HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 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 his assent to the following Bills:

Fire Brigades Act Amendment,

South Australian Health Commission Act Amendment.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 420 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 the Hon. P. B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PRE-SCHOOL OPERATING COSTS

Petitions signed by 1 233 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 Messrs Ashenden, Bannon, Evans, McRae, Millhouse, Slater, and Whitten.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions asked both in the House and the Estimates Committees, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Nos. 80, 88, 95, 139, 156, 176, and 202.

IN-SERVICE WORK

In reply to **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (24 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Budget Review Committee has suggested 'that attendance at conferences, seminars and in-service training programmes be kept to a minimum and that emphasis be given to conducting these activities in the vacation period—or at least on a shared basis (say, one hour of work time to one hour of non-work time)'. This would allow for a reduction in costs of replacement staff while teachers were absent on in-service activities. There would also be less disruption to classes in schools through such absences.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The funding available for pre-school education in South Australia is a matter of concern both to the Government and sections of the community. As members will know, the State Government has increased spending on pre-school education by 14 per cent in the 1981-82 financial year, and with anticipated increases in wages and salaries this could rise to 22 per cent for the full year. However, the Federal Government has refused to increase its allocation for pre-school education from the 1978 level of $3 700 000. Because of this, it has been necessary to make a small cut in overall allocations to pre-school education in the current financial year.

I intend asking the Kindergarten Union, the Education Department, Catholic Education and the Childhood Services Council to co-operate in a review of the present funding and administration of pre-school education in this State. The major purpose of the investigation will be to determine ways and means of directing more funds away from administration and directly into kindergartens and pre-schools. It has been suggested to my department that aspects of the Childhood Services Council may be duplicating work already being done—or capable of being done—by the Education Department or the Kindergarten Union.

This is not intended to pre-judge the findings of the inquiry. We are anxious that every consideration be given in an attempt to find ways of directing additional funding directly to kindergartens and pre-schools. The Government firmly believes that it would be in the interests of everyone if this were done. I hope that all bodies involved in pre-school education services will co-operate in the investigation.

The investigation will be conducted by the Director-General of Services and Supply, Mr J. Burdett. It is hoped that Mr Burdett will complete his investigation by the end of November. Any possible changes to the present arrangements for pre-school funding and administration which become apparent would, of course, be fully discussed with the organisations involved before implementation. The Government is firmly committed to maintaining the standard of pre-school education in this State. South Australia has the best pre-school education system of any State in Australia and the Government is determined that this situation will continue.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NURSING HOME ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The House will be aware of community concern to ensure that nursing home beds available at Windana are commissioned. These beds were established for the care of 90 adult patients suffering from brain failure, following approval of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and Cabinet in 1976 to the conversion of Windana's former function as a custodial institution for delinquent boys. Agreement was subsequently reached with Southern Cross Homes to operate the new facility, as well as the associated day care centre, which was established under Southern Cross Homes administration in 1980.

The House will also be aware of the Commonwealth Government's refusal to give approval to pay nursing home benefits in respect of these 90 beds. This was despite repeated submissions from the South Australian Health Commission and personal representations by me to the Minister for Health that Commonwealth approval should be forthcoming on the grounds that the needs of patients suffering from brain failure or senile dementia should be seen in a different context from psychiatric patients, for whom the Commonwealth is precluded from providing benefits under its legislation.

A request to recognise Windana as an ordinary nursing home was also refused by the Federal Government on the

basis that there were sufficient nursing home beds in that area of Adelaide. Against this background, the State Government has persisted in its efforts to make optimum use of the nursing home beds at Windana. At the same time as the Health Commission has been trying to open nursing home beds at Windana, the Department for Community Welfare, which operates a 72-bed nursing home at Magill Home, in association with hostel accommodation, has been trying to find a means of upgrading accommodation for the nursing home patients. Two of the buildings containing nursing home beds at Magill Home are significantly substandard and fail to meet the requirements of the State Health Act for nursing home accommodation. Accordingly, the Commonwealth Health Department has served notice that payment of nursing home benefits for patients located in the two substandard buildings (36 beds) will no longer be paid unless the accommodation is brought up to standard. The estimated cost of such a project is $2 000 000.

Following negotiations between officers of the South Australian Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare, the concept has been developed of closing the nursing home component of Magill and negotiating with the Commonwealth to open the beds at Windana in exchange for the closure of the beds at Magill Home. If achievable, this would result in an increase of 18 in the Government nursing home bedstock. It is obviously more logical for the Government to examine the possibility of transferring nursing home patients from substandard accommodation at Magill to the high quality accommodation at Windana, rather than to expend $2 000 000 of taxpayers' money to upgrade the substandard accommodation. It also appears that, all other avenues having been exhausted, transfer of beds may be the only way in which the high quality accommodation at Windana can be used for nursing home purposes.

All Windana requires are certain minor modifications and upgrading to meet the latest fire protection standards, and the cost for this has been estimated at $220 000. If the Commonwealth agrees to the transfer of the funds, this work will be undertaken as a matter of urgency. The Government recognises the need to ensure that nursing home patients in its care are accommodated in the best possible facilities and that any transfers are undertaken with the least possible inconvenience and disruption to the patients and their families.

Achievement of such transfer necessarily involves negotiations between the Health Commission and the Commonwealth Government and between the Health Commission and Southern Cross Homes, who were, as I mentioned earlier, given Cabinet approval last year to operate Windana as a nursing home. The Government has therefore given approval for the Health Commission to:

1. Negotiate with the Commonwealth Health Department in order to exchange the allocation of 72 State nursing home beds at Magill for 90 (general purpose) State nursing home beds at Windana.

2. Negotiate with Southern Cross Homes Inc. to assume conduct of Windana as a State nursing home.

Subject to the satisfactory outcome of these negotiations, discussions will be held with unions and employees affected by the transfer to keep them informed.

Both the Minister of Community Welfare and I are very conscious of the need to reassure patients and their families that their future care and accommodation are provided for in the best possible way. To this end, we intend to enlist the assistance of appropriate professional support from the Health Commission and Department for Community Welfare to assess the needs of each individual and to try to ensure that those needs are met in the most appropriate manner, whether it be by transfer to Windana or by relocation in some other facility best suited to them.

