosy he could not have been shunned any more effectively than he was by members of the House on that side. Now the fact is that he is leading them; they have all lined up behind the member for Elizabeth in this attack on the police. Today he qualified his initial attack by saying that there are only a few police involved. What is he reported as saying in the *News* when these banner

headlines hit the public of South Australia, 'Duncan slams police'? The report was as follows:

In a series of sensational allegations, Mr Duncan said some police had stolen, lied and cheated.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Read on.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The report continues: Mr Duncan, who has been compiling evidence—

we will deal with his evidence in due course—evidence that he has not given to the police—

of alleged police corruption for more than 12 months—

he has been a busy boy—

said: 'I am not saying all or even many South Australian policemen are corrupt. But I believe some are—and they should be weeded out.' He also believed some officers would be charged with criminal offences.

Today he says that corruption has not reached the top, only inefficiency, because he said earlier, in relation to some of the information given by the Chief Secretary in the dealings the member for Elizabeth recently with the higher echelons of the Police Force, that they had managed to muffle it—in other words, they are not corrupt, they just mess things up. Everybody in this House knows that that was interpreted and could only be interpreted throughout the community of South Australia as an attack on the police. The fact is that the member for Elizabeth has not come forward with any information which has been of use to the police in coming to terms with these grave charges that he has publicly made.

The Chief Secretary said today that the member for Elizabeth did not come forward, and that is quite correct. The honourable member said that he did not come forward, because he thought it involved only the Chief Secretary and that it was a police inquiry. He said that, had he known it was a high level inquiry, with the Attorney-General involved, it would have been different. He knows now that the Attorney-General is involved.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's not what I said.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was here and I heard what the member for Elizabeth said. He said that he did not come forward, because he did not have any confidence in the status of the inquiry. Now that the inquiry is wider things are different. The member for Elizabeth has still not produced a shred of evidence on which the police can act.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How do you know?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As late as this afternoon I had a conversation to check some of the facts.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who with?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: With Deputy Commissioner Giles.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Now we know.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am telling you. We have known all along about the state of play. I thought I would get the latest information, because we were told only at one minute to one this afternoon that the Labor Party wanted to move a vote of no confidence in the Chief Secretary. In that situation, it is not a bad idea to find out the latest state of play. Until today, I was aware of the fact that the member for Elizabeth had not put his money where his mouth was and had given the police no information at all on which they could carry out meaningful investigations. I checked today to see whether anything new had come to light, but there is nothing new. What the Chief Secretary said today is perfectly correct.

Obviously, the member for Elizabeth relished these headlines, which can only be interpreted as an attack on the police. After those headlines were published, an attempt was made by the Deputy Commissioner to contact the member for Elizabeth, but he had flown the coop; he was in Tasmania. As a matter of fact, he still had leprosy.

Members of his Party would not have worn him in a fit. In fact, I do not think they would have marched in behind him today had it not been for the urging and stirring behind the scenes by the member for Mitcham during the Estimates Committee hearing. The member for Mitcham is pretty good at that. He stirs the old pot behind the scenes and then crawls out from under like a white angel.

Mr O'Neill: He gave your Party a nice old doing over a few years ago.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am just saying that the member for Mitcham has a happy knack of stirring things behind the scenes. He has a ready ally in the member for Elizabeth, and now the entire A.L.P. has jumped on to the band wagon. The member for Elizabeth has had a miracle cure—he has been washed by the waters or some damn thing. He has been cured and he is now leading members opposite. However, it is a pretty sorry path along which he is leading them, because as a result of this attempted no-confidence motion I contacted Deputy Police Commissioner Giles, who told me that as a result of the headline to which I have referred he attempted to contact the member for Elizabeth, but he had flown the coop.

Mr O'Neill: This is what you call whistling in the dark.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it is not whistling in the dark. Members opposite had better stop whistling in the dark themselves and decide just who the Leader of the A.L.P. is. If they follow the member for Elizabeth they might get a better Parliamentary performer, but they will finish up on queer street. The member for Elizabeth has not been able to come up with any evidence to put before senior police officers who have attempted to contact him. In fact, there was a request from senior police officers who, in the member for Elizabeth's estimation, are not corrupt, fortunately—only incompetent. The member for Elizabeth said that this afternoon—they are not corrupt, only incompetent. The member for Elizabeth having returned from Tasmania and having being cured of leprosy or whatever made him unpalatable to his Party made contact only once—on 2 October when he telephoned the Deputy Commissioner and said that he had some information and that the Deputy Commissioner should contact a certain prisoner in Yatala in relation to an alleged shot-gunning. Now the member for Elizabeth is saying that the police muffed it. He is saying that Deputy Commissioner Giles, who has come up through the ranks, who has found preferment and promotion in the Police Force, and who is highly regarded in this State, muffed it.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Do you get the impression that the member for Elizabeth thinks he is the only member in step?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have long since given up trying to work out the tortuous windings of the member for Elizabeth's mind. I believe that he would make a far better leader in this place than the current Leader. It is good to see that members opposite do recognise some ability. However, the member for Elizabeth will certainly lead them down queer street if they follow him on this issue. The member for Elizabeth has claimed today that, as a result of that phone call, the Deputy Commissioner muffed it. An interview took place with the prisoner, who refused to give any information, yet the member for Elizabeth says that the Deputy Commissioner muffed it. He is not corrupt—he muffed it and he is incompetent. The allegations have increased today. Further down the ranks the police are crook, and at the top they are incompetent. The Government and I have every confidence in Deputy Commissioner Giles, Assistant Commissioner Hunt and the rest of the force.

Deputy Commissioner Giles and Assistant Commissioner Hunt are the two senior officers charged with getting to

the bottom of these unsubstantiated, uncorroborated allegations of the member for Elizabeth. He has not been prepared to put anything substantial into the hands of the police so that they can investigate the matter, get to the bottom of it and weed out any poor elements in the force, if any can be found.

Just what is the position? The member for Elizabeth is revelling in the publicity. He is revelling in his new found leadership of the Labor Party over this issue. Of course, he is being stirred along by the member for Mitcham.

Mr Keneally: Come on, Roger.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that members opposite do not like what I am saying, and are embarrassed. The member for Stuart did not know where to jump, and I will refer to the Public Accounts Committee in a moment, because the member for Elizabeth referred to that also, including the vascillation of the member for Stuart in relation to that committee. He wanted to back off because of the Police Association. The member for Stuart did not want the Public Accounts Committee to investigate the police, but he had nowhere to jump. I will refer to the deliberations of the Estimates Committee and its preoccupation with the female from *Nationwide* in due course. The fact is that members of the Labor Party have been sucked in. They have really fallen for the sucker play by stepping into line behind the leadership of the member for Elizabeth. Members opposite cannot get around that fact.

I note that members opposite are shaking their heads, and so they might, because they cannot get around the fact that the member for Elizabeth has put up nothing substantial at all to the police which would assist them in the investigation of these serious charges, which have besmirched the name of the police across this State. It is all right for the member for Elizabeth to back off a bit and say that he was only talking about a few—where is the evidence?

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I'm not backing off at all.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course you are. The member for Elizabeth has not come up with anything to assist the police in their inquiries, nor anything to assist the Estimates Committee, which he now says is acceptable. He cannot have it all ways.

I now refer to the Royal Commission into prisons, which was mentioned by the member for Elizabeth. The official Leader of the Opposition said that the Royal Commission was set up to protect the Chief Secretary. He said that it was set up before the Estimates Committees began taking evidence last year to protect the Chief Secretary. What does the Leader of this push say? The member for Elizabeth said that he was clamouring for this Royal Commission, so he believes that he has had a victory. Let members opposite sort themselves out. Do they want it or not? Obviously, the member for Elizabeth wants it, but the official Leader of the Opposition has said that it was only set up by the Government as a cover-up. Where is the Opposition going? I think members opposite should sort out just who is leading them.

They should be very cautious about following the member for Elizabeth, because they know just how erratic he can be. They know that only two months ago he accused the official Leader of treachery—strong stuff. According to the member for Elizabeth, the Leader deceived him and he accused his Leader of being a liar. He said that he deceived him by breaking an undertaking. I caution members opposite and point out that their new found friendship with the member for Elizabeth could prove to be very dangerous.

I wish to deal with one or two other matters, and in particular the hoo-hah about random breath testing. I happened to be attending a meeting in the House last Thursday. After that meeting I watched the proceedings of both

Estimates Committees to see how they were going. I attended Estimates Committee B quite early where the Chief Secretary and his officers were answering questions. If ever I saw the makings of a nice sort of set-up there it was.

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Before the dinner adjournment I was discussing the allegations made by the member for Elizabeth and the way in which the Labor Party has so willingly fallen in behind his leadership.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I'd like to get the money he'll get out of the T.V. interview tonight.

Mr Hamilton: Good statement from the Premier tonight on channel 2. Terrific. It would be worth about 20 grand.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not have the faintest idea of what members opposite are talking about, so I will not be diverted. We had an interesting interlude during Question Time. Questions were asked in the House today regarding information made available to the now Minister of Transport and allegations were made (and there had been similar implications in an earlier question) that the Chief Secretary had been approached by one of the Ministers in this Government and that no action had taken place as a result of that information being passed to him. In a follow-up question it was alleged that the Minister of Transport had been given this information. The facts were made clear subsequently by the Minister of Transport that all this had transpired during the life of the Labor Government.

Mr Hamilton: You should have been here for the personal explanation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I heard the personal explanation. The clear implication in the question today was that the Chief Secretary had been approached by a Minister in this Government with information and that he had not acted on it. There was a separate question about some newspaper journalists approaching the Minister of Transport, but that was not what the Labor Party was referring to. The Labor Party was saying that a member of the public had approached a Minister of this Government, who in turn had approached the Chief Secretary, who had done nothing. The member for Stuart went noticeably pale during the subsequent answer because it transpired that all of this happened during the life of the Labor Government, that somebody did approach the now Minister of Transport, who was then the member for Torrens and on the Opposition benches, with allegations regarding the police. The member for Torrens passed that information on to the Police Commissioner.

If the Opposition want to criticise anybody, let them criticise the Police Commissioner, because that information led to nothing further being done. They got their timing wrong, to their great embarrassment. The Minister of Transport has not been approached by a member of the public with any new information, and therefore he did not approach the Chief Secretary. In other words, the allegation put by the Opposition was absolute nonsense. It reflects discredit on the former Government that nothing came of it.

Many allegations that the member for Elizabeth is making are in relation to activities that occurred during the life of the previous Administration. The member for Elizabeth cannot get around the basic point that he has not put forward any evidence to the police, despite this new inquiry of which he now approves, that would justify those sweeping allegations given only too readily and freely to the media. If there is genuine concern in the Labor Party for the reputation of the police, if the member for Elizabeth does

have information of value, and if members opposite want to protect the good name of the police, the honourable member should be satisfied now that there is an investigation more to his liking, and should surely come forward with his information to senior police officers so that they can carry out this investigation, along with officers from the Attorney-General's Department. This did not happen: he is still sitting on it. All he has done today is to compound his felony by accusing the upper echelons of the Police Force of incompetence.

They cannot have it both ways: either they have confidence in the police, and the honourable member will come forward and make information available so that it can be investigated, or else the whole of this exercise is a sham. We know perfectly well what the true explanation is: it is a sham. I am surprised that the Labor Party is prepared to fall in behind the member for Elizabeth, from whom, two months ago, they could not distance themselves quickly enough when he accused the official Leader of the Opposition of treachery. They are now lined up in this sham in attempting to censure the Chief Secretary.

The embarrassment of Opposition members must increase hourly when they accuse the Chief Secretary of doing nothing about allegations passed on to the Police Commissioner during the life of its Administration, allegations that led to nothing.

Mr Lewis: Shameful!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It shows how absolutely phoney, hypocritical and hollow is this purported no-confidence motion. Let us look at the list the Opposition handed out today. The official Leader—not the one they are following today, the member for Elizabeth—probably learnt something from his visit to Nifty a week or so ago. I think Nifty said, 'The way to get ahead in politics is make up a story; it doesn't matter whether or not it is true. Make up a yarn, float it, comment on it, and let the others try to answer it.'

I have been on the receiving end of this sort of thing in my portfolio from groups that the Labor Party obviously supported from time to time. I have been the subject of a whole range of misrepresentations over the months. This is not a new tactic. The Leader has cottoned on to this.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You're the favourite son of business now.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know who the Deputy Leader is the favourite son of; I do not know who would adopt him. This is the nonsense promulgated to the media today, in the name 'A catalogue of incompetence'. Let us briefly examine the list. It refers to a remand centre. What did the Labor Party do during its 10 years in office (the Dunstan decade) for these poor unfortunate people who are being charged, brought before our courts, and have to suffer the indignities of the present remand conditions? I could colourfully describe what it did in colloquial terms: but let me just say that it did nothing. The member for Elizabeth, in his more unguarded moments, confessed that former Premier Dunstan said, 'There are no votes in prisons; why spend money on prisons? Education and health are the emotive areas: why waste money on a remand centre?' Yet members opposite accuse the Chief Secretary, at the head of their list—

Mr Trainer: Your mob didn't want to waste money on kindergartens.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Our bearded friend would do well to hold his peace.

Mr Trainer: You obviously hold yours all day.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member is one of the more disreputable members of this House. He does not even have the guts to apologise when he publicly accuses me of behaviour of which I am not guilty.

The honourable member does not have the guts and decency to come up and say that he is sorry. My opinion of the honourable member could not be lower.

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Premier seems to be making some allegations about me that have no basis in fact. I cannot retract any Parliamentary statement that does not appear in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member, from his own statement, has indicated that there is no truth in the matter alleged against him.

Mr TRAINER: A further point of order, Sir. The Deputy Leader used, I think, the words 'the disreputable member for Ascot Park'. I take exception to those words and ask him to withdraw them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked for the word 'disreputable' to be withdrawn. It is my recollection that that was a term used some time before and the honourable member did not rise immediately to have it removed. If I am incorrect in the timing of events, then I am most sorry that I have made that insinuation. I ask the Deputy Premier whether, the honourable member's having taken issue with the use of that term (be it in time or not), he will withdraw it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will certainly withdraw any unparliamentary term that I used. However, the fact is that some media prominence was given to interjections by two members opposite.

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order. The fact is that the Deputy Premier used the word 'disreputable'. I will not be involved with any of the surrounding circumstances. However, he did call the member for Ascot Park a disreputable member.

Mr Ashenden: He didn't say that at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier has withdrawn the term, and has not denied having made it. My recollection of the statements most recently made by the Deputy Premier is that he withdrew that term.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I rise on a point of order. When you, Sir, asked the Deputy Premier to withdraw the statement as you (and indeed I) understood him to say it, namely, that he called the member for Ascot Park one of the more disreputable members of this Parliament—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I have not finished my point of order, Sir.

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

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There is, if you let me make it.

The SPEAKER: On the basis on which the Deputy Leader is proceeding at the moment, there is no point of order to make. The practice of this House has clearly been that, if a member is concerned about a statement made in respect of himself, he and only he can ask for it to be withdrawn. No other member can seek a withdrawal or seek to make a personal explanation on behalf of a member who would otherwise have been impugned by the statement made by a member during debate.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They don't want to hear me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: My point of order is that, when the Deputy Premier was asked to withdraw those words, he indicated that he would withdraw any words that were unparliamentary. I want to know whether 'disreputable' is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the Deputy Leader's point of order. I have previously indicated that the word 'you', 'he' or 'she' can be unparliamentary in whatever manner it may be used against another member, and where

the inflexion of voice, and so on, makes quite clear that the term was used to cause hurt. The Deputy Premier, although not indicating that he withdrew the word 'disreputable', indicated that he withdrew any word that might be considered unparliamentary. The member for Ascot Park having indicated that the use of that term was hurtful to him in essence has a withdrawal of a word that he himself had identified. The Deputy Premier had not specifically stated which word or words he had withdrawn, but I was prepared to accept the Deputy Premier's statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition has managed to cut short very markedly my speaking time. I should now like to go on with the alleged catalogue of incompetence, and refer, first, to prison regulations and prison escapes. The Opposition has not one scrap of evidence to indicate that there have been any more escapes since this Government has been in power. In fact, the evidence is to the contrary. I refer also to police corruption, the substance matter of this debate, and the unsubstantiated allegations of police corruption by the member for Elizabeth.

I refer also to random breath testing. What is the burden of the Opposition's argument in that respect? I refer to the Budget Estimates debate, the report of which goes on for page after page, when the Chief Secretary gave a clear answer to the first question put to him. If I had time, I would read it again. I urge honourable members to read it. The Minister made perfectly clear in his first answer what the situation was regarding random breath testing. The record shows, page after page, that the Deputy Leader bought in. The Opposition had a hang-up with a *Nationwide* programme. If the young lady concerned is not a fully paid-up member of the Labor Party, she ought to be, bearing in mind the way in which she behaved on that programme. That young lady denied that she had had a body search, despite the fact that the *News* ran the story. All these pages of questioning are on the basis of the *Nationwide* programme, which is quite inappropriate, in view of the first—

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

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition to reduce the Treasury line. This is, in fact, a vote of no confidence in the Government. I am somewhat surprised to see how this debate has developed. It is a very clever tack by the Government to try to concentrate a wide-ranging vote of no confidence in a Minister, who has a wide and varied portfolio responsibility, into a discussion about the police.

In so doing, the Government is trying to insinuate that any action taken by the Opposition is clearly an attack on the Police Force. That is a clever tactic, which might even get the Government a line, somewhere or other. However, I believe that the South Australian community is sufficiently aware of the tactics of people like the Deputy Premier not to be sucked in to believing what the Government wants it to believe.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will point out why this Parliament ought to support a vote of no confidence in the Government, the Premier and, particularly, the Chief Secretary. But, first, I think we should put to rest the accusations about the Opposition's attack on the Police Force. As the Opposition's spokesman on the Chief Secretary's portfolio, including police matters, I want to make clear to the Premier, the Deputy Premier and anyone else who might wish to make accusations—

Mr McRae: And the people of South Australia.

Mr KENEALLY: I refer also to the people of South Australia. I thank my colleague for that interjection. I want to make clear exactly what was said last Thursday and in

which context the vote of no confidence was moved. That aspect has not been debated at all here today. When I, as the Opposition's spokesman, was given an opportunity to make some remarks at the commencement of last Thursday's Estimates Committee hearing, I said that two very important issues relating to the Police Force were exercising the minds of the electorate of South Australia at that time. One was the accusation about police corruption and the investigation into those accusations; the second was how the police were to implement Parliament's decision on random breath tests. They were two relevant matters about which the community was concerned and which the Opposition felt it was appropriate to clarify during that Committee's deliberations.

For the benefit of all those who wish to read the *Hansard* report of the Committee's hearings, it is quite clear that, had the Minister given clear answers to the questions asked, at least two hours of questioning of the Minister on the police line would have been unnecessary, and we would have been able to get on to other issues. There is no doubt about that, and I will get to that aspect in a moment. My opening remarks on Thursday were as follows:

The first major vote is the police, and we are all aware that recently there has been some bad publicity for the Police Force about activities that have taken place within the force. We think it is a matter of public importance that questions should be asked of the Minister about the Police Force and its activities. This is not to suggest that the Opposition believes that there is intrinsically anything necessarily wrong with the Police Force. We repeat what we have said on many occasions: we in South Australia are very fortunate in having the best Police Force in Australia. Nevertheless, we, along with the Government, I am sure, and the Police Commissioner, I am certain, want that high reputation to be maintained, and the best way to ensure that is to convince the public generally in South Australia that everything that can be done is being done to ensure that the high standards apply. The Police Force, as we know, can only be effective when it has the confidence of the community. It has that confidence now, but I think there has been some publicity that has reflected on that confidence, and we would be happy to ask questions of the Minister that will enable information to be provided that will regain that confidence, or retain the confidence if, in fact, that needs to be done.