Hostel accommodation at Magill Home is of a high standard and the State Government has spent more than $2 000 000 on the home in the past four years. Hostel residents will not be involved in the proposed transfer of the nursing home beds, and the hostel will continue to provide high standard accommodation for its residents.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Firearms Act, 1977—Regulations—Fees (Amendment).

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton) for the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

Pursuant to Statute—

Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1976—Regulations—

I. Goats.

II. Movement of Stock.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1980-81.

II. Auditor-General's Report, 1980-81.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Sewerage Act, 1929-1977—Regulations—Qualifications.

QUESTION TIME

POPULATION

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say why people are still leaving South Australia for other States, especially in the light of the positive statement that he made on 9 April 1980 that people and capital had ceased to emigrate from South Australia to other States? Today, the Australian Bureau of Statistics released the latest population figures, including information about the movement of people between the States. In the June quarter of 1981, South Australia suffered a net loss of 1 185 people to other States, giving a cumulative net loss in the first seven quarters (or 21 months) of the present Government of 11 858 persons, equivalent to the loss of an entire provincial centre of the size of Murray Bridge or Port Lincoln. When the present Government came to office, South Australia had a population of 46 000 more than that of Western Australia. The difference has now narrowed to 16 000 and, looking at the trend, it would appear that Western Australia will pass us, in terms of population, within a year.

This further information has come from the recent results of a Morgan Gallup poll on the perception of residents in the different States concerning their State's prospects: 49 per cent of South Australians in the sample thought that their State was now falling behind others and only 41 per cent thought that we were holding our own or progressing more quickly. These results reveal a degree of pessimism in South Australia far greater than that apparent in any other mainland State.

By contrast, for instance, 72 per cent of those polled in New South Wales thought that they were either holding their own or progressing more quickly. With the actual poll came some observations that included the mention by South Australians of such factors as unemployment, dwindling

industry and the movement of people out of the State, which is the point of my question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Once again—

Mr Bannon: Are Ministers going to brief him?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He is a funny little man, Mr Speaker; he really is. The Leader of the Opposition has come out with figures that have been made available today from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and once again he has used the figures that suit him, not the total figures. I am having the document that has been released today fully analysed, because it shows, in fact, quite the reverse of what the Leader says. I shall be delighted to give the House tomorrow the full details and the full implications of those figures.

Let me say now that it is typical of the distortion and the distorted facts that the Leader uses that he has not referred to overseas migration; he has spoken of only interstate migration. He has not referred to the slow-down in the rate of migration out of the State and, in fact, the reversal of the trend. He has not referred to the fact that most of the migration out of the State occurred in 1977-78, a fact that was confirmed by Mr Hughes, I think, on a television programme recently. There is no doubt the figures now show that the net migration out of South Australia is slowing down, and, indeed, in some respects, depending on which figures are being used, has stopped. It is about time that the Leader of the Opposition stopped being so negative.

I find this quite remarkable, and it is a very sad image that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition generally are projecting in this State. First, they are totally and absolutely destructive in their approach to South Australia, towards every potential it has for development, to the creation of jobs, and to the future prosperity of all South Australians, and that is not a very attractive image for any Party to have, anyway. Secondly, the Opposition is constantly using leaked documents, and interpreting them in the sort of way that suits its case of negativism.

Thirdly, the Opposition seems to be spending a great deal of its time indulging in petty rumourmongering, even to the extent of issuing official Opposition press releases on certain subjects pertaining to alleged Government activities, and often with scant regard for the truth. It must have been very many years since any political Party has projected actively such a miserable, mean and petty image as the Opposition in South Australia is now projecting to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, you would be well aware of the Standing Orders that require speakers in this House to address themselves to the Chair. I have noticed that the Premier, in his grandstanding, has been addressing the gallery rather than yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order. The honourable Premier has been doing that in the course of his answer.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTS

Mr RANDALL: An article on page 3 of today's *Advertiser* suggests that the lighting of Football Park is again in doubt. The article is headed 'Lighting in doubt again at Football Park'. Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware of the deadlock reported in the article? The article states:

On 10 September it was reported in the *Advertiser* that a financial package enabling the construction of lights and more seating at Football Park had been approved by the Parliamentary Industries Development Committee.

That approval was seen as a major step forward in the plan to have Football Park lit by July next year.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I thank the member for his question. This matter affects the whole State and is of concern to most members of the community. As far as this Government is concerned, they can start constructing the lights tomorrow.

Mr Hamilton: Who are 'they'.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope that the member for Albert Park is interested in the answer, because it is very important to the sporting public and the people of South Australia generally. As far as this Government is concerned, the lights can go up tomorrow. As correctly reported in the *Advertiser* several weeks ago, the Government did reach a solution with the league on a financial package of measures that would enable the league not only to construct the lights but also to complete the roofing, the seating in the outer, and the landscaping around Football Park so that South Australia would have a fully completed sporting arena. This Government wants that to happen. This Government wants to see a fully completed sporting venue at West Lakes.

The details of that financial package have been released to the press. To recapitulate, it involves the extension of the present Government guarantee to the league from $1 400 000 to $3 500 000 and a grant of $850 000 by the Government to assist with the installation of the lighting. The I.D.C. has approved that, and up to four or five weeks ago it was generally accepted that agreement had been reached between the parties. One of the conditions of that financial package granted by the Government to the league was that the intensity of the lights should be no greater than 1 000 lux.

The disagreement that has arisen between the league and West Lakes Limited is on the definition of intensity, whether it means an average intensity or a maximun intensity. As far as the Government is concerned the only criterion is the amount of light spill that will affect the residents of West Lakes. If the league and West Lakes Limited can reach agreement on intensity that will produce no greater light spill, the Government will be happy with that agreement.

The Government has said that it will not legislate to change the West Lakes indenture. The Government made plain that to legislate to change the West Lakes indenture would have serious repercussions on other indentures that would have to be gone into by the Government. Therefore, the Government will not change the West Lakes indenture. That being the case, the only way that the lights can go up is by an agreement between the lessor, West Lakes Limited, and the lessee, the South Australian National Football League. Unless that agreement can be reached, it is up to the two parties to take whatever action they see fit. The Government will not legislate and therefore that agreement is imperative. This Government has bent over backwards to try to facilitate that agreement.

Mr Keneally: Let's wash our hands.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I repeat, for the member for Stuart, that this Government has bent over backwards to try to facilitate that agreement and intends to keep trying to facilitate that agreement. It has made available a very generous financial package—so that the league will be in a position to erect the lights.

Mr Hamilton: You have fiddled around for two years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In the negotiations between the league and West Lakes Limited, West Lakes Limited was representing the interests of the residents of West Lakes, and I should have thought that would be of interest

to the member for Albert Park. In those negotiations, as I have said, five weeks ago it appeared that agreement had been reached. However, because of that misunderstanding about the definition of 1 000 lux, whether it means an average or not, negotiations seem to be nearing a point of breaking down.

What that means is that to have a 1 000 lux average in the centre of the stadium we could have an intensity of, say, 1 400 lux but towards the extremeties of the stadium the intensity would be around 750 lux, or various permutations in that area. That would still give an average of around 1 000 lux. However, as the Government has continually stressed, what we are concerned about is the light spill. If the averaging of the intensity will bring no greater light spill, the Government is quite happy with that, as long as agreement can be reached between the parties. I want to finish by saying that the public of South Australia is fed up with the delays on this matter. It is time that agreement was reached and the lights were put up so they will be ready for next football season. I repeat that, as far as the Government is concerned, the lights can go up tomorrow, provided the agreement is reached.

MOUNT GAMBIER COMPANY

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What action, if any, has the Minister of Industrial Affairs initiated to protect entitlements for Mount Gambier contractors and subcontractors following the collapse of Brian Grove Constructions on the North-West Primary School in Mount Gambier? I quote from a letter I have received from a resident of Mount Gambier, who is very interested in this matter, as follows:

It is our opinion that the action that Brian Grove and his directors of the company have taken in the matter of the company closedown amounts to nothing less than corporate crime, and if you had not previously known, I am told by very reliable people that this is not the first time. They have done the same thing twice previously while trading as J. Grove and Son and in each case made a lot of money by not paying other people, especially subcontractors. Brian Grove is, in my opinion, a very wealthy man. He would control by being Managing Director, or directly own in the case of Mount Schank Quarries, property in my conservative estimate of $15 000 000. I enclose copies of sheet listing properties owned by various companies.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Hon. Deputy Leader to please resume his seat. The use of a letter by another person, particularly where it is making assertions relative to a matter which is before a court (in this case, the Bankruptcy Court) is quite a delicate matter and borders on *sub judice*. There are two features, the *sub judice* aspect of the matter, and also the fact of commenting by way of assertion by use of another person's letter. I ask the Hon. Deputy Leader to be very careful in phrasing any further explanation that he makes in relation to this matter.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think the assertions are coming to an end. The letter continues:

I am trying desperately to get every person, every subcontractor and every supplier paid for their services for the work already carried out on the north-west school project, for two reasons; one, as I initiated the purchase of local materials and, two, because I represented Brian Grove Constructions Pty Ltd in Mount Gambier I feel I have a moral obligation to try, as the company is obviously not. As you can see by the copies of letters I have attached to this note, that I have wrote to the Minister for Education, Mr Allison, the project team leader of the north-west primary school, from the Public Buildings Department, Peter Baldwinson, Brian Grove Accountants, and the Society of Carpenters and Joiners Secretary.

The position at the moment is that the Public Buildings Department has stated that they can do no more to help Brian Grove and now they must press on and finish the school. The truth is that they have done too much to help Brian Grove and absolutely nothing to help me, the tradesmen who worked their guts out in the dust and then mud on the site, the subcontractors (who could easily go to the wall if they are not paid, and lose their homes into the bargain) and the suppliers of materials and services.

Regardless of the statements made by Mr Allison and the Minister of Public Works, Mr Brown (who incidentally has been a great mate of Brian Grove for years)—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The letter continues:

—regardless of what they say to the contrary, there was a progress payment made up after the cease work order on the school and a cheque drawn for up to $200 000. This cheque was not paid to Brian Grove Constructions, but we have been told from reliable information from within the Public Buildings Department that this money was paid into a special account.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is now going far beyond the pale. I have explained the delicate nature of the situation. The honourable Deputy Leader has already been warned, and, if there is any further transgression, I will withdraw leave to continue the explanation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The letter goes on:

An honourable member: Do you want an extension?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The letter goes on to ask a series of questions. I do not think these are assertions but I will be guided by what you think about it. The letter continues:

1. Why was Brian Grove Constructions Pty Ltd accepted as contractors for a major contract both here and in Adelaide, when it is obvious that the company was shaky financially at the time the company was given the contract?
2. Why was the project team leader's advice to the Minister not to accept the lowest tender (which was Brian Grove Constructions) but to accept the next one up as he felt that this tender was more reliable, completely ignored and overruled and the lowest tender accepted?
3. Why did the Minister inform the team leader for the north-west school, Mr Peter Baldwinson, and his department to keep quiet about the meeting he had with Brian Grove regarding his financial difficulties two weeks before the announcement of the stop work order, thus effectively giving Brian Grove two weeks to consolidate his position?
4. Why did the Public Buildings Department refrain from stepping in immediately to carry on with the school project and keep the site team intact and discuss Brian Grove's problems while this was being done, instead of losing valuable time in making up tender documents for the completion which has taken months and spend the time lost trying to help Brian Grove?
5. Why antagonise local tradesmen, subcontractors, suppliers and the building unions by refusing to acknowledge correspondence or even talk to people involved, and maintain that the school will be completed on time and appoint a principal as if nothing has happened?
6. Why insist and keep on insisting that there is no money owing to Brian Grove Constructions from the Public Buildings Department when we know there is?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I think it is unfortunate that a member of Parliament with the experience of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should use the protection of Parliament to make the sorts of allegations that he has made this afternoon.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I learnt from you when you were in Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I challenge the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to go outside this House and repeat those allegations. I challenge you to do that and I guarantee that you will not because you know they are incorrect and you know that four or five parties would take you for every dollar you have if you made those allegations outside the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Any person who stands and uses the protection of Parliament to make libellous and untrue statements like those made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition certainly gets under my skin, because I believe it is below the dignity of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard enough by way of interjections.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will get a very detailed reply to the Deputy Leader's question and explanation today because he made at least 10 or 15 different points that need to be answered in detail, but I will go through now and cover the specific issue on the details that I know, without any reference back to more detailed information.