I had only just recently had a lengthy discussion with the Police Commissioner and the Deputy Police Commissioner, and I know that what I said in those opening remarks was agreed to by those gentlemen. They felt, as I did, that there had been a reflection on the standing of the Police Force in the community, and they agreed that these matters ought to be brought up so that adequate answers could be given. To enable adequate answers to be given later on, but still fairly early in the Committee stages, I asked a question of the Chief Secretary. I asked him what were the procedures that the police used to investigate complaints against the Police Force, whether they be complaints of a criminal nature or just complaints against individual police officers. I made this comment in that question:

I made the point earlier that we accept that we have the best Police Force in Australia. Nevertheless, it is important for the people who read newspapers and who listen to the various news media to be assured of the procedures which take place to ensure that the Police Force of South Australia maintains that high level of professional conduct.

The Minister stated:

The Government is quite happy in the present procedure. It is an internal matter, and I am going to ask the commissioner to give an answer to the honourable member.

It was clearly a matter of policy which required the Minister to reply, but he passed it over to the Police Commissioner who, in fact, answered the query. Then I said:

I take it from that [that is, the Police Commissioner's reply] that the community in South Australia can be assured that the police are concerned about misconduct of members of their force by the very fact that when there are offenders the police do take action, and we have seen examples of that within the last few months. That is a factor that the community ought to be aware of. We have examples in South Australia where the police, once they

understand that charges ought to be laid, do lay them. That was the point I was trying to get the Minister to make so that he could point out to those people who read *Hansard*, or point out through some public statement that the Police Department of South Australia is prepared to prosecute its own officers where circumstances prevail that such action should take place. It was not a criticism of the police. I was trying to get that point through, and I would have hoped that the Chief Secretary would be alert enough to make it.

In fact, the Chief Secretary did not defend the Police Force: I had to. After directing a question to the Chief Secretary, I then had to make the appropriate point that the community of South Australia could be assured of the good action of the Police Force, which had shown that it would investigate complaints against its own officers. That is the best assurance that the community can have—if we have an honest and ethical Police Force. But the Chief Secretary did not make that point when he was questioned: it was I, the spokesman for the Opposition, who had to defend the Police Force. We have had this facade here today, with the Premier, Deputy Premier and Chief Secretary saying that all the Opposition is on about is a vendetta against the Police Force. It is quite obvious that the Chief Secretary had no idea of the relevance of the questions asked him. He has made a public statement saying (this matter has already been addressed by the member for Elizabeth) that it was the intention of the Opposition to have the Chief Secretary mention police names during the Committee stages.

The Chief Secretary made that quite clear in his statement to the press last Friday. In fact, one of the press people who received this statement was surprised, because it was mentioned to me that the statement was not germane at all to the Committee hearing, and neither it is. The Minister said:

Quite simply, the demand for naming police officers at this stage cannot be justified. The character and reputation of any officer could be impugned unfairly, etc.

Of course, we agree with that. It was the Chief Secretary who tried to tempt the member for Elizabeth into naming police officers, and the member for Elizabeth said he would not do that because it would be unreasonable to name police officers who were the subject of allegations. We have this incredible statement by the Chief Secretary, and it is quite clear that he does not understand questions that are put to him. He did not understand what was going on last Thursday, and this is only a small example of what the State of South Australia have put up with for the last two years.

The no-confidence motion that was moved in the Chief Secretary last Thursday was not moved because of any reflection on his administration at that time, and that was quite clearly stated by me. My opening remarks in moving that vote of no confidence were as follows:

The motion is simple and direct. We do not dispute here in this motion any matter to do with the Minister's wider responsibility as a Minister. We are discussing the refusal by a Minister of the Crown to provide to the Parliament of the State answers to legitimate questions.

The no-confidence motion was moved in the Chief Secretary because he refused to provide answers to legitimate questions. The answer to the questions asked by the member for Mitcham and the member for Elizabeth was available to the Minister should he have but asked the Police Commissioner, who was sitting alongside him. The answer to what were the terms of reference, turned out to be that there were no set terms of reference. Had the Chief Secretary asked the Commissioner immediately that question was put to him, he could have relayed that information to the Committee. That would have stopped the debate; it would not have required a no-confidence motion, and an

hour and a half of the Committee's hearings would not have taken place.

We were forced to take the only action that we could in the Committee to express our concern that a Minister would act in such a way, and we did this through the medium of a no-confidence motion. From that motion we have had this incredible performance here today. From that motion the Government suggests that we are attacking the Police Force. I would be very interested if the Premier, who went on television tonight and said that the member for Elizabeth is on public record as stating that he is out to get the Police Force, could prove that. I think the Premier has not heard the last of that accusation. He needs very carefully to reassess what he had to say, or come up with some evidence.

For the Government to presume that what we said last week is a wide-ranging criticism of the Police Force, and that this debate should concentrate on the Police Force, as I said earlier, is a cunning tactic by the Government to evade the essential points of this motion, namely that the Chief Secretary is being imposed upon by the Premier of this State requiring him to retain his portfolio load. I am prepared to believe that the Premier is continuing to ask the Chief Secretary to carry on as Minister. I believe that the Chief Secretary is a man who is prepared to serve, and so he accepts the Premier's request to do this, I might say at great cost to his own personal reputation. Nevertheless, because he has been asked by the Premier to do it, he does so. He is the sacrificial lamb to the incompetence of the Tonkin Government.

In his incompetence, the Premier wants someone in his Cabinet for that incompetence to focus upon. He is content to have the Chief Secretary there so that the Chief Secretary can carry the public concern about the Premier's and the Government's performance. I would have liked to have spent more time on these matters in the hearings on Thursday, but it was not possible because of the cunning and apt defence of the Chief Secretary by some of his colleagues, particularly the member for Fisher. I must say that at times I was annoyed by the tactic of the member for Fisher, but I appreciate it. He used the Parliamentary system well; he held the crease longer than the Opposition was able to do, so that we could not ask questions of the Chief Secretary.

In fact, to put the record straight, the member for Fisher asked the Chief Secretary to read out the respective wages and salary lines for penal institutions in South Australia—information that had been provided to Parliament in the Budget and Estimates papers. We had the Director of Correctional Services reading out information which had already been provided to Parliament. The member for Fisher claims that the reason for his request was to ensure that people who read *Hansard* know those respective figures. It was no more than a filibuster, it was apparent as a filibuster, and we appreciate what the honourable member was on about.

Nevertheless, the facts are true that the honourable member was protecting his Minister. I read last year's Budget debate concerning this Minister, and it is apparent that the same thing happened last year. The Opposition is concerned that both last year and this year the Minister referred to his officers not only simple questions that he ought to have been able to answer but also policy questions: questions directed to the Minister which he, as a member of Cabinet and as the Minister responsible, should have answered. Those questions were passed to the Commissioner of Police, to the Director of Correctional Services and to the Director of Fisheries, but that is just not on.

Members know that it is beyond the pale to ask senior public servants to comment in Parliament on political issues, yet that is what has been happening. Why does the Oppo-

sition believe that the Tonkin Government and the Premier should be censured? It is because of the Premier's insistence of placing the Chief Secretary in purgatory. What is important to understand is that not only is there wide questioning within the community, the press and amongst the Opposition about the competence of this particular officer, but also it is clear, if one looks at the record over the past two years, just in what standing the Chief Secretary is held by his own Government and Ministerial colleagues.

Last year, the night before the Estimates Committee, a Royal Commission inquiry was appointed into correctional services. We were to ask the Minister questions on that department the next day, but that Royal Commission was called the night before. In fact, the Governor was called out from a dinner with her Royal Highness so that he could sign the papers the night before we were to discuss that matter. During that discussion I asked the Chief Secretary about the timing of the Royal Commission. The *Hansard* report is as follows:

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I understand it was done last evening.

Mr KENEALLY: You understand?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I was not present. I uphold the action of the Government.

The Royal Commission into correctional services was decided upon, and the Chief Secretary, the officer responsible, was not even present at that decision-making process. He heard about it, I expect, at about the same time that we did. This year, prior to the Estimates Committee hearings, an investigation into the Police Force was announced by the Government, but by no-one less than the Attorney-General.

It is clear from what has taken place here today that the Chief Secretary was not involved in that decision, either. He could not tell the Committee what the terms of reference were; indeed, there were no terms of reference. In fact, he says it was despicable of the Opposition to ask questions on that matter because he thought it was not a matter appropriate for the Committee to discuss. Again, he thought he could hide behind an inquiry. It turned out that he could not do that, but this is how the Minister acts, and this is what his colleagues do to him.

The remand centre has been discussed here today. There has been a long history about this matter, and I am prepared to accept criticism that the previous Dunstan and Corcoran Governments should have done something about the remand centre earlier (if that criticism is to be made) but, nevertheless, when we went out of office a decision had been made, the site had been selected at Regency Park and the project was ready to go ahead and be submitted to the Public Works Committee. That was two years ago. The Government coming into office sold the land at Regency Park to a white goods manufacturer, and since then we have had this whole sequence going over and over again. It is not the Chief Secretary who is involved, although it is his area of responsibility: it is the Minister of Public Works.

The Government cannot ask the Chief Secretary to carry on the investigations which were rightly his. It gave the investigations to the Minister of Public Works. During discussion last Thursday, I raised the question of Mr Splatt, a prisoner at Yatala Labour Prison, who wanted to discuss with Mr Stewart Cockburn facts associated with his case. He was told that the Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, would not allow Mr Cockburn to discuss these matters with him. Subsequently, the Attorney's decision was supported by the Chief Secretary, but it was the Attorney who made that decision—not the Chief Secretary. Why is there this continual interference in the Chief Secretary's area of responsibility by his Ministerial colleagues? I refer to the example of the lights at Football Park. That matter was taken from the Chief Secretary by the Minister of Transport.

One of the most classic examples I have already mentioned in this Chamber previously, concerning the situation that happens every time one wants to speak to the Minister of Fisheries (another portfolio of the Chief Secretary) about areas within the fisheries portfolio, is that it is impossible to speak to the Chief Secretary about matters pertaining to fisheries without his having in his presence another Cabinet Minister. To me, that is a direct reflection. Is it a Cabinet decision that the Chief Secretary is unable to handle these areas of his responsibility?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What about Port Augusta?

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister refers to Port Augusta, but that was also a classic example. A deputation was arranged for the Minister by the member for Eyre (I must admit that it was arranged not through me but by the member for Eyre) of fisheries people at Port Augusta who wanted to see the Minister. I was not told of that deputation until I had reached the Town Hall and then, because the officers with the Premier had said that the Premier and the Minister would not meet the deputation, I took up the matter with the Premier, the Chief Secretary and Mr Scriven. As a result of my discussions, they met with the fishermen, but only if the Minister of Agriculture was present.

At the same time I had already made an arrangement to take the Minister of Tourism to see an important project at Port Augusta. As the two meetings conflicted, I went with the Minister of Tourism because the member for Eyre, not I, had arranged the meeting with the Chief Secretary. I followed through the negotiations that I had made.

We have had the experience with the Chief Secretary during the last 12 months of having a Ministerial minder; that is, on any sensitive issue in which the Chief Secretary is involved he always has a Minister alongside him in this Chamber or someone in his Ministerial office to protect him. That clearly underlines what the Opposition is saying, namely, that the Government has no confidence in the Chief Secretary and ought to be more honest in its attitude towards this gentleman, either asking him to perform the responsibility of his portfolio or relieving him of his duties altogether. I suggest that the honourable gentleman should be given the agriculture portfolio and that the Minister of Agriculture should be given the boot, and then the Cabinet and the South Australian electorate at large would be better off. I believe that the Chief Secretary at least knows something about agriculture, and this reshuffle would improve the performance of Cabinet all round.

We know that there is a very large debt that the Premier must pay to the honourable gentleman, and that it is not unusual for leaders of political Parties to repay debts. However, it is the extent to which that debt is repaid that is somewhat unusual in the circumstances. Two years ago, almost to the day, on 23 October 1979 in this House I said that the Chief Secretary was a disaster and that after a significant period had transpired he would be given a knighthood and relieved of his duties. I invite members to check the *Hansard* record and see what was said then. I expect that that will happen. If he is given a knighthood, it will probably be an S.A.R., and we all know what that stands for—some people would say for incompetence. The Labor Party is not in the business of handing out knighthoods, but if the Government wants to give one to the honourable gentleman, so be it; members of the Opposition will welcome it.

The Opposition does not dispute the Premier's statement that this man has given long and loyal service to the Parliament and the State and that he is a man of integrity. We agree with that. However, it was significant that neither the Premier nor the Deputy Premier at any stage in their contributions (and I invite members once again to check

the *Hansard* record on this) support and defend the Chief Secretary's competence, which after all is what the motion is about and what the Opposition is about. We are concerned that South Australia can no longer afford to have a good guy as Minister. The State deserves better than that.

The Minister has had the opportunity to serve. He was entitled to that opportunity: he is a senior and respected member. We know that we would not have the Premier we have now if it were not for the Chief Secretary, and that the Minister of Industrial Affairs would be the Premier of the State if it were not for the Chief Secretary. We know that that debt is being repaid. But for how long does South Australia have to suffer the repayment of a personal debt? The State has to foot the bill. There is a catalogue of incompetence.

The Deputy Premier told us that the Government is aware of any approaches that Opposition members make to the Police Force. I am concerned about that. He said that the Government was well aware of the approaches made to the Police Force by the member for Elizabeth. I would ask whether the Government is aware of the discussions I had with the Police Force; if it is, I am disturbed. However, more particularly, I am disturbed to hear the Deputy Premier state in this Chamber a matter that was the confidential property of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not dispute what the Deputy Premier had to say; I was very nervous about an investigation into the Police Commissioner's Fund by the Public Accounts Committee, and I said so. I would have preferred to discuss the Police Commissioner's Fund with the Auditor-General before the Public Accounts Committee made any decision. I have discussed this matter with the member for Elizabeth, so there are no secrets about this. I am disturbed that confidential discussions of the Public Accounts Committee are in the possession of the Deputy Premier. After all, discussions that take place within that committee are confidential to it, and if some members of the Government are reporting to Cabinet statements made by the Opposition during Public Accounts Committee meetings the committee is at risk.

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

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: When Charlie Wells was Chairman he got his riding instructions before every committee, and you damn well know it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the Minister of Agriculture has the call. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion, which in substance agrees to the adoption of the reports of Estimates Committees A and B. I totally reject the amendment that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon.

Mr McRae: Can you clear up Gavin's—

Mr BECKER: During my 11 years in this Parliament I do not think I have ever heard a greater load of rubbish, innuendo or unsubstantiated statements. If members of the Opposition are prepared to dedicate their time to putting over such trivia as we have heard today, they are not worthy of occupying a seat in this Chamber. The member for Playford wants me to clear up some issues involving the Public Accounts Committee. I will not make any statements in this Chamber, and I will not make any statements anywhere about what happens regarding discussions of the Public Accounts Committee. If any member of that committee wants to make statements to the television stations, the newspapers or in this House, good luck to him; if he wants to discuss matters in the corridor, good luck to him; but that will be dealt with in the Public Accounts Committee, not here, and members will not give me instructions

on what to do as far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned. I am the Chairman of that committee, and we will discuss matters there.

Mr Trainer: You got a car out of it.

Mr BECKER: The member opposite, who continually makes stupid and inane interjections but who has never made any contribution in this Parliament in the two years he has been here, now decides to get on to the question of a motor car for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The vehicle is for the use of the committee. If the honourable member wants to ride in it then let him get on to the committee. I did not ask for it: it was given to the committee. It was part of the upgrading of the committee, and of the provision of facilities for the staff to visit various Government departments.

I do not want to lower my standard in this debate and be dragged down to the level of a sewer by members opposite, because I want to get on with the issue before Parliament, the issue that concerns the taxpayers of this State, namely, the reports on the activities of the Estimates Committees conducted in the last two weeks. I believe that the Estimates Committees have been a step forward, but we still have a long way to go before we can have truly effective financial control in this State. There are six aims that I believe must be achieved. The first is that the Parliament and the Government need to have a clear idea of the purpose for which taxpayers' money is to be used. The programme papers given to us contain a statement, for the very first time, of every programme for every department in the Public Service. For the first time, it has been spelt out in document form what the departments are doing, what the programmes are all about and where money is allocated.

Never under the nine years of socialist rule were we ever given that opportunity; never throughout the whole Dunstan era were we allowed to inquire into any department. We could ask questions in this House but were told anything. We could put questions on notice, but we were lucky if we ever got the answer, and then if we got somewhere near the truth of a matter we were accused of having a spy in the department. Many Ministers of the former Government put out memos in their departments denying members of the then Opposition any information relating to the activities of those departments. So much for the principle of open government, which was espoused time and time again by Dunstan but which was never practised. It was the Tonkin Liberal Government that for the first time introduced Estimates Committees and practised open government, and that has now given the people the opportunity to know what is going on.

However, the Opposition has messed it up and has done nothing. Members opposite cannot read and interpret the papers. If members opposite will listen to me, I will give them some ideas of what we should do to make the Estimates Committees work. If the member for Playford is consistent in what he said the other evening in the health debate, he will support my suggestion. If he does not he is not truly representative of the people of this State.

The programme papers gave us the details and gave us the information that we should be seeking. For the first time, in every department the Public Service was given the opportunity to further provide us with the information we sought in relation to those papers. I must admit that some of the programme details were better than others, but it was not an easy task. Some were too detailed and some were not detailed enough. I refer to the Public Buildings Department, volume 2, book 4, of the programme performance papers. The total Public Buildings expenditure was \$140 000 000. An amount of \$49 000 000 is recurrent and \$89 000 000 is capital. There was not nearly enough infor-

mation. There were eight programmes and that was all. To take one line, we find spending of \$19 506 000 for property management services.

The Government widened support services and the programme sector was for construction, property, transport and related services. The programme 'Property management services' was responsible for the provision of building utility services and under their responsibilities were telephones, light and power, water and sewerage, municipal rates, and miscellaneous. Under 'Provision of property services' were included office cleaning service, security, canteen and catering services, convention centre service, and official removal service, with 173 employees and a total amount of \$19 506 000. There was no word of what the telephone costs were, what the light and power costs, were or what the water and sewerage costs were.

A large amount was lumped into the 'Miscellaneous' line. Anything can be buried in the miscellaneous line. The telephone is one area that is abused consistently in many Government departments. There were no questions as to what that was all about and no-one asked for a break-down of those figures. It was totally missed. An amount of \$19 507 000 for the Public Buildings Department can be spent in any way and nobody will question it.

I refer to the Fire Brigades Board. I am not reflecting on that board or its management in any way, shape or form except to highlight that, in comparison with the Public Buildings Department (which was responsible for spending \$140 000 000), the Fire Brigades Board had an amount voted of \$15 000 000 and there were 40 sub-programmes to detail to the Parliament the expenditure of that amount. There were details in relation to the duties of the policy development and operational planning, which comes down to the component of general management and organising of the Fire Brigade, down to 'Promoting, good conduct and discipline, assess future operational areas and advise board re-extension of boundaries, keeping good operational order, clean the vehicles and equipment, daily checking and tests, monitor and report performance keeping records'. There is page after page of every detail carried out in the general operations of the Fire Brigades Board. It is excellent information, but is it really necessary? Do we need all of it? It is an example perhaps of where they have gone too far in giving all the detailed information.

We get down to the research section, research for fire and emergency, and the reference addenda, and then we go through all the various technical journals that are provided to the department. I believe that we have to draw a balance somewhere. We can draw a balance between the two documents. We cannot compare the Public Buildings Department to the Fire Brigades Board. I make no reflection on the Fire Brigades Board but in that we had everything in minute detail, whereas for the Public Buildings Department document we did not, yet the Opposition did not take that opportunity on behalf of the taxpayers to question or query the programmes. It never sought the opportunity to seek out information on substantial increases in some votes.