The first point is that it was the recommendation of the Public Buildings Department that Mr Brian Grove be the contractor for this particular job. I challenge the Deputy Leader and his informer to come up with any evidence to the contrary. I challenge you to come up with evidence to suggest it was anyone but the P.B.D. officers involved who made the recommendation as to who should get the contract. I took that recommendation that came from the P.B.D. to Cabinet, being a contract of more than $300 000 and requiring Cabinet's approval, and I put forward the P.B.D. recommendation and Cabinet accepted.

The second point, I think, was the accusation that I had been a mate of Brian Grove for many years. That is incorrect and I absolutely deny it. The other point that was raised by the Deputy Leader was that, in fact, the Government legally owes a substantial amount of money to Brian Grove for work completed. I will show the member, as I have produced evidence to other outside parties, that in fact the Government owes nothing legally to any of the subcontractors, or to Brian Grove Constructions for the work on that site. The Government has held (and I have revealed this publicly) bank guarantees to a certain extent and in addition to that there was a certain amount of work completed. The Government is going to have to put in substantial additional amounts of finance to complete that contract.

Mr McRae: How much has Grove put in the bank?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As the honourable member who has just interjected has said, if he knows his law to any extent at all, surely I would have expected the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, having been a Minister of Public Works, if he had any idea as to what the legal procedure and the legal standing of the Minister of Public Works in his department was in such circumstances, the Government goes on and finishes the project and if there is any refund or money utilised from the original allocation, that is then passed back to the company in liquidation. If there was a requirement for additional finance, the Government can quite legally turn around and put a demand on the company in liquidation for additional finance and rank as, I think, an unsecured creditor in that position. That is exactly where the Government will stand on this issue. I know the extent to which the political opponents of this Government, and the trade union movement as well, have been spreading deliberate lies and rumours in the South-East.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Public Works will withdraw the reference to the word 'lies'.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I withdraw that, Mr Speaker. Can I say that they have distorted the truth to the point where it is not recognisable.

Mr Hamilton: You're the Minister of Industrial Affairs; you're disgusting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Industrial Affairs will resume his seat.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I require the honourable member for Albert Park to withdraw the word 'lies'.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Tomorrow I will produce evidence to show that such rumours have been spread in the South-East. The Government is concerned that the project at Mount Gambier be completed as quickly as possible.

Mr Keneally: Challenge him to make the statement tomorrow outside the House.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will produce the evidence tomorrow.

Mr Keneally: Outside?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government is concerned that the project be completed as quickly as possible. We have looked at the plight of the subcontractors involved, and of the individual workers who have worked for subcontractors or the principal contractors involved. I understand—and I will get more details tomorrow—that the employees of Brian Grove Constructions are likely to be paid for any wages owing to them. We will get more details of that from the accounting firm responsible for the liquidation of the company, but certain statements have been made publicly by the liquidator and, as I understand it, those persons who are owed money will receive it by about the end of November.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How much is involved?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: For the employees it would be the full amount. The honourable member will realise that the employees rank very high in terms of payment, and it is expected that they will get at least the full amount owing to them for wages.

The other point relates to the financial plight faced by some of the subcontractors. The honourable member has asked this question, knowing that the Government, through the Public Buildings Department, has been to the South-East and has negotiated with the subcontractors. Those negotiations took place last week with Mr R. Johns, who is the Principal Architect in the Public Buildings Department responsible for the entire project. The Government, having looked at the financial position of some of the subcontractors who have raised their problems, has made decisions that will be conveyed later this week to the subcontractors. I expect two public servants to visit the South-East on Friday to hold further discussions with the subcontractors involved.

Some subcontractors are unable to undertake work to complete the project, because they have not got the financial resources to employ people to continue or to complete the subcontract work involved. The Government has looked very sympathetically at that matter, and the public servants I have mentioned will be visiting the South-East to look at the plight of the subcontractors.

The local member, the Minister of Education, has taken a very personal and active interest in investigating the personal problems created by the liquidation of Brian Grove Constructions. He is playing, I think, the right role in making sure that every effort is made by the Government, as the client that was having the building erected, to take a sympathetic attitude towards the subcontractors and employees involved in the project who are owed money by Brian Grove Constructions. That is why the Government has taken such an interest in the matter and why certain decisions have been made that will be conveyed to those people later this week.

The Government has acted legally, quite within its rights; it has acted in a proper manner, but also in a very humane manner, in the interests of the people who might suffer because of the liquidation of Brian Grove Contructions. I will bring forward a much more detailed reply tomorrow for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Health tell the House whether or not the Hospital Corporation of Australia intends to proceed with its plans to build its long proposed private hospital at Noarlunga Centre, and whether or not the Government has honoured its 1979 election promise not to impede the commencement of that private hospital? An article appeared in the *Southern Times* on 7 October this year referring to the Noarlunga District Hospital, and under the heading 'Viewpoint'. It states:

> In 1977 plans for a private hospital at Christies Beach were announced in the *Southern Times*... This week's viewpoint is from consultative group executive officer, John McDonnell.

The article continues, quoting John McDonnell:

> We believe the confusion surrounding the long-awaited Noarlunga District Private Hospital should be cleared up... Plans for a private hospital at Christies Beach were first announced in the *Southern Times* in January 1977. In June 1977 the then Government of the day ruled out the possibility of both a public hospital or a casualty clearing station for the Noarlunga area.

The article further states:

> For its part, the Liberal Party supported the proposed hospital including a maternity section and indicated that no impediment would be placed in the way of immediate commencement of construction. In March 1981 the Health Minister indicated to the group that the Government was maintaining its 'no impediment policy' by guaranteeing the capital funds required for construction.

That gives a brief outline of the history of the hospital. Of course, as the article states, it is now time that this matter was cleared up.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to clarify the matter for the member for Mawson, who I know has taken a continuous interest in this issue since he was elected to represent that area. The Hospital Corporation of Australia advised the Health Commission in August of this year that it did not intend to proceed with the project. The Hospital Corporation of Australia acknowledges that the Government has fulfilled its election undertaking, and indeed we have played our full part in trying to ensure that that hospital went ahead in accordance with the Hospital Corporation of Australia's original intention. However, I believe that the H.C.A. has recognised that the situation in regard to health services in the southern areas is dramatically different now from the situation which existed when it took the decision to build a hospital. Five principal factors have caused a change and a dramatic improvement in the quality of health services offered to the people in that area.

The first is the establishment of a very effective retrieval service based at Flinders Medical Centre, which has gone a long way towards relieving the worry that the residents of the Christies-Noarlunga area felt during the mid and late 1970s concerning access to emergency care. In addition, the establishment of the State rescue helicopter has magnificently complemented the very effective road ambulance services provided by St John and, again, has relieved the anxiety which was apparent in that area in the late 1970s. The completion of Dyson Road has provided another access road to the Flinders Medical Centre, and at the same time has relieved the pressure on South Road which caused congestion and which meant that ambulance times between the southern areas and Flinders were longer than they might have been. Those ambulance times are now quite acceptable because of the reduction in pressure on South Road through the existence of Dyson Road. Also, and this is a very significant factor, one of the larger local medical practices has established a 24-hour medical and minor casualty service for primary care. That is a 24-hour a day, seven days a week, all year round service that did not exist in the mid and late 1970s and, again, it constitutes a significant improvement to the health services in the area.

Following receipt of advice from the Hospital Corporation of Australia, I asked the Health Commission to review the situation in the southern areas and to report to me on whether it believed that the Government should undertake any upgrading of existing services in order to compensate for the Hospital Corporation's decision not to proceed with the hospital. As a result of that review and as a result of consultation between the Health Commission and the Fleurieu Medical Association and the Noarlunga council, the commission has recommended certain actions to me which I intend to set in train forthwith.

The first is that there should be a review of the facilities available at the McLaren Vale Hospital with a view to upgrading particularly the casualty and diagnostic areas. That upgrading does not need to be major upgrading; minor upgrading may be justified. Secondly, the Health Commission will discuss with local doctors the desirability of establishing a second practice further south on a 24-hour, seven days a week basis in order to provide better coverage of general practitioners on a seven day a week basis. Thirdly, the Health Commission will examine the provision of improved para-medical services, particularly physiotherapy and dietary services, in the southern areas.

It is likely that residents in the southern areas may not be aware of the extensive range of services that are available to them. I was interested to learn that there are no fewer than 19 private specialist services provided from the Christies-Noarlunga area to insured patients and those who are eligible for Commonwealth benefits. These services are regarded by the Health Commission as sufficient for the needs of the people in southern areas. In summary, the H.C.A. does not intend to proceed to establish a private hospital—

An honourable member: Or anyone else.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I doubt whether any entrepreneur would embark on the establishment of a private hospital in the southern areas without the full support of local medical practitioners. The local medical practitioners have advised the Health Commission that they believe that the construction of a private hospital in that area cannot be justified and is not warranted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: With better knowledge of those facts, we intend to review the services, particularly the diagnostic and casualty areas at McLaren Vale, and to discuss with local doctors the desirability of a second 24-hour, seven day a week service and to examine the provision of improved para-medical services. When those matters have been attended to, I feel confident that the health services available to people in the southern areas will be as good as, if not better than, those provided in any other area of metropolitan Adelaide.

COUNTRY OPTICAL CLINICS

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Health advise the House when it is likely that a decision will be made in respect of the Government initiating its apparent intention some time ago of setting up country optical clinics, particularly for pensioners? The Minister will recall that she announced at the end of last year that rural areas, including my own electorate, would have free optical clinics earlier this year, but this matter has apparently been delayed or deferred. As this proposal has a very long history and the need for such clinics has always been extremely urgent, will the Minister say what is happening in this area?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I recognise the honourable member's interest in this matter and also that of other members in the House who represent country electorates. The member for Whyalla is correct in recalling

that I announced late last year that the Government expected the service to proceed early this year. That announcement was made in good faith and in the genuine belief at that stage that it could proceed. Following that announcement and the very long-standing dispute between the professional services involved in the provision of spectacles to country pensioners, namely, opthalmologists and opticians, those two bodies were not able to agree on the method by which these spectacles should be dispensed, and the proposal foundered as a result of professional disagreement, if not intransigence. In the meantime, that dispute was resolved and we now find ourselves in an extremely difficult Budget situation. As a result of the difficulties imposed on the State Government by the Federal Government towards the end of the last financial year, it was not possible to proceed as we would have wished. However, I reiterate that I regard the issue of providing spectacles to country pensioners as one of very high priority. Even in the light of budgetary difficulties, I have asked the Health Commission to examine the manner in which spectacles are currently being provided to see whether improved management and a different method of distribution can result in savings which would extend that service to country areas. I hope to be in a position to announce later this year that the Government will do what it can towards meeting the needs of country pensioners for spectacles.

SAND-CARTING CONTRACTS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning accede to my requests to vary existing sand-carting contracts along the metropolitan coastline so that 20 000 cubic metres of sand destined for Glenelg North beach can be split between Glenelg North and the section of the Glenelg South beach between Pier Street and Broadway? The contract has been let to deposit 20 000 cubic metres of sand on the Glenelg North beach to prevent further damage to the base of the rip-rap retaining wall. A section of beach at the Broadway, in the district of my neighbour and colleague the member for Glenelg, is also badly eroded and is of concern to the honourable member, particularly as no current contract exists for that section of beachfront. The Glenelg council is also greatly concerned about the erosion of beaches, particularly with the summer recreation season about to begin, and has also requested that the contract be split between the two beach areas.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The member for Morphett has advised me that he would be seeking information on this matter, and I have been able to obtain that information for him. I am also aware that, following discussions that I have had with the member for Morphett, the Corporation of the City of Glenelg is, as mentioned by him, interested in this subject, particularly in relation to trial sand replenishment for the beach north of the Broadway. I understand that the council wishes to see beach levels increased in that area as a trial, and has requested that the Coast Protection Board vary the contract to move 20 000 cubic metres of sand from South to North Glenelg so that 10 000 cubic metres is placed on the beach north of Broadway. This would leave, so I am informed, a shortfall of some 10 000 cubic metres of North Glenelg, where beach levels are extremely low as a result of the recent storms we have had along the South Australian coastline.