I refer now to the Minister of Agriculture and the line 'Animal health'. There was a substantial increase in the vote in that area, but not one question was asked of the Minister of Agriculture as to why there was a substantial increase in the vote last year or why the line had been reduced this year. No-one wanted to know whether it was a one-off programme, or whether any specific disease was causing a substantial increase in expenditure.

The whole Budget concept of testing the papers, going through and testing the Minister with the programme performance documents was missed. No-one in the Opposition sought any detailed explanations. There may have been

excellent reasons why the Public Buildings Department, which was responsible for a large slice of expenditure, was covered in so few pages and with broad aims. Whatever the reason, it was difficult to come to an understanding or make any reasonable financial analysis of the information.

On the other hand, there were detailed activities listed in much smaller organisations such as the Fire Brigades Board. It is important that the programmes do not become a means of making it look as though the department is busy. The purpose of the paper is to inform and the purpose is there to benefit members of Parliament, who represent the taxpayers. I was pleased with the progress that was made but I think we could do a lot better next year.

There was one aspect that I found disappointing in the running of the Committees, namely, that the questions were not forthcoming. None was really directed at the total amount allocated to a programme and whether a proper and worthwhile expenditure was provided for that programme. Time and time again we have witnessed, in the Auditor-General's Report, the establishment of statutory authorities under the previous Government, yet insufficient capital was provided to make those statutory authorities work. I believe we must obtain value for our money, and to do so we must ask these questions. We must assure ourselves that each and every programme is needed, is operating effectively, and is allocated sufficient resources to achieve its purpose, and not one cent more. We must know what results we expect to get for the funds we spend.

I think it is a pity that so little attention was given to this in the Committees. Both sides were at fault. I hope next year we do better again. The second aspect of the sound financial management is informed and expert analysis of the Budget. It is a pity that the member for Playford is not here. The Estimates Committees have started this process, but it was clear that much of the opportunity was wasted because members were not able to come to grips with the complexity of the data, so they were not able to ask questions of any real value in many areas. It has become apparent that proper detailed analysis and informed debate will come only if the Estimates Committee members have access to financial analysis and advice on Public Service procedures.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I know the member for Baudin will never accept it. I would not expect a former schoolteacher to accept it. Accountability is the name of the game. I would expect members like the member for Baudin to have the ability to interpret the documents and to consider the taxpayers of the State.

Members opposite made similar points in the past few weeks when they asked for access to high level advisers. I am putting up a suggestion and members opposite should listen to it. They will have their opportunity to speak later. Problems should not be approached in any other way. It may take several years to find the best solution. If members of the Opposition do not have the ability to interpret the Budget papers, we will have to use public servants to assist them.

The member for Playford made great play about that the other night during the health debate, so the suggestion I have to make is that I think we could try to arrange for small teams of advisers to be provided to the Estimates Committees for a period of just one or two weeks before the meetings. I think it should be possible to come to some arrangement which enabled public servants to be seconded to such a team, provided that they were not permitted to provide advice on any matter dealing with their own department, or on which they had direct experience. There could be many problems in such an idea.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am sorry, but the member for Playford wanted this assistance. If he is that damned dumb, why is he not here now listening to someone who is trying to help him? We may need a senior officer to act as arbitrator between Committees and advisers on certain matters. I believe we should at least give the idea some thought. I think it would make the Committees more effective. If the taxpayers of this State saw the performance here this afternoon, they would rebel and refuse to pay the wages of politicians. I also believe it would be a very valuable experience for the public servants who would be involved. It might mean that the Committees would spend more time examining the Estimates, and understanding how our money is to be spent, and less time making political statements and the ballyhoo that has been going on. There are other opportunities for political debate. Estimates Committees should spend more time on financial matters, not political ones.

The third aim we need is a more dynamic budget system. We should be moving towards a system which enables us: to bring down a balanced Budget; to modify the Budget as a result of discussions in Estimates Committees; and to make sure that the Budget is dealt with quickly by Parliament and by the Public Service. We must reduce the awful hiatus that occurs in the Public Service around the middle of the year because the money has all gone and no-one knows how much will be available after the Budget. I know some improvements have been made to speed up the allocation of Budgets within departments after receiving the Treasury advice, but the system still has a long way to go.

The Estimates Committees have made little difference in this area, largely because they have no power to change financial allocations. It is probably too soon to think of introducing changes of that sort, but we will need to face it some time soon. Just look at the hullabaloo going on in Canberra at the present time in relation to sales tax. The fourth element of good financial management is that there is a need for improved reporting and monitoring of performance in departments. We have seen the first signs of progress this year with the inclusion of a statement of achievement for the past year for each programme. This must be accompanied by similar improvements in departmental processes to ensure that programmes are carefully monitored. This was another area in which I was disappointed at the lack of interest during Estimates Committees in what each programme had achieved.

The fifth element is review of programmes, and that is the role of the Public Accounts Committee. I know that the member for Baudin does not agree with the role of that committee, because it highlighted a few of his inadequacies when he was a Minister.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What are you talking about?

Mr BECKER: The member for Baudin made a statement—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Oh, it hurt, did it?

Mr BECKER: It hurt because it came from someone whom I know is incompetent on commercial matters. When the member for Baudin first went on the Industries Development Committee, he could not even read a balance-sheet.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You were always late.

Mr BECKER: You were incompetent. There was no point in getting there early because the honourable member had to be briefed on what to do, so I let the public servants brief him first because if I came in half-way through the meeting the honourable member would still be on the first line, asking, 'What does this mean, what is share capital ratio?' Education—hopeless! The Public Accounts Committee is having to spend far too much time on detailed examination and review because we first have to establish what has happened, how much money has been spent, and

what has been achieved before the committee can even start to ask why it has happened and whether money has been well spent. If the Estimates Committees can be made more effective in years to come I am sure that the work of the Public Accounts Committee will become more effective. Indeed, I look forward to the time when financial control will be of such a high standard that no department will have anything to hide from the committee and nothing to fear from it. I hope I live that long!

The sixth aspect of financial control is to extend our examination to cover statutory authorities. That is something for the future and will mean a lot of work. I believe it is something we will have to do as soon as we can manage it, because at present we are spending all our effort on only a small part of the total public expenditure in this State. As long as we do that we do not have real control. That was another point that was missed during the Estimates Committees.

The performance of the Estimates Committees this year was a vast improvement on what happened last year. Anything would have been better than last year, and it will not have to be too much better next year to beat what happened on this occasion. This year we had more information than we ever had before. We had the best opportunity ever to examine the financial management of the Public Service in this State. I think we should strive for even better things next year. However, I do not think that good use was made of this opportunity.

The less said about the time wasted on futile censure motions the better. It was a waste of time for the House and for the public servants in attendance and in the gallery. It was a waste of paper to record the speeches. The first real chance we ever had to make a thorough examination of the programmes being undertaken with the money we allocated was wasted in time spent on these motions, and time has already been wasted this afternoon by members of the Opposition.

Time was also wasted in the pursuit of errors in amounts. Sometimes there was value in clarifying how items in the Estimates lines matched those in the yellow programme performance books. But it seemed to me that some members opposite thought that they would be able to uncover some deception, some errors or some hidden items. They were doomed to disappointment before they even started. With weeks of work going into the preparation of these papers, it is highly improbable that there would be anything more than an occasional printer's error. If members opposite wish to spend two weeks working as overpaid proof readers they are welcome: I just wish that they had not wasted so much of our time while they did it.

One other problem became apparent when going through the yellow books. There are some departments where vast sums of money and a large number of staff are lumped together under one heading. This sometimes made it very difficult to decide whether the programme was worth the money allocated to it. This was particularly true when they were lumped under 'services' or 'support'. There seems to have been some lack of uniformity between departments on what should be buried in these very handy sinks. I would like to see the sinks reduced as much as possible, because unless we do we will never be able to cut out wastage of taxpayers' money in this State.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): It is usual in debates of this type to make some brief comment when one starts on remarks that have just flowed from the previous speaker. I confine mine to two. First, the member for Hanson reminds me that I am one of his Parliamentary mentors, that he was, indeed, a junior member of the Industries Development Committee during my period as

Chairman. I have to say that, despite my best efforts, it is obvious that the member for Hanson is one of my major pedagogical failures. As to the other aspects of his speech, I notice that he used copious notes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know whether the honourable member reflected on the honourable member for Hanson or not in his remarks.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, Sir, it is entirely an indictment of myself. I tried and failed to nurture the honourable member in a field in which he was obviously struggling. I failed and that is still showing. As to my second comment, I simply make the point that the honourable member used copious notes and we look forward to the Saturday morning *Advertiser* comments on those notes.

I wish, in this debate, to comment on certain aspects of what happened in Estimates Committee B during the past two weeks and, in particular, to comment on my major contribution to that Committee, which was to lead for the Opposition on the lines committed to the Minister of Environment and Planning. In doing so, I make the point—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is a certain pertinence in what the member for Hanson has to say, because this Government has treated the Minister most unfairly in the allocation of time to his lines. I remind members that, in terms of expenditure, if that is some sort of bench mark, the Attorney-General and Minister of Corporate Affairs is responsible for less expenditure than is the Minister of Environment and Planning. The Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy is responsible for less expenditure than is the Minister of Environment and Planning, yet both those honourable gentlemen were given a full day, a full 9½ hours of Committee time, while the Minister of Environment and Planning had to make do with four hours of the Committee's time.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Are you sure it wasn't a choice by your Party as to who went on the one day?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not at all. We were given an allocation from the Government about how it would happen. It may well be that the Opposition was at fault in not raising the matter before the Committees started sitting. However, we were given to understand that would be the position. Perhaps we should not look only at the expenditure of money as being an indication of the apportionment of time, but what else are we to do? Do we see this as an indication of the Government's priorities? The Minister had four lines committed to his portfolio. In fact, the Committee did not get to cover two of those lines. We could have, but that was our decision.

We decided that it was more productive to spend a lot of time on the general line on environment and planning than to devote any time to the loan allocation for the North Haven Trust or to look at the Minister's Miscellaneous lines. That was the Opposition's decision. However, we were forced to make that decision because of the very limited time available for that debate. I do not recall how much time was spent on the Loan line, but I notice that it covers only two pages of *Hansard*. We were forced to spend very little time on one line and none at all on two others because of the necessity to get into the general line.

I now wish to say one or two things about tactics, because that issue was raised on this Committee and one or two others that I was a member of, and it has also been a point of issue during this debate. I repeat that members opposite seem to see the whole thing as an accountancy exercise. The retired bank clerk opposite who just addressed the House obviously sees it in that light. However, the Opposition does not see it in that light.

We see it as an opportunity to probe the Minister, who is the witness, on policy and to determine whether that

policy is embodied in the budgetary process and, if not, why not? Surely that is the true function of Parliament. Do we really need to get down into the minutiae of petty expenditure when for the most part it is spelt out for us in the Budget papers anyway? This did not happen during the Committee of which I was a member, but I am told that on some Committees there were instances of Government members asking Ministers questions on matters of fact and all the Minister had to do was turn to the appropriate page in the yellow book and read out the answers.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: That did not happen in our Committee, did it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have already made that point. It certainly did not happen in our Committee, but it did happen in other Committees. It happened in Committee B on Thursday evening. What is the point of that? The whole point of the exercise, as I see it, is that it is an opportunity to probe and cross-examine Ministers about the way they are implementing the policies upon which they claim to have been elected. The Committees are meant to keep the Ministers honest, in the proper sense of that term.

In relation to the lines themselves, in the general carnage which is this Budget, the Minister of Environment and Planning appears to have been let off. However, it is difficult to work through the Budget papers because of the amalgamation of departments that has taken place. I invite members to examine *Hansard*, particularly in relation to the Development Management Division of the Minister's department, to see whether they can get any idea about whether we were able, in cross-examination, to really ferret out of the Minister whether the reduction of staff that has occurred in that division really means a reduction in services to the general public. If I have time I will return to that matter before I conclude.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I can get you out of your misery right now. There has been no reduction at all.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Minister attempted to get us out of our misery during the Committee hearing, but I really do not think he was able to clarify the situation to our satisfaction. It is difficult, because of the amalgamation of departments, to really compare what has happened this year to what happened last year, because there were two separate departments last year and bits and pieces have gone everywhere. With that qualification, it appears that the Minister has been let off when compared to what has happened to many of his colleagues.

However, we must remember the base against which this is predicated. Let us remember, particularly in relation to the National Parks and Wildlife division, that people have been pleading for some growth for quite some time. The Nature Conservation Society, the Conservation Council, students at Salisbury C.A.E. who see their professional future in this particular field, and many others have lobbied this Government and the previous Government about this particular matter. Therefore, it was high time that some growth took place.

I hope the Minister will not be so pleased by this little victory that he will not push for a good deal more in the next Budget, because he has a long way to go. This raises the matter of just what is a fair thing. How do we determine what is a desirable staffing level for the Minister, particularly in this sensitive area of nature conservation?

During the Committee hearing I raised the matter of the draft management plans which are prepared from time to time for our national parks. I was able to get some information from the Minister about what is happening with these plans. However, when we look at the development plans that have been prepared to date, we find very little or no information at all about the staffing resources that

ideally should be devoted to the proper care and maintenance of the parks system.

During the Committee's hearing I referred to the draft management plan of the Cleland Conservation Reserve, which is fairly important because it will be the interpretive centre of the parks system in this State. I pointed out that the 1979 draft management plan included a statement by the then Director of the department about staffing resources, but it did not spell out in any detail what was seen as a desirable staffing formula for that park.

It seems to me that it is not unreasonable that these plans should do just that. I liken this situation to what happened in my former area of portfolio interest, that is, education, where people endeavoured to work out what could be regarded as a desirable class size or some sort of desirable pupil-teacher ratio. By the same token, if one is going to work out a management plan for a national park, surely one should also be spelling out in some sort of detail the human resources that have to go into the care and maintenance of that park.

The staffing that one puts into this job should be a response to, firstly, the nature and location of the park and, secondly, public access to and use of that park. As to the first, if the park is very small and what it contains is perhaps not as sensitive to the ecological balance of the area that another park may be or, indeed, if it is in a very remote area, it may be that the staffing resources do not have to be as great as if the other side of those equations applies.

Similarly, if it is a park that has very little visitor impact, if very few people visit that park, perhaps less staffing resources will be required than are required at, say, Cleland, Belair, Para Wirra, or any of the other big volume parks that are basically recreation parks rather than parks set aside for nature conservation. The Minister referred to some of these things in his reply. He also said that he thought that the specific spelling out of staffing resources could not happen, because that is a Budget consideration. Of course it is a Budget consideration in relation to performance.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: In future years.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You were asking over a three-year period, I think.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, I did not mention three-year periods; the Minister referred to three-year periods, as I recall, or perhaps it was one of his colleagues. All I am saying is that if there is a draft management plan for Cleland, which is supposed to cover what is to happen in the next few years and which details the natural resources of that park and gives some sort of indication about the impact of the general public on that park, surely it should also spell out the ideal human management structure for that park.

In the Budget next year you may not be able to get anywhere near that or the next year make very much more progress. The ideal is there. The Schools Commission spells out what seem to be the desirable staffing levels in the Government school system. It is a target to which the department and the Minister can aim if it is there. In the absence of such a target, you have either *ad hoc*ery or you have an outcome of some sort of a continuing uneasy industrial bargaining process. The industrial bargaining process is going to go on anyway; you cannot guarantee, even if you get to what the professional people in the department regard as an ideal staffing level, that that will necessarily mean the Public Service Association, or the A.G.W.A.-M.W.U. are going to agree with it. Fair enough. Nevertheless, you still have some sort of bench mark against which you can measure the performance of the Government in terms of providing some sort of management structure.

That would be of considerable assistance to the Minister if he were able to get this incorporated as a feature of the management plans of our parks.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I think we agreed with that.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I did not think that I had a commitment from the Minister that he would implement this as policy.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: We agreed to it but said it was difficult to commit ourselves to numbers. We agreed to have some recognition in the management plan.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is not good enough for me. I would like to see something more specific spelt out in the management plan. I appreciate that it will not be possible immediately for this Government to be able to implement those staffing resources. It is there as a bench mark. It is all right for the Minister to agree in general. Let us see some action and something spelt out. The Minister indicated that he is giving greater staffing resources to development of these management plans and that far more will be spewed out of the system in the next 12 months than we have seen hitherto. That is great, but let us see some specific spelling out of resources in these plans.

The problem to which I then moved on the committee, and what seemed to be a natural progression, was the matter of acquisition of bush land for national park purposes. The Minister revealed to us that the only acquisitions this financial year will be part of a tidying up process, rounding off of boundaries in some areas, and that the real stress would be on off-park conservation in the system. On page 311 of the record the Minister said:

Of course, there are areas that could be acquired for further national parks. I suppose there always will be, but it is a fact of life that we have to consolidate and look at the management situation which currently exists and to concentrate on that before we continue to acquire more land. I think it is only sensible that that should happen. Further consideration will take place once we are 100 per cent satisfied that we are managing our reserves as well as we should be—

and then there is a qualification—

and that does not necessarily mean that every park has to be managed in such a way that they are all run like Cleland, Belair, Para Wirra or any other park, because some of the areas are reserved because of their wilderness significance.

The qualification slips out of sight as the Minister continues:

If in the not too distant future we feel totally satisfied that we have management under control, we would look at further acquisition.

I am disappointed with that. I do not know when we could say that we would be totally satisfied that we have management under control—when would we get to that—particularly seeing that the Minister did not want to spell out in any great detail what the management resources for the park should be. What he is really saying is that for ever and a day he is going to acquire bits here and there to round off the existing parks system and other than that he will rely on the heritage agreements.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I did not, I said over the next—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: How else are we to interpret the words, 'Further consideration will take place once we are 100 per cent satisfied that we are managing our reserves as well as we should be', or, 'If in the not too distant future we feel totally satisfied that we have management under control'? How else are we to make that sort of interpretation? If what the Minister is telling me, by way of interjection, is that he really did not use the words as carefully as he should have in answer to some of the questions, well and good. Maybe we will get more specific spelling out of those things from him later. In that case I will not regard my words here this evening as totally wasted.

We also looked at the matter of the Gosse Crown land. One almost apologises for raising this here because it must

be the third or fourth occasion on which I have raised it. This is a critical issue. In terms of the whole matter of the conservation of natural habitat, I doubt whether people like members of the Nature Conservation Society would see anything as being of higher priority than the proper protection of this area. I was able to get from the Minister an admission that the Gosse scrub is 'an important area for conservation purposes'.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I said that a long time ago.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Let the Minister have patience. I was also able to share with the Committee a document which had been made available to me and which was a minute from the Minister of Lands to the Minister of Agriculture recommending that the area not be cleared for reasons that were spelt out. I do not want to go over it again here. This is very interesting. The last time I raised this matter in the House (not in the Committee) I was interjected upon by the Minister who sits next to the Minister of Environment and Planning and who would be under a bear hug now if he were sitting next to the Minister, to the extent that there was no way that he, as Minister of Agriculture, would want to see that area other than cleared and made available for agricultural purposes.

So, we have a minute from the Minister of Lands saying that the area should not be cleared. Then, we have an admission from the Minister of Environment and Planning (who should know and who is the best advised of any of these people in terms of departmental expertise on this type of subject) that the area is very important for conservation purposes. Finally, we have the Minister of Agriculture, who happens to be the local member, saying that the area should be cleared. At this stage the score is two to one. I tried to tot up a bit more of the batting average, if that phrase is at all popular in South Australia after the events of the last 24 hours. As far as I can see, apart from the three Ministers to whom I have referred, the Minister of Tourism is probably okay on the area; native scrub, after all, is much more a tourist asset than having the area cleared and ploughed up. I think the Minister of Education is okay on it. I think the Minister of Transport is okay on it. I have grave doubts about the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Labour and Industry. I do not think the Chief Secretary is any good on it or the Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: 'Labour and Industry' is not the correct title.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I accept the correction from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Minister of Community Welfare is probably okay and the Minister of Local Government probably is not. That brings us down to six all, with the Premier (and I would not have a clue on his position) holding the balance of power between what we might call the greenies and the developers on the Cabinet. This battle has a way to go, and I hope that the score from those about which I am certain is some indication as to what the real power position is in the Cabinet on this particular matter.