I am also advised that the situation could endanger the protective works behind the area in question and that it is vitally important that we do something to alleviate that problem. To compensate for this shortfall and to comply with council's request, which, as has been pointed out, is necessary prior to the Christmas holidays, it will be necessary to vary two existing contracts and one proposed contract. The variations will be aimed at moving sand over a shorter distance. The main variation will be to move an additional 35 000 cubic metres of sand from South Glenelg, instead of from West Beach, to be used at Brighton. This contract would be run after the Christmas holidays. I have been advised by the Coast Protection Board that this is possible due to the large amount of sand that has accumulated at South Glenelg during the recent fair weather. So I can inform the member for Hanson—

An honourable member: The member for Morphett.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: —the member for Morphett, the member for Hanson and the member for Glenelg, that they are all going to be looked after—

Mr Peterson: What about Semaphore?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: —and Semaphore. I am very conscious that sand replenishment is a very sensitive subject, and we are anxious that the matter should be cleared up as quickly as possible. I hope that the information I have made available to the member for Morphett will indicate that we are prepared to look at that situation on a trial basis.

SWIMMING CLASSES

Mr SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say whether a proposed reduction in personnel in the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department is likely to affect swimming and water safety lessons for children in South Australia? I am advised by the Education Department Swimming Instructors Association of South Australia that its members are concerned about a proposed reduction or transfer of personnel within the Physical Education Branch. They believe that the personnel are important to the school swimming programmes in respect of organisation, administration and advice affecting those programmes. The instructors have expressed concern that swimming and water safety lessons will be seriously affected by any reduction in staff of the Physical Education Branch.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are a number of different means of educating children in water safety. During the last financial year a rumour circulated which bears close parallel to this one—that, in fact, the whole of the summer school programme would be disbanded.

Mr Slater: Is this a rumour or is it true?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No; last year there was a strong rumour that the summer school swimming programme would be disbanded, and I can assure the honourable member that that programme is being maintained, both within school lessons and within holiday periods, at a high level. In fact, I do not believe that there will be any reduction during the coming holiday period. However, in view of the honourable member's specific question and his fears that there may be some curtailment, I will make sure that he gets a positive answer soon.

SMALL LOTTERY LICENCE

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport involves a question of civil liberties and political rights. Why did the Minister discriminate against a political organisation called the Campaign to Decriminalise the Cultivation and Possession of Indian Hemp for Personal Use by refusing to issue a lottery licence to that organisation? It is reported to me that that organisation, which I understand is an incorporated body, applied for a small lotteries licence pursuant to the normal regulations. I am also advised that apparently the organisation

has complied with all the normal requirements for the issuing of a lottery licence. However, after the organisation wrote specifically to the Minister in a letter dated 3 October signed by a Mr Mark Eckermann, who describes himself as candidate for the Legislative Council endorsed by the Campaign to Decriminalise the Cultivation and Possession of Indian Hemp for Personal Use, the Minister wrote back to Mr Eckermann as follows:

I refer to your letter dated 3 October . . . together with your application for a licence to promote a lottery for the Campaign to Decriminalise the Cultivation and Possession of Indian Hemp for Personal Use. I have given serious consideration to your application and, in terms of the regulations made under the Lottery and Gaming Act . . . I am not prepared to approve of the granting of a licence to you for this purpose.

My question is not intended in any way to indicate my support or otherwise for the cause that is proposed to be supported in this matter, and I want to make that clear to the House, but whatever the cause I would support the right of others in the community to have the same political rights as members of the Australian Labor Party, members of the Liberal Party of Australia and, for that matter, members of the National Country Party, because to my knowledge—

Mr Slater: Or even the Australian Democrats.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —or even the Australian Democrats. To my knowledge, each and every one of those political Parties has been granted the right to hold a small lottery licence, either as the Party itself or through sub-branches thereof, and it seems to me that this is an example of a breach—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth is now tending to debate the issue instead of offering an explanation for the question that he has asked.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I think I have made the point fairly clearly in any event. I simply ask the Minister to explain why a licence was rejected in this instance.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not intend to go into all the details that I have at my disposal on this matter. I do not think any purpose would be served other than to say that I was not prepared to grant a lottery licence to that organisation, because I was not convinced that the proceeds would not be used for a purpose which in this State at the moment is illegal.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr LEWIS: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of the public announcement made this morning attributed to Colonel Harries of South Australia, who is national spokesman for the R.S.P.C.A., stating the opposition of that organisation to live sheep exports from this country? Has the Minister ever heard any public statement from Colonel Harries deploring the way uncontrolled dingo and dog packs attack and savage livestock and/or people or the way in which feral and/or domestic cats tear Australian native birds or Australian native animals apart limb from limb without compassionate regard for the feelings of their victims? A headline in today's *News* states that a baby girl has been savaged by a dog pack. I wonder whether the Minister considers the irresponsible attitudes of the owners of such pets as being in any way worthy of the comment of Colonel Harries in connection with the question I have asked.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I would prefer to leave the subject raised by the member for Mallee about domestic pets divorced from the principal subject matter of Colonel Harries' press release. I have obtained a copy of that press release, because it deals with a delicate and important subject involving the rural sector. To ensure that we were not going to react merely to a report in the newspaper, steps were taken to obtain a copy of the actual release.

I am concerned about the step taken by Colonel Harries' organisation in announcing its opposition to the live sheep trade. The announcement is somewhat mellowed in the body of the press release wherein he explains that in the short term his organisation is prepared to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government. However, it is quite absurd to suggest that all political Parties should change their policies and have legislation enacted to ban further livestock exports for slaughter from this country. I am amazed to think that the representative of that reputable Australian organisation should make such a specific statement.

It is true that over the years this live sheep trade has been cultivated by the Australian rural sector and in particular by the South Australian rural sector. Having enjoyed co-operation from the organisation to this point, we now read in the newspaper that it intends to ask Commonwealth and State Governments to legislate against this practice in the long term. I quote from the press release, as follows:

The adoption by Australian political Parties of R.S.P.C.A. policy leading to the introduction of legislation to prevent the export of live animals for immediate slaughter, or fattening for slaughter, and for such exports to be substituted by a carcass trade.

In my view and, I am absolutely certain, in the view of the rural industry of Australia, that is an unachievable goal; it is quite unrealistic and quite absurd to pursue it. This trade that we speak about has been established in countries that, for their own given reasons, seek to have their live sheep at their disposal to slaughter within their ritual requirements when it is convenient to them and, indeed, as customers of those sheep, we are not in a position in Australia to dictate either what they shall buy or how they shall treat it on receipt.