Before leaving the matter of the natural environment, I did get an admission from the Minister that his department is looking closely at, to the extent of costing, the New South Wales PREPLAN system. This is a system of fire control in parks which is quite sophisticated and involves the taking of meteorological and soil data, and that sort of thing, from points on a kilometre square grid in a national park.

This information is then fed into a computer. In the New South Wales system, the computer is in Canberra, but we know what can be done with remote terminals. When a fire is located in the park, its position is determined on the grid. One then rings the computer and tells it where the fire has broken out, and it will give some sort of indication of the

direction in which the fire will burn and the probable term of the burn, the point being that, if the fire is going to burn itself out after only five or 10 minutes, it is better to leave it to do that, as more damage would be caused by trying to get in there to put out the fire than would be caused by the fire itself. The New South Wales people have been able to implement this on a limited basis only, because of the cost. I am delighted to see that the Minister and the department are looking at that system. We will watch progress on that very closely indeed.

As I said earlier, in relation to the area of the human environment, the Development Management Division has been reduced from 115.1 full-time equivalents to 93 full-time equivalents. As I also said earlier, I am a little uneasy regarding the Minister's reply on that matter. It seems to me that some responsibilities are being shrugged off to local government in the planning area, and I am not convinced that local government is all that overjoyed about having this additional responsibility. Of course, that is under the present Bill. We are also looking with a great deal of interest—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have given the Minister a go, and I will ignore him from now on. I have responded to more interjections than I normally do, and my time is running out. This is all predicated against the present Planning and Development Act. We do not know what will be in the new Bill when it is introduced. We know that the Minister's initial attempt at a new Bill was not well received by local government. In any event, I invite honourable members to look at the reports of the debate in order to determine whether they would be satisfied with the Minister's reply in this respect. I am awaiting information that the Minister has promised on the Planning and Development Fund. This is important, as this is perhaps one area in which there could be funds that will make up for what is not in the Loan area.

In regard to the Loan area, I also raised the matter of the Cleland trust. I think that I have just enough time to say one or two things about that. There is no doubt that there is much concern in certain areas of the community that the blueprint for the development of interpretative services at Cleland is not to be carried out.

The Minister made some comments regarding a semi-arid mallee area which was to have been developed there and which, he says, is not appropriate to a high rainfall area like that. I am taking advice on that. I am told that the step back from what was to be the original blueprint is far more serious than just that aspect of the original blueprint. The Minister was not able to give, or chose not to give, the Committee any great reassurances on that matter.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I told you how much we were going to spend.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In form, of course. The Minister said what he would spend this year. However, I remind him that we are looking at a long-range programme to which a former Government was committed, and that his Government is no longer committed to that original blueprint. We are really asking how much is to be chopped out.

At the end of the Committee, I told a little story which raised a certain amount of laughter and which got a rather unsatisfactory answer from the Minister. It was unsatisfactory even, judging by his reaction, to the member for Hanson, let alone Opposition members. I pointed out that, in preparation for the visit by the Duke of Edinburgh to the opening of the Swamp Aviary at Cleland, people were bemused by the fact that shrubs and various plants that were to be put around the area were being put into the ground in their plastic buckets. I wanted to know why.

I suggested that the Minister was perhaps hiring plants from a nursery somewhere and would send them back afterwards. Otherwise, why should they be put in the ground in their buckets? The only response I got was that everything was being done in a tremendous rush and perhaps the workers up there did not have time to take the plants out of their buckets; that is how much pressure they were under, and that that would all be done later.

However, people really did not take that seriously. Also, it was only two minutes to 10 o'clock, and there was no point in taking the matter further. I have now ascertained the real story. This involves one of those matters of false economics. Apparently, the Government has decided that it will plant plants at a less mature age. But, of course, H.R.H. was coming and it would not do for H.R.H. to see things about 3in. high around the place. So, there was suddenly a great rush to get more mature plants. And what happened when they arrived? They were the wrong ones, so they had to be sent back!

The only thing to do was to whack them into the ground in their plastic containers so that they could be taken out and sent back, and in good time the proper plants would arrive. That is false economy. That gives some idea of the *ad hoc*ery going on up there, brought on in part, no doubt, by the visit of royalty. However, we remain unconvinced that this Government is not making a mockery of the original design that was brought down.

I conclude with one point. The Opposition took the initiative to go to the Government in this debate and say, 'We are prepared to have a suspension of Standing Orders to allow the reports of the two Committees to be debated as one.' It was not a matter, as the member for Mitcham suggested, of our caving in to the Government's demands in this matter. We took the initiative, and perhaps that appals the member for Mitcham even more.

I make the point that we got no thanks for that move from the Government. Rather, we got kicked in the face. We thought that we were being responsible and reasonable people by going to the Government and saying, 'I am sure that you do not want 24 hours of debate on these two Committees in here. We are prepared to allow a suspension of Standing Orders so that it can be debated in one.'

What happened within about an hour of that being communicated to the Government? We then went and asked for the normal courtesies for a no-confidence motion and were told, 'No, you cannot have that.' Who is being reasonable, and who is being unreasonable, when one looks at the coincidence of those two things? The Government needs to wake up to itself in this matter. What it did this afternoon was an insult to Parliament, and the Opposition will think twice before being prepared to go to the Government again and be as reasonable as it has been in relation to this debate.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the motion moved by the Premier and, of course, disapprove of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to relate and recount briefly some of the situations that prevailed in relation to Estimates Committee B last Thursday. This has been the basis of the springboard used by the Opposition and the Australian Democrats in the media over the weekend in precipitating today the resolution which they failed to get off the ground at the commencement of proceedings but which they subsequently moved in an amendment to the motion.

The member who has just resumed his seat has, I believe, overlooked a very important factor, as, indeed, the Opposition did during the course of the Estimates Committees. This relates to Sessional Order 3 of the Estimates Committees. The honourable member referred to the paranoia

of Government members and the accountancy aspect of Estimates Committees. I remind him that Estimates Committees are to do with the receipts and payments of Government expenditure in the State principally. I refer to the Sessional Order that was agreed to by this House and laid down for the operation of proceedings. It is as follows:

A Committee may ask questions for explanation from Ministers of the Crown, assist where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information relating to the items of proposed expenditure. We would not have seen in last Thursday's Estimates Committee a no-confidence motion had it not been for the late arrival in the Estimates Committee of the member for Mitcham. We have become accustomed to the honourable member's late arrivals in the proceedings of the House, and likewise, it follows suit, in relation to Estimates Committee B.

The honourable member proceeded to question the Minister at the table. When he was obviously not getting the sort of responses that he wished (bearing in mind that Sessional Orders also indicate that the Minister at the table can respond to questions posed to him in the manner in which he or she sees fit at the time), the honourable member proceeded to call in a loud voice in the Chamber so that the press could audibly hear, 'What was the Opposition going to do about the scurrilous position in the House?'

We then saw the Opposition spring to the fore and move a no-confidence motion for fear of the official Opposition tag being placed on the shoulders of the member for Mitcham rather than the A.L.P., as the A.L.P. members see themselves as the real Opposition in South Australia. Subsequently, after the afternoon tea break when the act had been got together, so to speak, the resolution was formally put to the Estimates Committee and duly defeated. It was interesting to note in the debate that took place that it was not until there was the response from the mover of the resolution that the real questions posed in the notice of motion were brought forward to those proceedings. How irrelevant it is for a committee to be looking at expenditure lines under the Chief Secretary vote when a question that relates to policy decisions is to the fore. For example, how long did Cabinet discuss such a matter? What a question to be posed by the Opposition in the proceedings of the Estimates Committees. I believe that they have abrogated their responsibilities in terms of having detailed examination of Government expenditure line by line. An enormous amount of time has been spent by the Public Service in preparing documents that could stand in good stead in connection with serious questioning of Government expenditure of funds, but the Opposition's lack of penetrating questions in relation to finance highlighted its ineptitude in the operations of the Estimates Committee system.

From that particularly embarrassing situation for the Opposition in Estimates Committee B of Thursday last week, we then proceeded with the no-confidence motion in the House today by the Opposition. Really, the member for Elizabeth reminds me very much of the television commercial for Claytons drink; it is like being a leader when you are not a leader. Obviously there has been some pressure, because of his drive and tenacity in this field of endeavour, on the Opposition to move forward today in the no-confidence motion that it brought forward.

Mr Abbott: Is this the speech you make when you are not making one?

Mr OLSEN: The shadow Cabinet, during the course of the Estimates Committees and in the proceedings today, or for that matter during the course of the last two years, has not at any stage put up any alternative policies for the people of this State. If an Opposition is to be credible, if it is going to have a solid base on which to project itself, if it is going to be judged by the people, then it has to put

up credible alternative policies so that the people of this State can judge the two directions of policy initiatives, and the Opposition is not doing that.

We have heard that in the field of education the Opposition is having some conference towards the end of this year to determine its policies on education. Really, the question to be asked is this: are they re-working policies or are they really reworking their old prejudices? I want to touch briefly on the area of pay-roll tax. I want to make some brief comments in relation to the Opposition's attitude to taxes. There is no doubt that the Australian Labor Party is a Party of capital gains tax, wealth tax, resource tax—taxes that will retard this State's performance and inhibit the growth that we have seen in the supplement in the *Advertiser* today. That is adequately titled 'Heading towards a boom era'. On page 1 the Finance Editor, Mr John Field, clearly states the advantages Western Australia and Queensland have had in resource development and in private enterprise development by a Party that has given encouragement, not disincentive, to those industries and what that has meant in terms of the financial return to those States. Had we been prepared in the 1970s to embark on a more aggressive investigation of our natural resources in bringing that to fruition, had we been prepared to offer incentives to industries to come to this State, as indeed they shifted to Queensland and Western Australia, we today in South Australia would have been enjoying and reaping the benefits of some of the royalties that they have in those States. When you look at the mere \$6 000 000 that we are going to receive in royalties compared to the \$72 000 000 in Queensland and \$78 000 000 in Western Australia, those sorts of variations in royalty differences can have an enormous impact on a Budget in terms of the goods and services you can provide right across the board for the welfare of all citizens of this State. Really, what we are on about as a Government is producing the wealth and producing the finances so that you can distribute those finances to the benefit, in a whole range of goods and services, to every section of the South Australian community. Let there be no doubt about it, there can be no distribution of wealth unless we embark upon that project.

It is interesting, in talking about taxing attitudes, to take one or two quotes of leading Labor spokesmen on tax policies. I assume that these tax policies are akin to the policies of the Opposition in South Australia. One would really never know, because it is rarely that it, as a Parliamentary Opposition, gives out a policy document. I have noticed that the Trades Hall puts out policy documents quite frequently on the 35-hour working week and on *pro rata* long service leave on a short basis, and the like. All these things are tremendous disincentives to industry. Mr Willis, in an address to Labor economists conference in Brisbane, said:

If Labor does not gain office next election, then by 1983, when we could next hope to gain office, we will face a mammoth task in rebuilding the public sector and maybe an equally mammoth task—

here is the punch line—

in convincing the electorate that it should pay a higher level of tax to enable us to do so.

I wonder whether they applied that initiative to South Australia. In the field of pay-roll tax they did, and I will allude to that a little later. Mr Hayden in the *Financial Review* said, as a personal statement, 'I am a high tax man.' That would have to be the statement of the year; there is no doubt about that. Let us have a look at the field of pay-roll tax. I have spoken in this House on a number of occasions on what I have said has been one of the greatest disincentives to the employment of people in industry today—the impost of pay-roll tax and how it has grown

significantly over recent years. Pay-roll tax commenced in South Australia as a State tax in 1971 after it was handed over by the Commonwealth to the States, the Commonwealth having been in the pay-roll tax field since 1941, where they charged a 2.5 per cent rate on pay-roll tax with a basic exemption level of \$2 080 per annum. In 1971, when that was transferred to the States, it is interesting to note the speech of the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, who said:

The need to introduce this legislation and to introduce it at this time arises directly from decisions (taken at the Premiers' Conference of June 1971) to vary the arrangements for sharing national revenues more equitably between the Commonwealth and the States... At the meeting in June... the Prime Minister explained to the Premiers that, because of the constitutional barrier that prevents States from imposing a sales tax, and because of the Commonwealth's view that income tax should remain fully in its own hands for purposes of economic and financial control, it had been decided to offer the States the complete field of pay-roll tax.

Immediately on the introduction of pay-roll tax in this State it went from 2½ to 3½ per cent. Since that time there have been three increases in the rate charged on pay-roll tax, all during the period of the former Administration. In 1971, it rose by 1 per cent to 3½ per cent. In 1973, it rose a further 1 per cent to 4½ per cent, and in 1974 it rose again to 5 per cent. This Government has not seen fit, thankfully, to raise the rate of pay-roll tax—quite a stark comparison to our predecessors, who had three increases during that period.

Let us look at the receipts from pay-roll taxes. I spoke quite forcefully recently in this House in relation to it as a tax by stealth. It has a growth factor that is insidious. It places an impost on small business; it soaks up liquidity in small business and is the greatest disincentive to employment opportunities for young people in this State that one could ever imagine.

In 1971, the receipts were \$23 000 000. When the Labor Government went out of office in 1979, receipts from pay-roll tax had risen to \$151 000 000. Under the Labor Administration, there was an increase in pay-roll tax of 557 per cent. What is the Tonkin Government's record? Since that period it has increased this year to an estimated \$211 000 000, an increase of 40 per cent. What a stark comparison in revenue and in performance of this Government compared with that of the A.L.P. when holding the Treasury benches in this State.

Certainly, those policy statements on tax incentives attributable to the Federal spokesman of the Labor Party seem to be the norm when the A.L.P. is in Government in South Australia. This Government has undertaken a number of initiatives. I have indicated how, unlike our predecessors, we have not raised the rate charged on pay-roll tax. I have indicated how the percentage increase under this Government has been markedly smaller than was the position in the time of our predecessors. In addition, it is interesting to note that the increase in the allocation to the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this year's Budget is largely due to increases in the allocation for incentives to industry, including the establishment payments scheme, the motor vehicle industry assistance scheme, the export bridging finance scheme, and pay-roll tax and land tax rebates. These are commendable incentives; the Government is putting its money where its policies are, that is, giving in that portfolio area a 15.6 per cent increase in the allocation to provide those incentives to industry, and to encourage decentralisation in South Australia, providing employment opportunities to people in this State.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I've just read a document indicating that the actual rebate on pay-roll tax this year will grow substantially, and it shows in the growth of employment in country areas.

Mr OLSEN: The growth of employment in country areas and the rebate payable is directly attributable to one of the schemes introduced by this Government—the pay-roll tax and land tax reimbursement scheme, whereby businesses in near metropolitan areas get a 50 per cent rebate on pay-roll and land tax, and selected rural industries in what is termed the country zone, to which the Minister has referred, can get 100 per cent rebate. These are significant incentives for decentralisation, and for employment and job opportunities. I have said before in this House that, if we, in this State and across Australia, could provide the financial basis for every small business operator to employ one extra employee, we would solve most of the unemployment problems in the country. It is a matter of reducing the imposts.

While this Government's performance in pay-roll tax has been commendable, and by the standards laid down by the former Administration, outstanding, the advantage that we have had previously over other States needs to be maintained. Therefore, I believe that the Government ought to review those exemption levels applicable to pay-roll tax to small business operators in this State, so that we can take another step forward, provide further incentives and exemption levels, and reduce the impost on small business operators.

I hope that the Government will consider looking at the exemption level related to pay-roll tax as it affects small business operators and, hopefully, will be able to take some initiative from 1 January 1982. This would obviously have a flow-over effect during the whole calendar year of 1982, should the Government be in a financial position to do so. I believe this is something with which we have to come to grips, and I believe it is one of the most significant areas in which we can have an effect of reducing the financial burden on small businesses.

With the inflation spiral as it has been in the late 1970s and 1980s, the profits earned by small business operators have been soaked up in merely keeping stock on hand at the same level as it was in the previous year. Put simply, if we have an inflation rate of 14 per cent, a business has to have a profit during the course of that year that equates to the inflation rate of 14 per cent on the stock in trade so that it can maintain parts for sale, stock in trade, at the same level. One of the greatest burdens on the small business sector has been liquidity, its capacity to expand and offer a greater range of goods and services. Although, unfortunately, I do not have time to expand at this stage on small business finance, this is another area that we should seriously consider. I support the motion.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I was intrigued to hear the member for Rocky River say that he did not have time to expand on his comments about small business finance when he had a further 12 minutes in the debate remaining. Tonight I want to comment on the question of the Estimates Committee consideration of the 'Education' vote and the Loan funds school building account. I make the point that this year we believe the Government performed much better in terms of answering questions by the Opposition on the 'Education' vote by providing more information than was the case last year, but there are still many questions left unanswered.

Indeed, we will want to pursue those as time goes by, and also pursue some of the issues raised by some of the answers that were given. It was unfortunate that, while for the most part, Opposition members tried to keep their questions brief and to the point, during the consideration of the 'Education' vote, not all Committee members on that day saw fit to do the same. If we are to ensure that the Estimates Committee deliberations on education are effective and achieve all the information that we sought to

achieve, it will require the Minister of Education's replying to the questions that we asked much earlier than was the case last year.

Last year, when we raised questions in the Estimates Committee to which quite understandably the Minister was unable to provide immediate replies and to which he said he would bring down replies to the House—that was quite acceptable—it took until 4 June this year for those replies to be made available. That is an entirely unsatisfactory situation in terms of Budget considerations. I hope that, when the Minister said last week that replies would be brought down, we will see them brought down much earlier than was the case last year. I believe that a time limit of about four weeks is the absolute maximum that can be considered reasonable in that regard.

A number of issues affecting education arise from the Budget figures that need to be looked at and identified. For example, we need to look at the way in which the allocation of money has been altered in the current Budget. When I raised the point in the Committee that the priority of primary and secondary education had fallen from 25.8 per cent to 25.2 per cent, which indicated a shift away from education of about \$8 700 000 in the Budget, I was told that I was talking nonsense, that it was only \$4 500 000. Those who were present on the Committee will know that I then went through the mathematical calculations that gave me the figure of \$8 700 000. As a result of those calculations, the Minister was forced to concede that I had raised a point worth the consideration of Treasury officials and that there was an unexplained amount that had gone west. Somehow the Minister could not provide the answer on that day. He indicated that he would seek that information before those deliberations were completed. I suppose I was foolish enough to believe that the answer would be provided on 14 October, so that I could use that information in my further consideration of the Budget. However, it did not come on that day and, indeed, it has not come yet.

Before I continue, I believe I owe the member for Rocky River an apology concerning an earlier comment that I made. I was unaware that there was an agreement that he would not go his full time, and so my comment was entirely incorrect and should in no way reflect on his closing earlier than the time allowed.

As I was saying, I have not yet received an answer from the Minister. I had rather hoped that it would be provided this week, so that I could have used that answer in consideration of the Estimates Committee vote. However, still we find the answer has not been provided. I fear that it may yet be another 4 June exercise.

We do have to look at what happened to that money. Where has it gone? Why has the priority of education been dropped? I remind members that it is not entirely related to the question of school enrolment decline. I have worked out the figures (and I have already read the results to members of the House) that, if one chooses to reduce the expenditure on education by the amount saved in declining enrolment in primary and secondary areas, one does not come to a figure of \$8 700 000; one comes to a figure of only about \$4 500 000, which still leaves an unexplained gap.

On top of that, one could make the other point that it may not be entirely reasonable to expect to use all those savings that appear on paper from declining enrolments. I point to the Schools Commission report on this matter which makes two main findings: first, that declining student numbers do not take place in discrete units—one does not find a year 9 class or a grade 3 class suddenly disappearing from a school because enrolments have declined. In fact, the decline comprises two students from a certain class, three from another, and so on, randomly spread throughout

the school. Therefore, it is quite structurally difficult in some situations to match the teacher numbers with the student numbers in the short term.

The other point that ought to be made is that the School Commission stated that we should make use of the hiatus in enrolment to try to boost those areas of education which still need boosting. The Schools Commission has, for example, identified the important needs in primary education, indicating that this area requires a boost and that perhaps we should take advantage of this rest period to provide extra resources to it. That idea is not something that is totally in opposition to the Government's stated policy; certainly it is in opposition to its actions. Before the last election, the Government indicated that the primary staffing area was one of great importance where extra resources should be made available. We have yet to see the colour of the money that will make that possible.

Another question that we need to look at is the reversion to parents of increasing cost burdens in terms of financing the education of their children. Many members have mentioned in this House the matter of increasing State charges, charges that are quite easily identifiable, because one can go to the *Gazette* or to the various public announcements and see the way in which the imposts of the State Government and its instrumentalities on families and individuals are creating an ever-increasing burden. However, schools are no different; they are also putting on families and parents in this community increasing cost burdens, and that is being done because in large part grants to schools are not keeping pace with inflation.

During the Estimates Committee hearing last week, I identified the fact that in October of this year the Education Department *Gazette* indicated that there was no increase at all over the previous year's allocations for such things as supplies, grants, books and materials grants, grants for school purposes, ground maintenance, and the like. If we analyse those grants and assume that the costs which those grants are meant to meet have increased because of inflation (and that is not an unreasonable assumption—that few things in society have not gone up owing to inflation), if we fail to provide grants matching that increase in inflation, then by definition and by consequence we are putting a greater impost on families and school communities to pick up that tab that inflation has caused.

Had we had more time during the Estimates Committee meeting, the Opposition could have pursued that line of questioning to find out exactly how much money is involved. We were not able to do so, and I have had to take out some rough figures since then to try to get an order of magnitude, and I present these figures now. From the figures I have, I calculate that the extra costs on school communities owing to inflation, not matched by the increases in grants in the supplies grant area, amount to about \$270 000 minimum; in the books and material area, \$503 000; and in the grants for school purposes, \$104 000. I confess that I was not able to work out a figure for the ground maintenance grants, since I did not have information on the total land area of all the schools involved.

However, adding up these components that I did work out, I came to a figure of \$1 800 000 extra impost upon school communities. I worked that figure out by very conservative means. I did not assess separately area school numbers from primary school numbers, so consequently the cost figures were at that lesser rate, and, in fact, it is highly likely that that total figure taking into account that the area schools component and the ground maintenance component were not included, would be above \$2 000 000, rather than \$1 800 000. The conclusion to be drawn from that is that the State has had to put up with yet another increase in charges through this Budget to the tune of

\$2 000 000. That is a hidden increase—a hidden impost—because you will not see that clearly spelt out in any *Gazette* or Government publication. It is rather the implicit conclusion to be drawn from the data provided following the announcement that grants will not increase over last year's figure. I point out to the Minister that perhaps that is \$2 000 000 of the money that he cannot explain.

I shall return to that point at a later time when looking at kindergarten funding, because that is particularly important. Another area that I indicated was of grave concern to me was that concerning capital works programmes. I pointed out in my second reading speech on the Budget that I was very concerned about the reduction in funds available for capital works programmes for schools. I was concerned because I know, as other members in this House know, that the need has not gone away. All we are doing by deferring these capital works is committing an act of false economy, because this need will have to be met in the future. Indeed, in an effort to analyse just how much extra these needs will cost to be met I wrote to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, because the Public Works Loan Committee did not provide enough time. I am not accusing the Minister of any fault in this regard. I would like to read out my letter so that members know the drift of my thinking in this regard. I wrote to the Minister in the following terms:

Will your department undertake a study of the penalty costs relating to deferring capital works as a result of cutbacks in this Budget? By penalty costs I refer to those extra cost elements that will arise from delays over and above the impact of inflation. Some of these penalty costs are particularly associated with the projects in question, while others are of a broader economic character. Of those connected with particular buildings in question, the most significant would be cost escalation resulting from major changes in works proposed caused entirely by the delay. By way of example, a school which presently could be upgraded and thereby have a future economic life of perhaps 20 years, may in five years from now, in the absence of any upgrading, only be suitable for total replacement.

Another penalty cost associated with delays and attached to particular building projects is that connected with maintenance costs. In the last years of a building's economic life, maintenance costs escalate significantly and there comes a point at which they exceed the financing costs, plus lower maintenance costs, of a new building. Where projects have been delayed beyond that point, there is an obvious penalty cost.

Among elements of a broader economic character is the impact on Education Department costing and timing, of the state of the building industry. That industry, presently under-utilised, is capable of offering competitive prices and early completion dates; working on the assumption that the industry can get no worse than its present depressed state—

and I can only assume that is the hope of all South Australians—

building works required in the future may not have the same access to competitive pricing or early completion dates.

I would be interested in your investigation of this matter as I believe it to be one of importance in the present economic climate. Such a report could, for example, provide a useful point of argument in setting out to the Federal Government how false the savings in Loan funds may be.

That is a particularly important element. It appears on paper that money has been saved to the State by deferring capital works. I am posing the question that that may not in the long term be correct. The State may in fact, to its own ultimate cost, be deferring the present capital works. Until we have investigated that issue we will not know just how serious a problem that might be.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The next area to which I want to turn is in regard to kindergartens. Members will know that

there has been considerable concern in the community in recent weeks about the Budget operating allowance grants for kindergartens. I have spoken in a number of fora about this issue. The general finding at which I have arrived is that this is a particularly mean-minded action of this Government. The decision to cut back on Budget Operating Allowances which, in the context of the total education budget is not that significant (some hundreds of thousands of dollars out of a total education budget of over half a billion dollars), from the Government's viewpoint, is yet vitally important and significant from the viewpoint of the kindergartens and the child/parent centres. They were hoping for this money to pay electricity bills, water bills, to keep the places clean, and to provide the resources for the children to use in these pre-school centres. They will have to make up that short-fall by various other means.

We know that opposition to this move has been quite extensive. Many members of Parliament have received petitions and letters. Indeed, just today the list of petitions lodged in this House was quite large. I know that 14 members of my Party lodged petitions today and other members of the House were doing the same. I am sure that there are still more to come. Many of them are trying to get through the message to this Government that this cut is mean-minded and does impact on what is happening at the pre-school level, and that it is unfair to the parents of this community. Perhaps if that message has not yet got through, I might read just a couple of examples from kindergartens in my own electorate that have written to me. One made the following point:

An amount of \$1 a week does not sound much but on top of other increases (for example, mortgage repayments, gas, electricity, phone, council rates, etc.) this often mounts to several dollars a week and the average family just doesn't have several spare dollars a week.

That is a fact of life in much of this State at the moment. The letter makes another point:

For most of 1981 and to the end of it we have had and will have to have a fund-raiser nearly every month, and it is not feasible to ask parents to continually give more.

It is not feasible because it is not possible in many cases. A constituent came to me to ask what groups in society he could join to become more actively involved in his community. I suggested some groups that I thought would be in line with his interests. One question he asked me (he is a family man with two children) was whether he would have to go to any social functions. I said, 'You don't have to go to any social function of any of these groups.' It relieved him, because he had to admit that he could not afford to go to any social functions at all. He is a working family man—he is not unemployed—but his life is reduced to going to work, coming home and forgoing activities that cost any extra money, because the money is not there. Another kindergarten wrote to me and, after bitterly attacking the cuts in the operating allowances in the Budget, made this point:

This makes a mockery of the promise of free universal pre-schools for four-year-olds.

At some time, the Minister in this House will have to answer how he relates his opinions and his actions to the policies of his Federal colleagues who espouse the concept of free pre-school education. The letter continues:

There are even more erosions to the standards and quality of pre-school education being discussed, such as changes in staffing formula and increases in group sizes.

The Budget operating allowance cut is not the end of it, there is more to come. That is only the first episode in a terrible tale that is being forced on the families in this State. Indeed, the information I have indicates that that fear of more to come is quite correct. What has been the response to these cuts? What has been the response to the opposition to these cuts by the Government? The Minister

still persists in the attitude of saying it is 'only' a 50 per cent cut. That is a whole new psychology in political thinking when we feel that we can get to the stage of saying that a cut is only 50 per cent. That makes the 3 per cent and 4 per cent cuts earlier this year just chickenfeed.

The Minister also has the unmitigated gall to say that it will cost parents only a little more. They are the parents who are having to pay the extra costs that I mentioned a moment ago. They now find that they are having to pay up to \$42 more a year a child in kindergarten fees. That money counts in many homes because it cannot be easily found. I make that point that pre-school education is not yet adequately resourced in this State.

It is true that pre-schools in this State are better than pre-schools in other States, but they have not achieved anywhere near the goals that educationists in this State believe they should have achieved. They are nowhere as near to those goals, for example, as primary and secondary schools are to their respective goals, yet at this stage of relative under-development of that system the Government finds that it is reasonable to make cuts. I find the logic of that move very hard to understand.

The Minister indicated to the Estimates Committee, and to the House, that needs will be attended to and that communities where special needs exist need not fear. Kindergarten representatives who have written to me (and I know that they have written to the Minister as well) have shown me that there is a funny attitude to the meeting of needs by this Government if it believes what it is presently saying. I quoted to the Estimates Committee one kindergarten that falls into category D in the needs-base list; in other words, the second highest needs base, and its allocation projected for 1982, prior to the Minister's last amended version of the cuts, was only 53 per cent of what it received when this Government took office in 1979. What an appalling reduction!

One of the points made by the Premier in response to the public opposition was that the Federal Government had unfairly eroded and cut back funds to pre-school education. That is certainly true: the Federal Government has not lived up to its responsibilities in this area for some considerable time. For some years the funds allocated by the Federal Government to pre-school education have been declining year by year. That has been a focal point of opposition from, I imagine, all Parties in this place ever since that erosion started to occur. However, that does not answer the problem we have at this stage. It cannot be entirely passed away that the cut in the Budget operating allowances being forced upon kindergartens and child/parent centres in this State, amounting to only some hundreds of thousands of dollars, is entirely the fault of Federal Government cutbacks in funding. It certainly cannot be answered that way until the Minister can come up with a reasonable explanation for what has happened to the reduction in priority to education in this Budget and for what has happened to the money that is connected with that, because that is quite independent of Federal Government funding. That relates to State Government funds, not to Federal Government funds.

There is an important lesson to be learnt by the whole education community from what is presently happening to kindergartens, involving the concept that parents can afford to pay a little more and that it is not unreasonable to put a burden back on parents in the user pays philosophy. If the community accepts that a 50 per cent cut can justifiably be referred to as 'only a 50 per cent cut', and if the community accepts that \$42 a year extra impost is only a little more, then heaven help funding for secondary and primary schools in this State, because they will be the next areas to suffer similar imposts. They will be the next areas

where the Government will attempt to sidestep its responsibility and throw the greater burden back onto those communities. Already there is this erosion of responsibility, throwing greater and greater costs back onto families in this State. But, if that magnitude of cuts is accepted, it can only get worse in the next Budget, if it is still our misfortune for this Government to be in power when the next Budget is presented.

There were many other areas in the Estimates Committees that will need much further consideration as time goes by. I repeat that we certainly felt that we did get some information this year. It is certainly true that the programme performance budgeting papers were a vast improvement on the previous year's; they did at least this year bear some relevance to reality. Last year's papers were an entirely fictional fantasy so far as education was concerned that made amusing night-time reading when one wanted to lull oneself to sleep, but they certainly bore no reality to what was actually happening. However, there is still a great deal more that we need to find out. I hope that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, in the questions I posed to him through correspondence, will find the opportunity to answer those questions at the earliest possible time so that that information can be taken into account in the current ongoing consideration of the Budget; secondly, that the Minister of Education will likewise see his way clear to provide early answers to the questions he was unable to answer in the Estimates Committee and any further questions that may come up, particularly the question of the \$8 700 000 that Treasury officials are hopefully trying to find at present.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr McRae: Now don't wreck it.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I wonder whether there is anything anyone can do to wreck whatever prospect members of the Opposition had of gaining any credibility in this debate more than they have already done themselves. All Opposition members have done by attacking, of all people, that honourable man the Chief Secretary in a despicable and unwarranted way is expose the decade of neglect by their Administration in relation to that portfolio. Unquestionably, the problems about which members opposite complain in the Police Force and elsewhere come as a consequence of the incompetent oafs who were put in sinecure postings by their Party when in Government, particularly by former Premier Dunstan, who had absolutely no respect or regard for the need for people to live in a well ordered society by an accepted set of rules. In fact, his attitude to life was anything but civilised by that yardstick. He was known to be contemptuous of the police, both before he entered this place and during the time that he was here.

Mr McRae: Who told you that?

Mr LEWIS: On his own admission. What a pity it is that Opposition members should now try to hide their shame by accusing the current Chief Secretary of generating the problems that they purport to expose.

Mr McRae: We never said that.

Mr LEWIS: Well, then, what problems do members opposite presume to comment on when they attack the Chief Secretary? I cannot imagine for one moment which problems they have alluded to that did not have their roots and origins firmly implanted in the incompetence of former Chief Secretaries appointed by previous Labor Governments. I point out, if it ever needed pointing out, that no amount of argument on their side can hide that fact. I now turn to the comments of the member for Salisbury. It is not often that I follow a member of the Opposition and in

doing so look at my note pad and find that I have written down anything worthy of reply.

On this occasion, however, I find that the member for Salisbury's remarks deserve an answer because, whilst in terms of their logic they do stand up, they do not stand up to the scrutiny of rational analysis, whether in sociology or economics. The honourable member said that needs not met this year would have to be met next year or after, and that accordingly they would cost more, because additional maintenance costs would be incurred on buildings and facilities not erected this year but used in their stead. That is all right as far as it goes, but it does not take account of the fact that in any given economy the gross national product (that is, all the things we do collectively, the total product of our efforts for a year) is finite.

The fact remains then that, if we do other things this year, we will find that, as the time approaches for us to do those things which we can afford to lay to one side, the money needed for those projects will cost much less, because there will not be the same competition in the money market for the dollar available to be borrowed.

Mr McRae: You're in trouble; that's Keynesian.

Mr LEWIS: It is either Keynesian or neo-Keynesian. Since the member for Playford does not understand the difference between the two, he is mistaken. If it were only within his capacity to grasp the meaning of the theory put forward by Milton Friedman and by Keynes, then I dare say he would not have had any difficulty in understanding what I have just said.

Any building erected last year, this year or next year will begin to incur maintenance costs. It does not matter when we build it: we have to acknowledge that that is part of the total cost. The choice of timing depends upon the prevailing interest rate and whether the total cost can be significantly reduced by making the choice at some other time. There is a trade-off: what is the interest rate charge in doing it year compared to the interest rate charge (plus whatever may be notionally ascribed as additional maintenance work) in doing it next year, or the year after?

When the *Endeavour* pulled into Botany Bay less than 200 years ago, neither this House nor the city of Adelaide was built, let alone any schools. It is less than 100 years ago that this State introduced total free education for all children. The first place in the world to do it was South Australia. One needs to remember that one does as much as one can every day and leaves what one cannot do for tomorrow. One has to make sure that the priorities used in judging what it is one does today, are in keeping with the real needs of the people. One cannot kid oneself that one can have it all today and pay for it all today and if one cannot pay for it all today, borrow against the efforts of tomorrow and pay for it then.

Mr McRae: That is not the point: it is the question of who pays for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford will have an opportunity in due course.

Mr LEWIS: 'Who pays for it' will be individual, taxpayers, that is, collectively, the population. There is no doubt about that. The Labor Party needs to get its act together on that score. Voters these days are not as ignorant as they used to be and you need to realise that more people understand than do not understand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee would be assisted if the level of voice by other members was reduced.

Mr LEWIS: More people understand that we cannot have everything at once. If we could, there would be nothing left to do tomorrow. What we achieve this year can be done only by the amount of labour at our disposal, the amount of materials, the amount of equipment, and the amount of

money (that is, money which becomes available as a result of forgoing consumer goods which any individual or group of individuals—a nation if you like—have set aside to finance it). They do that because they believe the interest rate offered is sufficient to encourage them to do that. The more money sought by people to develop projects, the greater the interest rate required by the consumer before they are prepared to forgo the marginal dollar to make it possible for the construction to proceed.

This is part of a text of a book called *Economic Activity*, by the most senior economic adviser to the Australian Labor Party, who is now appointed to Jesus College, Cambridge. That is none other than Professor Harcourt, of the Adelaide University. Members of the Opposition should make sure in future that any argument they advance along the lines of what we should do with the resources at our disposal takes account of the sound theory advanced in that book written by Professor Harcourt, which is used as a textbook by Adelaide University economics students. Opposition members would do well to read it.

I also heard the member for Salisbury say that he considered it a legitimate complaint that dues of \$42 a year payable to the Kindergarten Union were untenable and unacceptable. Although I acknowledge that, indeed, to someone who just does not have that additional 80 cents a week to spare it is indeed untenable, I wonder whether any trade union (unlike the Kindergarten Union) would be prepared to forgo \$42 a week to enable that union member's family to enjoy the benefits of kindergarten attendance and education. There are plenty of trade unions of which I am aware and which cost such men as much as \$4 a week, which, in my calculations, is over \$200 a year, or five times as much. If the money so obtained by such trade unions was spent in any way morally or meaningfully, I could accept that it was legitimate for them to collect it. However, in the main, it is not spent morally or with facility, and certainly it is not spent with felicity.

I now refer to another area of the Budget on which the majority of the population in my district, and indeed in this State, depends, either directly or indirectly. I refer to the area of agriculture, and the expenditure that has been appropriated for the purpose of providing, through the Minister's office, the department's services to the people of the State.

Members opposite should know that, whereas 40 per cent of the value of national exports came from farm produce last year, the figure in South Australia is 62 per cent and that, therefore, our dependence on agriculture in this State is half as much and then some again of the national significance of that enterprise. Of course, in Mallee it is even greater. There are no large towns in Mallee District. Compared to each other they are large, but, compared to other subregional or urban centres, they are nothing more or less than simple country towns in terms of their size. They have enormous problems and are prepared to forbear them.

I listened to the member for Salisbury bleating about the difficulties that some of the parents in his electorate are experiencing in trying to find the necessary dollars to provide kindergarten or other pre-school services for their children. In Mallee District more than 60 per cent of the children do not have that option: no pre-school services are available to those people.

Mr Gunn: But they are well represented.

Mr LEWIS: I leave that to honourable members to judge. This Government and this State have begun what must be considered the long and painful course to increase the dollar allocation from the pitiful level to which the Labor Party allowed it to fall during its term of office, since the attitude of the Premiers at the time was, 'They do not vote for us, so why the hell should we support them?'

Nonetheless, this Government has begun the long and painful course of increasing the total allocation of funds from public revenue, supported by the industries themselves in the allocations that they are prepared to make through their various industry bodies to provide a contribution that will enable agriculture further to develop in its total contribution to the South Australian economy.

Again, the areas that can benefit are within my District of Mallee. Although I would have liked to detail the ways in which assistance could be provided, time prevents my doing so. Nonetheless, I remind the House that one of the principles that I have advocated since coming here is that the Government should be a good neighbour with its citizens. I have illustrated that point by referring to the unfortunate situation that obtains around the Ngarkat National Park, where graziers continually lose hundreds of head of livestock as a result of the attacks by dingoes on their flocks and herds.

This Government's commitment, through the Department of Environment and Planning (that is, the National Parks and Wildlife Service), is to become a good neighbour, whereas the previous Government did not care and did not give a damn. It continued to acquire more and more land with absolutely no intention and no plans—no stated intention and no stated plan to develop at any time—effective management policies that would enable those lands to be managed in a way that met the needs which the public were seeking from natural tracts of flora and which could support native fauna, side by side with the neighbouring farms.