Colonel Harries goes so far in his press release as to suggest or, indeed, support a move to call on the Commonwealth Government of Australia to take positive action to upgrade the slaughtering facilities in those recipient countries. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous as to suggest that the vendor country, in this instance the Australian Government, should interfere with the methods of slaughtering in those places, particularly in the Middle-East countries, and to suggest that it be an obligation on the Government to do so, in my view, demonstrates the degree to which this organisation is out of touch with reality in the rural and meat industry.

I am appreciative of the visit Mr Harries made to Kuwait during March this year on the vessel *Al Qurain*. I am appreciative also of the tremendous improvement in facilities and requirements on the live sheep vessels since March of this year. Indeed, it has been continually on the upgrade. I had the privilege a couple of months ago to go aboard the *Al Shuwaikh*, vessel that was recently modified for the purposes of carrying 120 000 live sheep, and the facilities provided there for both men and livestock were a tremendous improvement on what we were seeing in our ports but a few years ago.

It is clear that both the recipient countries and the agents operating over there in the Middle-East region and the agents operating and based here in the Australian States are very conscious of the need to continue their standard of carriage improvement, and to engage on board the vessels and en route between Australian and the Persian Gulf those veterinarian officers and other animal health officers an adequate staff to ensure that minimum losses occur.

I believe they are collectively to be commended for the great progress they have made in that regard in step with the State and Commonwealth Governments of Australia in their joint efforts to establish a very valuable trade, one we

cannot do without, and one I would be disappointed to see eroded, let alone destroyed, as the proposal of the R.S.P.C.A., if effective, would do in this instance.

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

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 October. Page 1485.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): When the Minister introduced this Bill on, I think, 16 October, he began his explanation by indicating, through the insertion in *Hansard*, the following statement:

> In the course of discussions concerning the proposed Moomba to Stony Point liquids pipeline, it has become apparent that it would be desirable for the Cooper Basin producers to construct and operate the pipeline in an easement that would become and remain the property of the authority.

In doing some research on this particular Bill, I was struck by the extreme similarity between the wording employed in relation to the Minister's explanation and that wording used back in 1974 by the then Minister for Mines and Energy (the Hon. D. J. Hopgood), when he said that, in the course of negotiations relating to the establishment of a petro-chemical industry at Redcliff Point in this State, it became clear that a good case could be made out for increasing the scope of operations of the authority established under the principal Act, the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act.

It is very interesting to see that, although there has been a passage of seven years or more, the present Minister utilised exactly the same form of explanation in order to introduce the current amendment Bill. The Minister went on to point out that the purpose of the Bill was to provide for a situation relating to the present proposal for the construction of a liquids pipeline from the Moomba gasfield to Stony Point. Some of the points which he put forward before the House as needing amendment were as I will explain.

He pointed out that, if the pipeline were to be constructed in an easement that would remain the property of the authority, it is not normally possible for the proprietor of an easement to transfer the benefit of the easement without relinquishing his title to that easement. I have checked that particular point and also consulted with my colleague, the member for Playford, and I find, from his great knowledge of these matters, that I on behalf of the Opposition can concur with that statement by the Minister. That is the situation at the moment. It is not possible to transfer a benefit in relation to an easement without relinquishing the title, so therefore we do need to make this legislative change proposed in the Bill. The Minister went on to say:

> In view of the desirability of the authority owning the easement [I want to speak on that particular area in greater length soon] it is important that it is right to permit others to enjoy the benefits of the easement be put beyond doubt.

In a project of this nature and the magnitude of the likely benefit to South Australia as a whole, I agree with the Minister that is a desirable thing to do, and the amendment in the Bill seems to make that area clearer. I point out it is never possible, apparently, in legislation to put things absolutely beyond doubt despite our best efforts, as they seem to be so often challenged at a later date and sometimes courts have found doubts that they have aired in their findings on these matters.

The Minister went on to say that it is also important to ensure that the powers of the authority with respect to powers of compulsory acquisition are adequate for the implementation of the scheme that the authority and the Cooper Basin producers have in view. That is a point that I think is quite clear if one studies the relevant clause of the Bill and the section of the Act, section 17. Clearly, some addition would be needed and the addition before the House would appear to provide for the necessary powers of compulsory acquisition to be able to apply in relation to the present scheme.

In considering this Bill, I would think that the initial feelings of the Opposition were those of many members of the public in South Australia when the recent announcement was made concerning the selection by the producers of the contracting group that will play a major part in building the actual liquids pipeline with which this Bill is concerned.

In the *Advertiser* on 22 October (a very propitious day, which happened to be my birthday) a report by Finance Editor John Field states:

> South Australia's largest civil engineering group, MacMahon Construction Pty Ltd, will play a major role in building the Cooper Basin liquids pipeline. The $130 000 000 pipeline will bring Cooper Basin liquids to Stony Point, near Whyalla.

Mr Field went on:

> Construction of the 650 kilometre pipeline from Moomba will involve more than 400 workers, and most of these will be South Australians now that MacMahon is involved. Details of the contract, worth about $40 000 000, were announced yesterday by the Chairman of Santos Ltd, Mr A. Carmichael.

He said that to 120 people at a lunch organised by the South Australian division of the Building Science Forum of Australia. The report continues:

> Sydney-based Saipem Australia Pty Ltd has actually won the liquids pipeline contract but MacMahon will be the major subcontractor.

This fairly realistic remark from Mr Carmichael followed:

> I should think Saipem and MacMahon are celebrating about now.

I guess they would have had reason to be pleased that they had obtained a contract of such magnitude. Our feelings as South Australians regarding MacMahon's involvement, and bearing in mind that much of the work of employment, at least in the construction of the pipeline, was to occur in South Australia would have to be coloured, or at least tempered, by a very recent press announcement that there had been something more than the normal calling of tenders and letting of contracts regarding that project. In today's *Financial Review* a report written by Tony Grant-Taylor, headed 'Uproar over Cooper Basin pipeline contract', states:

> A Queensland-based pipeline construction company, Red Ru Pipeline, has telexed the Cooper Basin liquids scheme partners, the Prime Minister and the Premier of South Australia alleging it has missed out on the contract to lay the Cooper liquids pipeline, despite being the lowest tenderer and, it claims, initially the first choice of the partners involved.