In the 1981-82 Budget this State has increased its vote for agriculture by \$4 700 000 over and above the amount which we allocated in the preceding year. That, in real terms, is an increase. What we need to remember, as we contemplate the relevance of this Budget to the State of South Australia, is that in so far as it is ever possible for Government to get out of the way and allow this State's economy to recover and for real jobs to be regenerated in the private sector of the economy and for the incentives to invest money here to create those jobs to be re-established, the climate is now right. The drift of capital away from this State has been halted, and the slow process of rebuilding the confidence of the investor in industry of any kind has recommenced.

The Government's commitment to reduce the burden of taxation on each individual and on the enterprises that provide those jobs has almost entirely been responsible for that turnaround in the economy, in the individual confidence expressed by firms and by individuals, who may comprise the shareholders of firms or who may be self-employed or small businessmen. Without that essential confidence, there would have been an even greater drift of people, with what limited capital they had as they drew on in years, heading out of the State to other States where there were no succession duties, taking their money with them and taking the investment opportunities with them away from this State, reducing job opportunities, reducing the State population, thereby increasing the burden of taxation on the smaller population remaining behind. It had got to the point virtually of no return and, if it had not been for the election of this Government, most certainly the State would have been in a sorry mess by 1985. I doubt whether we could have afforded to pay for a Labor Premier, let alone for the Parliament.

Whilst there is much I could say about the Committees in general, and those in particular on which I sat, I will not take the time of the House now, except to point out that the alternative to this Government, as has been expressed on many occasions, is to increase taxation again, because the Labor Party has not indicated how it would otherwise

finance the grandiose plans and promises it continues to make.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I have listened intently to the member for Mallee and to his expose on economics. I am sure that after many years he will do well in his studies. Certainly he has a lot to learn—he may learn if he lives long enough. He said some very peculiar things. One of the things he said which I must agree with is, 'The people of today are not as ignorant as they used to be.' I think that may be right, but I am not so sure about the people in Mallee because, after all, they have sent him here to us. I also have some doubts about the electoral college that selected him in the first place, because he has never made a speech in this House without talking about dingoes—dingoes every time. I really have had them by now.

Tonight, I wish to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and express my views on the Estimates Committees. The first speaker on the motion, the Premier, made a really profound statement. He said that this was the second time that the Estimates Committees have operated. Thus far he was correct. He then went on to say that they had worked but, from what the various speakers have had to say tonight, the Estimates Committees have not worked. True, they may have worked in regard to the Ministers, because the Committees gave them nearly a fortnight's holiday. They had to attend only one day at the House and for the rest of the time they were on leave.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: I have a bit saved up for the surfie from Henley Beach.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park knows that such interjections are out of order.

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I did not make any such remark at all, and I hope that that will be corrected in the record.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I may have made a mistake and called the member for Albert Park to order. I think it should have been the member for Florey.

Mr WHITTEN: The Premier also said that there has been much information disseminated to the Committees, that we have never had more information given in a Budget than has been the case this year. Some of that may be right, but the problem was to dissect that information.

Mr Lewis: It is not our fault if the Opposition cannot work.

Mr WHITTEN: I know that interjections are out of order, especially inane interjections, and I intend to ignore them completely. What concerned me about the Premier's speech was that he briefly said he supported the Chief Secretary and for the rest of his speech he indulged in condemnation and vilification of another member of this House, the member for Elizabeth. He spent most of his time indulging in vilification. I thought this was a debate where we should give opinions about what is happening, rather than indulging in character assassination.

Certainly, my Leader took a different view altogether and analysed what happened in the Committees. He made one of his best speeches and, as he said, it was not the Opposition's intention to attack the Chief Secretary as a person, and I endorse those comments. I believe that the Chief Secretary as a person is a good and fine fellow but, as a Minister and administrator, he is a complete disaster. I do not think I need go on any further on that score, having made that comment. I do not believe the Chief Secretary has had a fair go.

Certainly, the Deputy Premier will not give him a go, and the Minister of Transport would not give him a go.

There was a slight problem in regard to the lights at Football Park. What happened? The Minister of Transport took the matter away and would not give the Chief Secretary an opportunity to show what he could do. That opportunity was taken away from him. He has never been treated fairly—

Mr Lewis: By the Opposition!

Mr WHITTEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, cannot you control that Mallee person? What is the problem that the Chief Secretary has had over the period that he has been a Minister? I have referred to the lights at Football Park. The remand centre was taken away from the Chief Secretary by the Minister of Public Works. No-one allows the Chief Secretary to show what ability he has. What did the Minister of Agriculture do? As soon as the Chief Secretary looked like doing something as far as fisheries were concerned, the Minister of Agriculture stepped in and took the fisheries away from him. Actually, the Minister has been a Minister without portfolio. Half a dozen other Ministers have taken over from him. We found out during the Estimates Committee last Thursday that the Minister could not answer questions because the matter related to the Attorney-General's area, so the Attorney-General has taken over the police. What does the Chief Secretary have left to him? He does not have one thing; everything has been taken away from him.

As far as I am concerned the Estimates Committees were the greatest waste of time, the greatest waste of a fortnight, that I have ever experienced in this House, because I think the procedure is absolutely useless. We found that there was no way in which we could get information. If the Minister decided that he would not answer a question or that he would not refer it to one of his advisers—

Mr Lewis: Would you get any more information from any other committee system?

Mr WHITTEN: I will answer the interjection, because it is one of the few sensible interjections from the member for Mallee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Even though all interjections are out of order.

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Mallee asked whether there was any better system. I think the old system was better for the Opposition. Members opposite should remember that they will be in Opposition in just over one year's time. They will then find that, under the old system, they could hammer the Minister until he answered; otherwise they stayed until they got the information. At present, we are not getting the necessary information, particularly from the point of view of Opposition members. So many long, irrelevant questions were asked by members of the Government, particularly the member for Todd.

On the first day, questioning in Committee B on the 'Transport' vote went along very well and the Minister endeavoured to answer questions to the best of his ability. If he did not have the information at his fingertips, he had competent officers who could supply that information. But then we came to the stage where the member for Todd thought that the Opposition was getting too much information and that he would start to chip in with some irrelevant questions. He did so, and the member for Henley Beach did the same.

Mr Ashenden: What were the questions I asked?

Mr Randall: I was not even on Committee B; I was on Committee A.

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Todd really wants to know, I will pick an instance out for him. I did not really intend to do this, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr Randall: What questions did I ask?

Mr WHITTEN: I will give the honourable member a burst later, so I ask him not to run away from the Chamber,

because I will say something concerning his attitude on the final day.

Mr Hamilton: Union bashing.

Mr WHITTEN: No, it was not union bashing this time. The member for Todd said that the question he wanted to ask referred to a line about chief training service officers, training development officers, and so on, and then he quoted several lines from the document. He then said, 'I agree that it is an extremely worthy objective if it can be achieved. Can the Minister tell us some other projects that may be in his department?' Actually, it was a Dorothy Dixer. He did not know what he was asking; he did not know whether the Minister had anything else.

Mr Ashenden: Read out the question—that's what you were going to do.

Mr WHITTEN: It is not a question at all; it was a comment made by the honourable member. I would not have liked to be the Chairman of Committee B because I believe at times he was put under stress, when that was unnecessary, by some of his own members.

Another question was asked by the member for Newland on the same day. He was greatly concerned about the planting of trees and shrubs along the highways. It is an important question, but he went to such lengths to explain why there should be different species of gums planted and how the redwoods should be protected and took up so much time that other members of the Committee were not able to get true and factual information. A comment was made in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 17 October by the State political writer, Greg Kelton. We would all have to agree with him when he said:

As the second session of hearings of the Parliamentary Budget Estimates Committees drew to a close this week, M.P.s on both sides of the House breathed sighs of relief.

I know that so many members said, 'Thank God that useless exercise is over.'

Mr Ashenden: That is only because you didn't know what questions to ask.

Mr WHITTEN: Do not blame me if you did not know what questions to ask. The article continues:

Most of them had been hoping that the problems in the committee system which became evident during the history-making initial sessions last year would not recur this time . . .

Once again the feeling, especially among the A.L.P. members, after the Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, wound up the hearings on Thursday, was that they should revert to the old system of Parliament as a whole going through the lines of expenditure contained in the Budget.

They claimed the hearings were dull, did not produce anything worth while in the way of information, and became a forum for the Government to do a little political point-scoring.

I wholly agree with those comments. He later referred to Government members, and stated:

So far as Government M.P.s were concerned, their performance could be open to question. Many of the Liberals appointed to the committees failed to add anything to the hearings—in fact, during some of the committee sessions there were occasions when only one Government M.P. could be found sitting in.

When they did ask questions, a great many of them were gentle Dorothy Dix type questions which gave the Minister appearing an ideal opportunity to 'bucket' the Opposition.

As a political commentator, he knew full well, after observing the Committees, just what he was talking about; he spoke truly. I was a member of Committee B during the hearing of the votes of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I believe that some instruction must have gone out from the Premier that Ministers were to behave themselves this time and endeavour to provide information, because we all know the attitude of the Minister of Industrial Affairs towards Labor members. He appeared to be bending over backwards to give us information, until about half past four on that afternoon.

At half past four, when it was time for a cup of tea, the Minister asked whether some of his officers could be discharged and whether an assurance could be given that a certain vote would be dealt with at a certain time. He was told that the Opposition would endeavour to complete questioning on the particular vote by a quarter to five and that we would then go on to the next vote. We said, however, that there would be no guarantee that consideration of the vote would not continue until after the dinner adjournment. That seemed to be the turning point because, after that, the Minister endeavoured to answer questions at great length, bringing in irrelevant and extraneous matters enabling him to go on and on.

In answer to a simple question that I asked about whether there was a sufficient number of judges and members on the commission to handle the backlog of cases before the courts, the Minister took more than 10 minutes, during which all he did was union bash and blame the unions for the backlog, without indicating whether he believed there was a sufficient number of judges on the commission to handle the cases or whether the number would be increased as a result of the extra sum allocated to that vote. That then gave Government members an opportunity to do some more filibustering in an endeavour to deny Opposition members time to ask their questions.

The final day involved questioning of the Chief Secretary and Minister of Marine. When a no-confidence motion was moved, Government members on the Committee said their piece. However, it must have hurt the member for Rocky River, who would try to knock off the Chief Secretary tomorrow, to have to get up and attempt to defend the Chief Secretary, although if one reads that speech one cannot find in it one iota of defence of the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Are you a cockatoo or a galah?

Mr WHITTEN: I have said that I think the Chief Secretary is not a bad sort of bloke, but that he is not able, or allowed, to do his job. However, I have never heard the Chief Secretary interject in such an inane way. It does not do him any credit.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What you're saying doesn't do you any credit, either.

Mr WHITTEN: Well, then, I repeat that the member for Rocky River did not defend the Minister in any way whatsoever when he spoke during that no-confidence motion.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Rocky River gets back in his place and interjects, I will give him some answers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price has the call.

Mr Olsen: Read the debate.

Mr WHITTEN: If we look at what the member for Rocky River had to say it occupies only—

Mr Olsen: Read what it says.

Mr WHITTEN: The honourable member is insistent that I read it. He said, first, that he conceded the point raised by the member for Unley when he was criticising the Minister. Is that a defense of the Minister? He then went on to talk about what the Committee could do and how it could question the Minister. He said that the Committee could not question the Minister about policy. In no way did he defend the Minister by saying that he was right.

Mr Olsen: That was the whole point. It was on policy, not in relation to the lines. That's what the whole motion was about.

Mr WHITTEN: Seeing I now have the member for Rocky River really going, I now turn to—

Mr Lewis: Go out and read it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will not interject out of their places.

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Mallee is able to read, I refer him to *Hansard* of 15 October 1981 at page 488. He will find there is no real defence by the member for Rocky River of his Minister. On the final day of the Committee hearings the member for Henley Beach endeavoured to disrupt the proceedings. There were only 20 minutes left and two more votes had to be dealt with. The shadow Minister, the member for Florey, rose to ask questions. He made a short preamble statement and said that he was unable to ask all his questions because only 20 minutes remained, and I believe that he said he had 400 questions to ask.

That statement provoked ribald laughter by the member for Henley Beach. The member for Florey was provoked and he reacted. The member for Henley Beach was not seen to be laughing by the Chairman, who said he had control of the proceedings. I believe he did, too. I then heard an interjection from the member for Florey that again provoked ribald or derisive laughter.

Mr Lewis: Do you know the difference between 'ribald' and 'derisive'? There's a difference, you know.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much. I am always willing to learn if the member opposite can help me.

Mr Lewis: I'll try.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much. What really annoyed me was that the member for Fisher, to prevent the member for Florey from asking further questions, endeavoured to act as the policeman pimp. That is what he was, because the Chairman was quite prepared to allow the questioning to continue. The member for Fisher got up and said, 'Please, Mr Chairman, I wish to take a point of order.' That is the sort of rubbish put up by the member for Fisher in taking points of order. I then checked through *Hansard* of the previous year and noticed that the member for Fisher took the member for Ascot Park—

Mr RANDALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker and draw your attention to the time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. There appears to be some confusion. The last thing I want to do is deprive the honourable member for Price of any of his speaking time. I understand that he has six minutes left.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much for your fairness, Mr Deputy Speaker. There again the member for Henley Beach has shown his true colours by attempting to take mean advantage of a poor innocent person by drawing your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the time. He must have known the clock was wrong just as I knew it was wrong but he thought he could con you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I think he could have, too, which he did. I am not going to be put off what I was saying. Last year during the Estimate Committee hearings the member for Fisher drew the Chairman's attention to the fact that the member for Ascot Park had read three lines. He complained to the Acting Speaker that the member for Ascot Park was reading a prepared speech. He considered a prepared speech was a paragraph out of the *News*. That is the type of mean, low trick that Government members use.

I would like to have asked the Minister of Marine (but I never had the opportunity) questions which are of great importance as far as the wharfs are concerned, where we have a group of workers employed by the Department of Marine and Harbors who are going to lose their jobs on 28 October. I would have liked an answer from the Minister to some questions. The Minister could have answered them quite simply. I believe these workers will not lose their jobs, but will be transferred to private enterprise.

I am concerned about the sale or give-away of so much D.M.H. equipment. There are 24 men involved at Berth 13 (commonly known as the crane shed) and a great majority of them intend to join the Waterside Workers Federation. When they join this Federation they will not be employed by the Department of Marine and Harbors but will go to Smith Patrick, Mercantile, or one of the other stevedoring companies. After this there will be about 18 forklifts in good order and condition and those forklifts will be sold or given away.

I wanted to ask the Minister questions along those lines. I wanted to know whether the long service leave of these men will be transferred, whether the superannuation will be transferred, and whether they will get annual leave and accumulated sick leave. These are important questions to me and to the men working on the wharf. I would like to know the leasing arrangements as far as the four big luffing cranes are concerned. They are four of the largest cranes in the Port.

Mr Lewis: Do they need them?

Mr WHITTEN: Of course they are needed. I am not going to be put off by any more interjections. I am concerned that the luffing cranes will be used by Mercantile or Smith Patrick, and I want to know the amount of money that the State will get for the use of those cranes and who will maintain those cranes. I would like to know if it is the Minister's intention to upgrade the amenities room at Berth 1, from which the Minister of Agriculture ships a lot of wool. A Russian ship has been at this berth for the past five days loading wool from South Australia. The amenities room for the workers is disgraceful. There was a promise that the amenities room would be upgraded, but it has not yet been upgraded.

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

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I did rise earlier on a point of order. I was going to offer my services to the House as a technician to repair the time clock, which was fast failing.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach has the call.

Mr RANDALL: This is not the appropriate place to talk about repairing time clocks, or whatever. I am glad to see that we have alternative means of keeping time on speeches made by members rather than the electronic clock.

The member for Price has made some quite outstanding statements tonight. The honourable member has prompted and motivated me to get out the *Hansard* record and see on which days he came to the House during the sittings of the Estimates Committees and how many questions he asked. Based on that record, I find incredible the comments that he has made regarding his assessment of how the Estimates Committees worked.

First, the record will show that on Tuesday 1 October, the first day of the Estimates Committees, the honourable member was present from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m., asked four questions, and took one point of order. According to the record, his next appearance in the House was on Thursday 8 October, when he appeared between 11 a.m. and approximately 5.30 p.m. On that day, industrial affairs was the honourable member's interest, and he asked 12 questions. Then, his next appearance was not until the last day of the Estimates Committee, and then not until approximately 9.15 p.m.

So, it is quite clear that members opposite were working shift work and were here in regular shifts. They were allocated hours and had their rosters, whereas the Liberal back-benchers were in the House every day. If we were not

allocated to Committees, we were sitting on the backbenches of the Committees asking questions also, as the record will show.

I had an interest in education, and we had four members on that Committee looking at education issues and asking intelligent questions that were not Dorothy Dixers, as the record will clearly show. Others of us were sitting on the back-bench asking questions that were relevant to education issues in our electorates. If members are interested in the kindergarten issue, let them look and see who asked questions about kindergarten issues. They will find that Government members asked significant questions about funding and pre-school education.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park has had a fair go.

Mr RANDALL: It is quite clear from the record that the credibility of the member for Price is found wanting when he makes the sorts of statement that he has made this evening. I want to put on record answers to some of the questions that have not yet been answered, as well as answers that I have been able to get. This question arose when the shadow Education Minister, the member for Salisbury, insisted (as he has again tonight) that this Government has somehow lost \$8 800 000. I found it difficult to stand out on the steps of Parliament House and hear the honourable member address a public meeting, stating that this Government had lost \$8 800 000 and that the money had gone to the O'Bahn system.

Mr Keneally: It's only \$8 650 000, isn't it?

Mr RANDALL: Let us look at the figures and put the facts straight. The most common error made in comparing expenditure from one year to the next is that of comparing actual expenditure one year with the Budget figure for the next year.

An honourable member: You've got only two minutes left.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the House that we are having some problems with the electronic clock. However, the Sergeant-at-Arms has the correct time on the other machine, and I assure honourable members that they will not be deprived of any of their time.

Mr RANDALL: As I said earlier, I have every confidence in you, Sir, and in the method of time keeping. The comparison of the Budget figure often fails to recognise that the former figure includes the cost of salary and wage increases, whereas the latter does not. The matter raised by the member for Salisbury is complicated further, as in 1980-81 actual payments for the Education Department included an additional pay period merely as a result of the timing of the debits, and in 1981-82 it is not so included.

The following outlines the relative percentage of education expenditure as part of the total State Budget for 1980-81 and 1981-82. The total figures include allowances for wage and salary increases, while the departmental figures do not include any allowance therefor that occurred or might occur during the year. However, the 1980-81 figures incorporate an estimate for an additional pay period, involving, by the way, \$11 400 000. For instance, if we take the 1980-81 Budget and divide the \$371 980 000 by the overall (we are talking in thousands) Budget figure of \$1 510 744, we find an allocation of roughly 24.6 per cent.

In the 1981-82 Budget allocation we find the figures of \$411 450 000 and, if we divide that by the overall figure of \$1 722 412, we find an allocation of 23.8 per cent. If a round sum allowance and the provision for the additional period for 1980-81 (at the Budgeted rate of \$11 400 000) are both excluded from the calculations, then the figures—this is what the member for Salisbury has missed—translate to a figure of \$360 580 000 divided by \$1 412 344, a percentage in 1980-81 of 25.6 per cent and

in 1981-82 the figure will now read \$411 450 000 divided by \$1 626 912; in other words, we have 25.3 per cent. If members wish to compare the figures in a more meaningful way (the proportion of actual payments for 1980-81 spent on education with the proportion proposed for the 1981-82 Budget) then the effect of the actual cost of the additional pay period should be removed from the figures; that is, a round figure of \$13 230 000.

Members interjecting:

Mr RANDALL: I know this is a technical matter. I know it is boring for some members opposite, but the member for Salisbury made great play on this. He said the Minister of Education could not do his sums. He made such statements on the steps of the House. The Minister quite clearly said that, given time, he would bring back an accurate answer for the member for Salisbury. I need also say the actual wages and salary increases paid in respect to the department's employees in 1980-81 and the Government as a whole should be removed from the 1980-81 figures. The department figures were \$26 900 000 (page 36 of the Premier and Treasurer's financial statement for the 1981-82 period). For the Government as a whole, the salary figures were \$92 300 000 (page 31). I need to do some mathematical calculations for members opposite and look at the 1980-81 figures. We are talking in thousands. We have 401 502—I will give this for members opposite—(minus 13 230 plus 26 900) divided by 1 554 884 minus (13 230 plus 92 300). In that mathematical formula we see the figure for 1980-81 of 24.9 per cent. I want to put this on record for members opposite so they can see what we have done with education in this State. The 1981-82 figures again show 411 450 divided by 1 626 912, and that gives a percentage of 25.3 per cent (we are talking in thousands). On that basis the Education Department's proportion of the Budget has increased in 1981-82 over its share in 1980-81.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That is a darned sight more than they ever spent.

Mr RANDALL: Yes, as the Minister for Health said, a darned sight more than they ever spent—an increasing amount, when we hear the cuts in education and expenditure. The figures quoted by the member for Salisbury in *Hansard* do not take into consideration the effect of the additional pay period. While it might be cyclical, it certainly must be discounted if comparisons of the share of the Budget spent on education from year to year are to be made. In addition to the above, details and funding in respect of school-to-work transition programmes have yet to be determined by the Government and, as such, some adjustment to the budgeted estimates may be necessary. These adjustments will have the effect of increasing slightly the per cent figures in respect of 1981-82. Therefore, I believe the record will show in *Hansard* an answer to the member for Salisbury's comments tonight. His statements in the House have been strong against the Minister for Education for not answering the sorts of comments he wanted to see. Unfortunately, he could not wait to get the answer: he had to go out publicly and make his statement.

Mr Hamilton: The Minister did not go out there, did he?

Mr RANDALL: The Minister had his responsibilities to this House and he rightly fulfilled them. That is where he should be. I was concerned about the way that the rally was held. I stood amongst the crowd and listened to comments of the shadow Minister of Education. He said that this Government had lost \$8 800 000 and had transferred it in order to pay for the extended plans of the O'Bahn system. Unfortunately, the innuendo has been picked up throughout the community, because now the South Australian Institute of Teachers is promoting that we have supposedly (I do not see how it could have come to the

conclusion) cut education funds in South Australia. If members look, they will find that the figures and percentages are increasing, and will continue to increase.

Another matter that concerned me about the rally on the steps of Parliament House, particularly about the kindergarten and preschool rally, was the way it was organised. Circulars were sent to kindergartens encouraging them to organise excursions to Parliament House.

Mr Hamilton: Why not?

Mr RANDALL: That is the point that concerns me. There are irresponsible people in our community who encourage teachers to bring three, four and five-year-old children to the steps of Parliament House to protest about education cuts; in other words, to manipulate and use those children for political purposes. I do not believe that we should be using children in that way. If members opposite want to use them, the responsibility rests on their shoulders. But to encourage parents to sign release forms so that their children can attend Parliament House on an excursion and then to find that the children did not come inside Parliament House but stayed outside on the steps and were part of the protest movement, a movement organised by S.A.I.T., is not something I support. They were encouraged to do that. I am concerned, and would be concerned as a parent, if my child was put in that position. Other parents are concerned about that misuse of position.

My encouragement to preschool teachers is to take up their responsibilities concerning the welfare of the children, but they should do it in the preschools. If they have something to say in protest, they can contact their local member, write to him and give him some reasons about their concern. We can then take up the point. Avenues of protest are available. I do not mind those teachers gathering as adults on the steps of Parliament House to protest but, when they use two, three, and four-year-old children as part of preschool activities, there is something wrong with the system and our society.

One other area of concern arose during the Estimates Committee when the Women's Education Resource Centre was raised in considering the education estimates. Subsequently, a report appeared in the paper about the Minister's reply. During that Committee I said that one member of the Opposition seemed to have made it his vendetta; he seemed to be the leading light in feeding information which was again misleading. I refer to the S.A.I.T. releases put around the schools indicating that the Women's Education Resource Centre is under threat, when it is not—it is misleading information being fed by a certain honourable member opposite.

I have no doubt that that honourable member will continue to feed that information and create that impression, but we should get a few facts straight. The *Advertiser* carried a report on the following Friday after the Estimates Committee. That report, written by the education writer, Sheena MacLean, stated:

Following the controversy in Parliament it is understood an inquiry showing that the centre's sex education kit had been requested by a school only once in the past two years.

Again, Sheena MacLean has never contacted the member for Brighton or me to find out how many times that kit had been used in schools. How would she know unless she was told by someone, unless she was given some misinformation? I believe she was. The other point raised by that reporter is as follows:

Yesterday, the President elect of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, Leonie Ebert, said that the centre was a fundamental and essential advisory support service to teachers in implementing the Education Department's equal opportunities policy.

What she did not mention was the role that the resource centre plays in providing sex education material to primary

and secondary schools in our State. Does she support that role or does she not? She has yet to say publicly. One wonders whether she does, or whether she would be game to say it publicly.

The final comment I want to make on this subject concerns a comment supposedly made by one of the co-ordinators of the centre, Debra Altorfer. She is reported as saying that 'responsibility for selection of appropriate classroom material from the kit rested with teachers in consultation with principals and parents'. That is quite right. That is the very point the member for Brighton made, as can be seen from *Hansard*, and he continues to ask that, if that sort of resource material goes into schools, it go there with the knowledge of the principal and the parents. That is all that members of the Government ask, namely, that, if this sort of resource material is to be used in schools, we as parents should know about it, that we are given the opportunity to see the sort of information going into the schools. With regard to the resource centre playing that role, after assessment, a decision will need to be taken by the Minister—hence the inquiry into the resource centre. I want to place on record quite clearly that the member for Brighton and I believe that that resource centre has a role to play in our community, and we do not want to see that centre withdrawn from the community. It also has a responsibility, if it desires Government funding. The question is whether the role of the resource centre should be to provide advisory information for teachers in the Education Department and information relating to sex education. I am sure that the Minister of Education, having received the report of his inquiry, will take notice of it and make the appropriate adjustments.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I take issue with the member for Henley Beach's comments in relation to kindergarten funding. I refer to the statement that the Minister would not address the parents assembled outside Parliament House on 14 October, because the Minister was otherwise involved in his Parliamentary duties. Of course, that is not the case. A perusal of *Hansard* of that date reveals that, before the luncheon adjournment, the member for Salisbury pointed out that he was prepared to accommodate the Minister so that he could address the rally on the steps of Parliament House: he said, 'We are happy to reconvene at 2.10 p.m.' The Chairman of the Committee at that time stated, in part: 'It is the Chairman's view that the appropriate course of action is to recommence the sittings at 2 p.m. I am not really inclined to break the Sessional Orders; however, when the Committee resumes at 2 p.m. I will reconsider the matter,' as I understand was done. However, the Minister did not go out. I also point out, whilst not reflecting on the Chairman of that day in any way, that Sessional Orders were broken, and I refer to the number of occasions when breaks were taken, during different sessions, for a cup of tea, a cigarette, or whatever.

Mr Gunn: With agreement.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, clearly that was the case. I have made quite clear that I am not reflecting on the Chairman. Quite clearly, had agreement been reached between the Minister and the Committee arrangements could have been made. That was the point I was making. The Minister should have had the guts to face those people, as he is responsible for the portfolio responsible for those cuts. He could have done it and, had he been a man, he would have done it. I believe he should have accepted the challenge to go out and address those people on the steps of Parliament House, because they were most concerned. It is very easy for some members opposite who have a quid in their pockets to be not really concerned about the cuts in education,

particularly in pre-school education, and about the disadvantaged in the community.

Mr Lewis: We are concerned.

Mr HAMILTON: It does not come across to the many people from whom I have received letters at my electorate office. The Minister was not prepared to go out for 10 lousy minutes and talk to the people on the steps of Parliament House. If a Minister could not give 10 minutes of his time to address a mass of people out there who were concerned about the education of their children (and this Government had, before the 1979 election, promised that they would have free education), there is something wrong. The Government has not lived up to its promises. Many people in my electorate are well aware of the promises put up by this Government. It will be interesting to see how the Government shapes up when it goes before the polls.

I am glad that the member for Mallee is here. Once again, this evening he rubbished the trade union movement. I heard him say, in respect of education, that it would be a pity if some of the workers could not forego some of their wage increases to assist the funding of kindergartens. That was the thrust of the member for Mallee's statement. It is quite clear that the member for Mallee does not understand how the trade union movement operates.

An honourable member: Are you reading a speech?

Mr HAMILTON: No, I am not; you can have a look. We have seen State charges increased across the board, and further imposts are still being inflicted by this Government on the workers in South Australia. We have heard the member for Mallee and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, repeatedly say in this House, that we must abolish penalty rates. How much more do they want the working man in this country to carry the incompetence of the State Government and its Federal colleagues. In 1978, the Treasurer, in his Budget speech, stated:

Real wages are still too high and this remains a major cause of unemployment. The company profit share is still too low.

I only wish I had time to state how the profits of many of the big companies in this country have increased markedly in that period of time, compared to the increase in workers' wages.

The member for Hanson is not here, and this somewhat concerns me, because I would have liked him to have been in the House. I refer to his attack on the South Australian Film Corporation in one of the Budget speeches.

Mr Lewis: Do you get interest on your savings accounts?

Mr HAMILTON: I have not got that much money to have any interest on. It was interesting to hear the member for Hanson reflect on the member for Mawson and his ability on the Public Accounts Committee when the member for Hanson was in Opposition. One would question the competence of the member for Hanson, when considering his innane remarks on 23 September when he attacked the South Australian Film Corporation, which is housed in my electorate. He certainly incurred the wrath of that corporation, not only the wrath of the corporation itself but also many of its employees in that area. People would have seen on the *Nationwide* programme how innane and stupid the member for Hanson's comments were when he came up against Mr Morris from the South Australian Film Corporation. The member for Hanson was cut to pieces by the knowledge of the South Australian Film Corporation people.

It must have hurt the member for Hanson to be disowned by his own Premier and Minister when they came out and pledged full support for the South Australian Film Corporation and its activities. It was quite obvious that the member for Hanson, who had apparently not attended the opening in July of this year, had not heard the Minister of Arts lavish praise on the activities of the South Australian

Film Corporation. He said that at least another four years' work was to be done at the corporation headquarters.

The member for Hanson had obviously done no work on ascertaining how much money had been brought into South Australia by the activities of the South Australian Film Corporation. It amounts to about \$23 000 000 which, if one accepts the Government's multiplying factor of four to one, is about \$92 000 000 from which the State has benefited. I suggest to the member for Hanson that in future, if he wants to know something about activities in my electorate, he see me before poking his nose in and having it rubbed in the dirt later. It ill-behoves him to attack such a corporation. Like many others in this Chamber, I received the programme papers on the Thursday prior to the Tuesday sitting.

Mr Lewis: I think that was pretty kind.

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Mallee may be one of those extremely able persons who can in that time go through 13 books and be able to ascertain what questions should be asked of the Government. We are not in the position of being given Dorothy Dixers by the Minister; we have to research those questions ourselves. It is quite obvious that the Government does not want the Opposition to question and probe the Government, as it should, on the Ministers' various portfolios. There was a need to ask questions about transport issues. As all members know, the Minister of Transport is also the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Mr Lewis: He's a good bloke.

Mr HAMILTON: I am not denying that he is a good bloke. He is a rather amiable sort of fellow. However, when it came to questioning Government Ministers during the Estimates Committees, clearly there was insufficient time—one miserable day to question a Minister on the portfolios for which he is responsible. I could have questioned the Minister for at least four hours that day about the issues in which I was particularly interested. Not even one question could I ask about the lighting of Football Park, which the Minister would know is near and dear to my electorate. Also, the Minister of Transport would be well aware that I would have liked to question him at great length on the signalling proposed by a firm of consultants investigating the upgrading of State Transport Authority operations. I have heard that the Minister may reconsider a recommendation made by those consultants not to introduce emergency equipment for State Transport Authority railcars. I do not want to prejudice the inquiry, but I understand that this may overcome the problem that occurred at Dry Creek. That information was supplied to me at about 12 o'clock today. Those are some of the issues involved, and the Minister is well aware that, because of my previous occupation and knowledge of the industry, I could have questioned him about these matters at great length. These matters will be the subject of many questions that I am going to put on the Notice Paper, not that I am prone to putting questions on the Notice Paper. However, the Minister would know, as many members on the other side know, that there was insufficient time for Opposition members to probe Ministers properly. There was filibustering on many of the answers to questions asked by members of the Estimates Committees on the Government side, which certainly reduced the time available to others for asking questions. I was frustrated on many occasions because I did not have time to put the questions I wished to put to the Minister.

Quite clearly, more time needs to be made available. Whilst that situation may be all right for Government members, it will be interesting to see in two years time, when the Labor Party is returned to office, their response

as an Opposition when they attempt to question the Government before these Committees.

Mr Randall: You're hopeful.

Mr HAMILTON: Certainly I am; why not? I believe that Government members would be continually frustrated if they were in our position. It is an exercise designed to avoid providing the Opposition Parties with any information. It is another retrograde step in the democratic processes of this Parliament.

Mr Randall: It's better than the old system.

Mr HAMILTON: That is open to debate, and I am certainly not prepared to accept what the member for Henley Beach says about that, because of my experience in this place. I now turn to the pre-school fees row. It is quite clear that this Government does not have any com-

passion for pre-schools and other schools in South Australia. Many years ago, I read an interesting booklet about the myth of equality in education. I commend that publication to Government members, bearing in mind the disadvantaged members of our society who do not have an opportunity in their formative years to attend pre-schools or receive proper primary school education.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 21 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 October 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE ACT

41. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Is it proposed to introduce amendments to the Aboriginal Heritage Act and, if so, why, when and what are they?

2. When is it proposed that the Act be proclaimed and why has it not been proclaimed before this?

3. What action did the Minister take as a result of the minute to the Minister of Mines and Energy of 27 May 1981 by his Executive Assistant, James Kimpton?

4. Has Mr Kimpton written to the Minister saying what amendments should be made to the Act and, if so, when, what amendments are suggested and does Mr E. J. Phipps agree with them?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is proposed to introduce amendments to the Aboriginal Heritage Act for the purpose of affording better protection to Aboriginal sites and items, and to remove inconsistencies in the legislation.

2. It is proposed that, subject to Cabinet approval, the amendments will be introduced in the current session of Parliament and the Act proclaimed as soon as possible after passage of such amendments.

During the life of the former Government, the Aboriginal Heritage Act was passed by the Parliament and received the Royal Assent. Although the Royal Assent was given on 15 March 1979, for reasons not known to this Government, the Act had not been proclaimed prior to the change of Government in September that year, some six months later. Accordingly, it fell to this Government to consider the question of proclamation. The Act has not been proclaimed by this Government before this because of the need to consider, draft and discuss extensive amendments to make the legislation more effective.

3. Officers of the Department of Environment and Planning have held discussions with officers of the Department of Mines and Energy on several occasions during drafting of the amendments. Issues raised by Mr Kimpton have been discussed in the context of these discussions.

4. No.

TOUCHE ROSS SERVICES REPORT

42. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How much has the Review of South Australian Department of Correctional Services prepared by Touche Ross Services cost the Government and how is that cost made up?

2. Why did the Government have it prepared?

3. Does it tell the Government anything it did not know before and, if so, what?

4. To what use, if any, has the report yet been put?

5. Does the Government propose to accept any of the recommendations in it and, if so, which and when does it propose to act on them?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. \$129 274. This figure is made up of \$106 000 for fees to the Principal Consultant, \$15 835 to the Specialist Consultant and \$7 439 as cost of preparation of the report.

2. The review was initiated as a result of rising concern regarding the safety, security and effectiveness of the South Australian correctional system.

3. The review was not contracted to 'tell the Government anything it did not know' but to provide an objective assessment and recommend solutions to the problems apparent.

4. On 5 June 1981, various procedures were promulgated to all heads of correctional institutions.

5. The recommendations and their implications are currently being considered.

MURRAY RIVER IRRIGATION

51. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What incentives, if any, are offered to those using water under licence for irrigation from the Murray River to use less than their quota?

2. Is it proposed to offer any, or any more, such incentives and, if so, what are they and when?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Improved irrigation techniques, by way of grants to irrigators in Government Irrigation Areas yet to be rehabilitated in lieu of on farm connection costs.

2. Application has been made to the Federal Government for low interest rate loans to irrigators over the next seven years—refer to the 'Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem'.

RENDELSHAM SCHOOL

94. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When is it proposed a new primary school will be built at Rendelsham and when will it be completed?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are no firm plans for the total redevelopment of the Rendelsham Primary School at the present time. It is more likely that some upgrading work and progressive redevelopment will occur. This will take into account the highest priority needs within the school first. As this will depend on funds availability, it is not possible to nominate completion dates.

LINDEN PARK SCHOOL

100. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What proposals are there for the upgrading of Linden Park Primary School, when will they be put into effect and when will they be completed?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is no provision for the upgrading of Linden Park Primary within the present triennial major works programme, nor had that school been on the previous programme current since last October. The matter is, however, to be reviewed on a regular half yearly basis.

STRUGGLE FOR POWER

101. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the School Libraries Branch considered whether the book circulated to schools entitled *Struggle for Power* by John Grover should be placed on 'open' or 'restricted' access in school libraries?

2. Has the Minister asked the branch to indicate whether the book is of a 'propagandist' nature and, if not, why not?

3. Has the Minister asked the branch to investigate the inclusion of the *INFCE Summary Report* in school libraries as a possible alternative to *Struggle for Power* and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The School Libraries Branch recommends that material on controversial topics such as this be kept on open access in school libraries. On such topics the branch recommends that the school acquires material which presents both sides of the issue in question. The reason for this is explained in the previous minute on this topic—'If students are encouraged to read the book in a critical manner it should provoke discussion and encourage students to read other material on this subject, both opposing and supporting nuclear energy.'

2. The School Libraries Branch has already indicated that John Grover is unequivocally devoted to the generation of power by nuclear means. It is his aim, in *Struggle for Power*, to convince the reader of the appropriateness of his point of view. The tone of the writing is strongly didactic but the book can no more be termed propagandist than many other books which strongly support an issue or viewpoint.

3. Yes. However, the School Libraries Branch was unable to find a copy of this report. Groups contacted unsuccessfully were the Government Publications Section of the State Library of South Australia, the Conservation Centre, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Mines and Energy and CANE (the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy). A direct approach to Mr Arnold's office has not yet elicited any response.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

123. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: In view of the statement contained in Bulletin 3, July 1981, of the *Salinity File* that shows the net salt contribution to the Murray River as being 45 per cent New South Wales, 29 per cent Victoria, and 26 per cent South Australia, why has the submission *A Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem*—(a) not included any specific salt mitigation works for New South Wales; and (b) given priority to salt mitigation works in Victoria and South Australia?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Lake Tyrell Scheme and the Kerang Region Dewatering Scheme were proposed in the submission *A Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem* as specific schemes because preliminary investigations and development of the proposals had proceeded to the stage of identifying them as feasible, effective and beneficial. Work of a similar nature has not been identified in New South Wales at this stage.

The submission also proposes that the Commonwealth Government provide interest free non-repayable grants to fund the detailed investigation, design and construction of further salinity investigation measures (including possible additional storages to provide dilution flows) in all three States. It is noted in the submission that at this stage these projects have not been sufficiently identified.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

142. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Which officers of the Department of Correctional Services have been on overseas trips at Government expense in the last 12 months?

2. In the case of each—

- (a) what was the purpose of the trip;
- (b) where did the officer go;
- (c) how long was he away;
- (d) what has been the result of the trip;
- (e) what recommendations, if any, did he make on his return and which, if any of them, has been acted on; and
- (f) how much did the trip cost the Government?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. None. However, Mr J. Moody is presently on a private visit to the United Kingdom and has been granted two weeks leave with pay to undertake study of correctional institutions.

2. (a) Private.

(b) On official business Mr Moody plans to visit institutions in Scotland and England.

(c) Still absent.

(d) See (c).

(e) See (c).

(f) \$1 766.

HOUSING TRUST FLATS

143. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Housing: Has the South Australian Housing Trust bought blocks of flats, privately built, in the last five years and, if so—

(a) how many blocks of flats and how many flats in all;

(b) in the case of each block—

(i) at what address;

(ii) at what cost; and

(iii) are the flats being let and, if so, at what rent; and

(c) what is the reason for the purchase?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The South Australian Housing Trust has purchased three groups of privately built flats in recent years: a block of seven in the Port Adelaide redevelopment area, a group of four flats at Malvern and another of eight flats at Myrtle Bank. Also, the Housing Trust has acquired a number of small groups of strata-titled home units.

Details of the three groups of flats referred to above are:

Port Adelaide—Seven flats at 13 Ship Street purchased 28 July 1977 for \$70 000.

Malvern—Four flats at 100 Cheltenham Street purchased 4 June 1981 for \$84 000.

Myrtle Bank—Eight flats at 19 Moorhouse Street purchased 12 May 1981 for \$260 000.

Rents payable range from \$8 to \$26 at Port Adelaide, from \$11.50 to \$32 at Malvern and from \$11.50 to \$26 at Myrtle Bank. The acquisitions have been made to increase the trust's rental stock.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

146. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What specific items of real estate including land, buildings and other improvements were disposed of by departments and authorities under the Minister's control during the year 1980-81?

2. What payments did the Government receive for the properties sold?

3. What was the total value of assets other than real estate sold during the year 1980-81?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The reply is as follows:

Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board

1. None.
2. None.
3. \$4 000.

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science

1. None.
2. None.
3. \$100 350.

South Australian Health Commission

1 and 2. Inflammable Liquids Decanting

Unit, Dudley Park \$178 000
Residence, Wallaroo \$13 575

3. \$280 120

Department of Tourism

1. None.
2. None.
3. \$13 365.

147. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. What specific items of real estate including land, buildings and other improvements were disposed of by departments and authorities under the Minister's control during the year 1980-81?

2. What payments did the Government receive for the properties sold?

3. What was the total value of assets other than real estate sold during the year 1980-81?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2.

Location	Type of Building	Selling Price \$
Kingscote	Residence	24 500
Nuriootpa	Residence	30 000
Kadina	Residence	29 500
Balaklava	Residence	17 500
Andamooka	Land and Minor Improvements	1 800
Wallaroo	Residence	14 500
Somerton Park	Vacant Land	69 500
Adelaide	Olde Kings Music Hall	196 000

3. \$987 436 (Motor Vehicles, Plant and Salvage Material).

148. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What specific items of real estate including land, buildings and other improvements were disposed of by departments and authorities under the Minister's control during the year 1980-81?

2. What payments did the Government receive for the properties sold?

3. What was the total value of assets other than real estate sold during the year 1980-81?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Education Department—

- (a) Karatta School Residence
- (b) Risdon Park Primary School Residence
- (c) Salisbury Park High—Land
- (d) Mount Templeton Primary—Residence
- (e) Warnertown Primary—Land
- (f) Stenhouse Bay School Residence
- (g) Glencoe West Primary—Residence
- (h) Old Payneham Junior Primary
- (i) Blanche (Mount Gambier) Land Exchange
- (j) Gepps Cross High—Land
- (k) Woodside Primary—Land
- (l) OB Flat Primary (Binnun)

(m) Part payment on land sold to Payneham Council

(n) Sturt CAE—Land

Department of Further Education—Vacant site at Ridgehaven.

O.A.A.—Nil.

T.E.A.S.A.—Nil.

C.S.C.—Nil.

K.U.—Nil.

T.H.A.—47 houses.

2. Education Department—

(a) \$16 500

(b) \$11 057.67

(c) \$12 000

(d) \$300

(e) \$1 100

(f) \$10 500

(g) \$14 169.50

(h) \$150 000

(i) \$47 520

(j) \$50 000

(k) \$30 004.33

(l) \$9 151

(m) \$114.18

(n) \$300 000

Department of Further Education—\$400 000

O.A.A.—Nil.

T.E.A.S.A.—Nil.

C.S.C.—Nil.

K.U.—Nil.

T.H.A.—\$705 000

3. Education Department—Nil.

Department of Further Education—\$37 141.77

O.A.A.—Nil.

T.E.A.S.A.—Nil.

C.S.C.—Nil.

K.U.—15 motor vehicles for \$56 760

T.H.A.—Nil.

149. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What specific items of real estate including land, buildings and other improvements were disposed of by departments and authorities under the Minister's control during the year 1980-81?

2. What payments did the Government receive for the properties sold?

3. What was the total value of assets other than real estate sold during the year 1980-81?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Part sections 3282, 440, hundred of Munno Para, Hillbank.

House, allotment 1, Main Road, Palmer.

House, allotment 3, Main Road, Palmer.

House, section 535, Loxton irrigation area.

House, section 505, Loxton irrigation area.

House, section 1388, Berri irrigation area.

Reephram pumping station site, Churchill Road, Islington.

House, Mypolonga.

House, section 921, Berri irrigation area.

Part section 4012, Whites Road, Salisbury North.

Allotment 101, Herbert Street, Salisbury.

House, 64 Brook Street, Whyalla.

Allotment 75, Causeway Road, Glanville.

House, 29 Meadow Crescent, Port Pirie.

House, section 349, Bute.

House, allotment 197, Cobdogla irrigation area.

House, sections 59 and 98, Berri irrigation area.

House, section 434, Berri irrigation area.

Part section 5580, Golden Grove.

Allotment 15, Cheviot Road, Salisbury South.

House, 14 Oberlander Street, Millicent.

House, 2 Winston Terrace, Mount Gambier.
 Part section 410, hundred of Mobilong.
 House, allotment 511, Verran Terrace, Berri.
 E. & W.S. Depot, Gilberton.
 House, allotment 6, hundred of Talunga, Mount Pleasant.
 House, allotment 2, Main Road, Palmer.
 House, 49 Mitchell Street, Crystal Brook.
 House, 3 Flinders Street, Crystal Brook.
 House, 24 Thomas Street, Murray Bridge.
 House, 7 Coronation Street, Port Lincoln.
 House, allotments 25/26 Regent Street, Port Pirie.
 2. \$638 678.59.
 3. \$2 582 000.

150. **Mr BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. What specific items of real estate including land, buildings and other improvements were disposed of by departments and authorities under the Minister's control during the year 1980-81?

2. What payments did the Government receive for the properties sold?

3. What was the total value of assets other than real estate sold during the year 1980-81?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Lands received \$6 000 from the sale of departmental accommodation (improvements) on Kangaroo Island.

2. The sale of departmental motor vehicles, plant and equipment realised \$257 000 during 1980-81.

3. The department also received income from:

	\$'000
Freeholding of leasehold, licensed, reserved land, etc.	3 009
Sale of residential and industrial allotments in country towns	274
Sale of Monarto site (deposits paid)	151
Sale of Monarto equipment, etc.	47

These receipts are detailed in the 1980-81 Auditor-General's Report.

LIGHT SQUARE COLD STORES

151. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Why did the Government sell the property known as the Light Square Cold Stores, when was the decision to sell it made, to whom was it sold, when, at what price and when was vacant possession given?

2. When and by whom was the property last valued before sale, what valuation was put on it and how was it made up?

3. What fittings, plant and machinery owned by the Government were in the cold stores, what was its estimated value and has it been sold and, if so, what did it fetch and, if not, what is the Government going to do with it?

4. Did the Government have tenants in the cold stores and, if so, who were they, what was the nature of the business of each and what rent did each pay?

5. Was the Light Square Cold Stores a bond store and what other bond stores are there in the State?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. On 15 January 1979 Cabinet decided that the operations of the Light Square Cold Store be phased out and consideration be given to the disposal of the property. Tenders for the sale of these premises closed on 6 May 1981. To date, the sale of the property has not been finalised.

2. On 18 October 1979 the Valuer-General reported that the Light Square complex comprising part town acres 71 and 72, together with the cold stores and associated improvements thereon, had a market value, excluding salvageable plant, of \$700 000.

3. Ammonia refrigeration plant including air curtains and electrical fittings; butchershop meat processing equipment; and cold storage material handling equipment including conveyors, meat rails, hoists and hand trolleys. The value of this equipment was estimated at \$40 000.

An auction for the sale of this equipment was held on 26 August 1981 and the gross proceeds from this auction amounted to \$37 000. A few items not sold at the auction were sold subsequently by private treaty for approximately \$4 000.

4.

Light Square Cold Store—Tenants

Tenant	Nature of Business	Monthly Rent \$
Thos. Borthwick and Son	Meat wholesalers, exporters and caterers	5 344
Cheviot Meat	Meat retailers	1 235
R. J. and H. J. Dunk	Rabbit processors	442
Mount Shank Meat Co.	Meat retailers	1 000
Holbrooks Meats	Meat wholesalers and caterers	1 294

5. Yes. As at 21 September 1981 the Bureau of Customs had not received any request or application for any other cold store in South Australia to be authorised for the storage of underbond goods.

SCHOOL FEES

153. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding the member for Salisbury's correspondence to the Minister on the subject of school fees and his reply of 4 August (Ref. ED 19/9/64A), will the Minister have inserted in the *Education Gazette* a specific notice stating that school councils do not have the power to charge interest on unpaid accounts and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes.

INGLE FARM CENTRAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

155. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Have plans been prepared for the development and upgrading of the grounds of the Ingle Farm Central Primary School and, if so, when were they completed and is it proposed to proceed with the implementation of those plans and, if so, when and in what stages?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Final plans were prepared during February 1981 for the development and upgrading of the grounds at Ingle Farm Central Primary School.

The Central Northern Regional Education Office proposes to implement stage I of the project during the 1981-82 financial year. This work will proceed when allocations for minor works projects have been determined.

Stage I will include the upgrading of areas around the primary school block which should prevent the drainage problems near the entrance and over the footpaths adjacent to the primary school block.

Further grounds development work will not proceed until the effect of the stage I project has been assessed.

NATIONAL PARKS REPORTS

167. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. When was the last report of the National Parks and Wildlife Service tabled?

2. When is it intended that the reports will be brought up to date and what is the reason for the delay?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The annual reports of the National Parks and Wildlife Service for 1978-79 and 1979-80 were laid before Parliament on 18 August 1981.

2. It is anticipated that the reports will be printed and available to the public by the end of October 1981. The 1980-81 report is in the final stages of preparation and is expected to be available for tabling in the current session of Parliament.

POLICE VISITS

172. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What charges are imposed for visits to city centres and country townships by the Police Band and members of the Mounted Police?

2. How many visits occurred during the year 1980-81 and what were the respective costs involved for the Police Band and the Mounted Police?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The current policy is to charge for the attendance of the Police Band and Mounted Cadre only when expenditure over and above normal operating cost is incurred by the Police Department. Charges are therefore generally made only when the venue of the performance is situated in excess of 32 kilometres from Adelaide.

The charges include transport costs, sustenance and accommodation costs (unless supplied by the organisers) at standard departmental rates, together with the amount of any penalty payments due to members in accordance with the police award.

	Visits	Costs Charged \$
Police Band	2	312.48
Mounted Cadre	6	2 773.98

MEDICAL INSURANCE

175. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What action will the Government take if doctors in country and metropolitan hospitals refuse to treat patients with no medical insurance?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The South Australian Health Commission has undertaken discussions with the Australian Medical Association and, through the boards of management of all recognised hospitals, with the medical staffs of those hospitals, in an attempt to explain and to obtain assurances with regard to medical services under the new health insurance arrangements. The Australian Medical Association has asked all doctors to continue to treat patients as they normally do and it is understood that this is occurring.

PRESS SECRETARIES

177. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many Ministerial press secretaries are employed by the Government?

2. What are the names and salaries of the Ministers' respective press secretaries?

3. On how many occasions have these press secretaries been made available to other members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, who were the members involved on each occasion, what were the respective issues involved and what were the respective costs?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. 14.

2. Premier's Office

Mr N. Starck (MO-2) \$24 231+25 per cent

Mr M. Stone (MO-2) \$24 231+25 per cent

Deputy Premier's Office

Mr R. Yeeles (MO-2) \$24 231+20 per cent

Attorney-General's Office

Mr R. Trowbridge (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Industrial Affairs Office

Mr C. Rudd (MO-2) \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Education's Office

Ms L. Blieschke (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Chief Secretary's Office

Mr G. Stewart (MO-2) \$24 231+10 per cent

Local Government Office

Mr J. Jennings (MO-2) \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Agriculture's Office

Mr R. M. Rickards (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Environment's Office

Mr D. R. Wright (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Transport's Office

Mr R. G. Burnett (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Health's Office

Mrs L. A. Bramley (MO-2) ... \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Water Resources Office

Mr A. Luks (MO-2) \$24 231+10 per cent

Minister of Community Welfare's Office

Mr D. Lewis (MO-2) \$24 231+10 per cent

3. None.

HELICOPTERS

182. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it a fact that the Government intends to investigate the system of using helicopters to detect speeding motorists or other road offenders on country roads and, if so, when?

2. How will this system of detection operate and when will it be introduced?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. See above.

PESTICIDES

183. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What programme of pesticide sprayings will be carried out in South Australia to combat mosquito breeding and encephalitis, including the areas to be sprayed and the time in each case?

2. What educational programmes will be conducted to advise the public of the dangers of encephalitis caused by mosquitos?

3. What assistance will be provided to householders for spraying rainwater tanks, creeks, swimming pools, etc.?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The limited programmes for application of pesticide carried out by local boards of health or the South Australian

Health Commission in conjunction with local boards, depend largely on the need at any given time related to conditions that favour mosquito breeding. There is no fixed programme for the application of pesticides. The objective is to minimise the unnecessary use of pesticides.

2. It is proposed to provide general statements during the coming summer about the need for mosquito control. Mosquito-borne encephalitis is a very rare disease and it is not proposed to give specific information on this type of encephalitis. Local boards along the River Murray have conducted public awareness programmes aimed at mosquito control in settled areas and it is understood that they will undertake similar activities this summer.

3. Advice is available to householders but generally no physical assistance is given. In some cases, local authorities and service groups have in the past given physical assistance to householders in the application of pesticide.

MONARTO

184. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Will the supplementary development plan for the Monarto designated site, to be released this month, make it immediately obvious that no part of any of the new plantations of native trees and shrubs is in the slightest danger of being destroyed?

2. Does the Minister's letter to the member for Adelaide of 26 August mean that all such afforested land, whether kept in public ownership or returned to private hands, is to be protected?

3. Why was the Minister unable to give an unqualified undertaking that the 1 640 hectares of tree plantings, largely in the west of the designated zone, will be maintained at all costs in reply to the member for Adelaide's letters of 12 February and 7 August?

4. Is it a fact that the opportunity does remain for returning private landholders to cut down any plantings of trees and, if so, why?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The intention of the proposed Supplementary Development Plan is to guide and control all future development within the Supplementary Development Plan Area, which coincides with the designated site for Monarto, and the plan includes amongst its objectives the following:

- to provide for the conservation of areas of natural bushland, rare plant sites and fauna habitats.
- to provide for the protection of all tree plantation areas.

2 and 3. As stated in my letter of 26 August 1981 to the member for Adelaide, the Government's policy is to apply vegetation protection to the whole of the Monarto site in relation to significant areas of long standing scrub and new plantations, through the measures of:

- public ownership of land.
- the application of heritage agreements at the time of sale.
- the development controls to be provided by the proposed Supplementary Development Plan for the designated site.

In the application of this policy, all land having significant areas of existing bushland or tree plantations is being sold subject to heritage agreements which impose conditions appropriate to the scientific or aesthetic importance of the trees to be protected.

4. There is no opportunity given to any landholder for the wholesale cutting down of trees; however, in the observation of reasonable land management, owners may find it

necessary to remove some trees to provide for firebreaks, access or pest and pest plant control.

ORE SAMPLES

185. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the total quantity (by weight) of ore samples transported from Roxby Downs to Amdel since 1 January 1981?

2. What is the size range of the shipments of ore samples from Roxby Downs to Amdel and how frequently are they made?

3. What quantity (by weight) of ore samples will be transported from Roxby Downs to Amdel in the next year?

4. What is done with the ore samples after testing is completed?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. Approximately 5 tonnes.

2. Samples shipped from Roxby Downs to Amdel Frewville range in weight from approximately 5 kg to approximately 100 kg, with up to two shipments per week. Samples shipped from Roxby Downs to Amdel, Thebarton, since 1 January 1981 have been four in number, ranging in weight from 200 kg to 2.5 tonnes with an average of approximately 625 kg.

3. The weight of ore samples to be transported from Roxby Downs to Amdel in the next year will depend on contracts between the two parties which remain to be established.

4. After testing is complete, the samples and residues are returned to Olympic Dam at intervals of approximately one month, or more frequently if required by the rate of accumulation.

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT

192. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Which Minister requested Mr Lewis Barrett to approach me regarding appointment as a judge of the Local and District Criminal Court, what was the purpose of making that approach to me, was that purpose explained to Mr Barrett and, if so, by whom and why did not the Minister make the approach to me personally?

2. Was the Premier informed of my refusal to consider accepting such appointment and, if so, by whom and when?

3. Which Ministers had conferred with Mr Barrett regarding amendments to the Savings Bank of South Australia Act shortly before he was requested to approach me?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is not appropriate to pursue this matter further. All that can properly be said about the honourable member's concern has already been said in Parliament.

EMBEZZLEMENT

193. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many cases of embezzlement were reported to the Police Department during 1980-81 and what were the gross amounts and organisations involved?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Thirty-seven at a reported value of \$54 383. In order to identify the organisations, an appreciable amount of computer time and clerical effort would be involved and I do not propose to make this commitment at this stage.

SALES TAX

194. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister requested the Federal Government and/or his Federal colleague to abolish the 2.5 per cent sales tax on uniforms and, if so, when and what response has been received and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No. Such approaches take place at a Prime Minister/Premier level.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1.	\$
Corporation of the City of Woodville	65 757
Corporation of the City of Payneham	15 856
Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange	13 826
	<hr/> \$95 439

2. All services are fulfilling the purposes for which they were intended and from that point of view are successful.

3. No information is available on running costs as these are borne by the respective councils.

FESTIVAL THEATRE CAR PARK

197. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Government request the appropriate authority to erect a sign at the entrance to the Festival Theatre car park from King William Street pointing out to drivers of school buses and/or tourist buses that they have insufficient height clearance and space to proceed on this road?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust has agreed to erect further clearance signs at the King William Road entrance to Festival Drive.

ANTI-RIOT GEAR

200. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Are the police supplied with anti-riot gear and, if so, what equipment is supplied and, if not, does the Government intend to purchase such equipment?

The Hon. A. W. RODDA: Yes. Equipment includes riot shields, helmets and batons.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

203. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

1. When is it expected that discussions will be completed between representatives of the Kooniba people, the Murat Bay District Council and local representatives of the Lutheran Church, as set out in his letter to me of 26 May 1981, over the transfer to the Aboriginal Lands Trust of the land at Davenport Creek near Ceduna, described in my letter to the Minister of 7 November 1980?

2. When did those discussions begin and why have they taken so long?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The discussions have involved many groups of individuals who have expressed an interest in this matter. No indication can be given as to when a final decision will be made.

COMMUNITY BUS SERVICES

199. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What were the respective amounts allocated during 1980-81 by the Government to local government for the provision of community bus services?

2. How successful have these bus services been?

3. What were the respective running costs for the community bus services?