I do not believe that anyone on the Opposition side was privy to any of the negotiations involved in the letting and acceptance of tenders, and so on, so probably we are not in a position to comment in any detail on that part of the report by Tony Grant-Taylor. The report further states:

> In a postscript to the telex, Mr Nicholas, [Red Ru's Managing Director] said that on 21 October, a letter of intent on the contract went to the big Italian Government-controlled pipeline constructors, Saipem.

That point, I think, will temper the pleasure of many South Australians in the earlier announcement concerning the involvement of the MacMahon organisation and local labour. However, the Italian Government-controlled pipeline contractor, Saipem, may be in a position to respond that the acceptance of its tender might have been based on factors, other than the lowest price put forward, that might

have had some validity. I believe that members might at least consider such a viewpoint because, in the original natural gas pipeline commenced in the 1960s, that firm was the contractor involved. The *Advertiser* report to which I referred earlier and which was dated 22 October, that propitious day, states:

> Building pipelines in South Australia is not new to Saipem, as the company was responsible for construction of the natural gas pipeline from Moomba to Adelaide.

On that basis, because of the previous experience of that firm in the construction of a pipeline for the conveyance of gas over long distances, it seems that the expertise and constructional ability gained in carrying out that earlier contract could be put to good use in the construction of the present pipeline for the passage of liquids from Moomba to Adelaide. The report further stated that the Sydney-based group completed that pipeline in record time and achieved a world record in 1969 by completing eight kilometres in a day, so there would be some support for the position that Santos may have had factors in mind other than just the lowest tender price in making its choice of a firm to carry out the construction of the liquids pipeline.

Before turning to some of the detail in the Bill, I want to point out briefly that, only fairly recently, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Government have perceived their major error in trying to get on the band waggon of greater and quicker mineral development in South Australia as the salvation of this State in terms of royalties to be expected and the employment to be created. The correction of their wrong attitude has occurred only recently.

I commend the Government on having rethought its previously incorrect attitude, and on its recognition of the vital importance to South Australia of the Cooper Basin in relation to this liquids scheme to produce gas for use by South Australian industry and by domestic consumers. I commend it on its belated perspicacity in realising that it was completely on the wrong track in citing mystical and far-distant possible returns to the State as a course of action for the Government.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Before the mirth of the Minister of Mines and Energy becomes uncontrollable, let me refer him to the 1979 mines and energy platform of the present Government. In a summary of Liberal policies at the time of the 1979 State election, under the heading of 'Mines and energy', the platform stated that a Liberal Government would, first, encourage the development of Roxby Downs and, secondly, promote the establishment of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. Those were the first two points in the platform, but the third, fourth and fifth points made no mention of the Cooper Basin liquids scheme or of any other development, gas or liquid, in relation to the future of this State.

If the Minister suggests that the Labor Party was at fault prior to the last election, I refer him to our policy which was announced at that time by the then Minister, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, to the effect that a State Labor Government will 'actively encourage the institution of a liquids scheme, the provision of a pipeline and refinement facilities'. This refers to the gas and liquids field in the Moomba area. One can contrast that policy with that of the present Minister and the Government, whose policy makes no mention whatever of the liquids scheme and pipeline, etc., under the heading 'Mines and Energy'.

I refer now to the policy that a present South Australian Labor Government might well have followed in respect of the construction of this pipeline.

On 28 February 1967 the Hon. Frank Walsh, who was then the Premier and Treasurer, introduced a Bill to set up the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority, as it was then called, which with the passing of time has come to be known as the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. The Hon. Frank Walsh said:

> It is with much satisfaction that I now present for consideration a Bill to authorise the setting up of a Natural Gas Pipeline Authority, whose function will be to construct and operate the first major natural gas pipeline in Australia.

As we know, that construction came to pass under the auspices of a State Labor Government, and that pipeline has been a success and one of the major factors in ensuring that South Australia did not fall behind other States in relation to a reasonable, low cost supply of fuel, both for industry and for the generation of power and use by domestic consumers at prices that could be afforded.

The question of finance at that time was extremely important, as funds were every bit as difficult to find as they are today. Probably if one were to calculate the inflation rate involved, one would find that the cost of the pipeline proposed in 1967 would be similar to that involved in the construction of the present pipeline, namely, $130 000 000. The then Premier said in February 1967:

> The original submission was that the Commonwealth should lend directly to the State the necessary initial capital funds estimated at between $35 000 000 and $40 000 00 upon the normal terms for Government loans, leaving it entirely to the Commonwealth's decision as to the source from which it should secure the funds.

Premier Walsh added that this seemed the simplest and most economical procedure and had certain precedents in relation to loans made to other States. He went on to point out that certain similar arrangements had been concluded or were being considered with other States. Further on in his introduction he said:

> In the course of examination of alternatives we [the State of South Australia] gave close attention to the practicability of the pipeline authority's securing Loan funds as a semi-governmental borrower. We met with the greatest co-operation and even enthusiasm from the directorates and managements of the major financial institutions operating in this State. As a result, the Government was advised that there seemed to be good prospects that the pipeline authority could raise from such sources about $20 000 000 over a period of four or five years but concentrated substantially in the vital two financial years 1967-68 and 1968-69. As a consequence of that advice the Commonwealth agreed to support an application to the Australian Loan Council for a borrowing authority over the period ending 30 June 1972 of $20 000 000 for that purpose.

The other $15 000 000 was provided to South Australia on Commonwealth Government Loan terms as a direct loan from the Commonwealth. Premier Walsh continued:

> . . . the Commonwealth has indicated its willingness to advance to the State the balance of $15 000 000 as required in the form of bridging finance. That is to say, the Commonwealth will act as if it were an institutional lender and lend to the State on the appropriate semi-governmental terms and interest rates until the State is in a position to refinance the Commonwealth loan from borrowings from normal sources.

Why has the Government decided that the construction of the pipeline will be a function outside the original charter of PASA (Pipelines Authority of South Australia), and a responsibility and function of the consortium, including Santos? It would seem to me that, if ever a scheme existed for which the obtaining of finance might well be argued to be a reasonable projection, it is the Moomba liquids pipeline scheme. On the present oil scene, including l.p.g., there is a proposal to construct a pipeline through which liquids will be fractionated and divided into the required forms of hydrocarbon liquids for sale, with gas also being obtained in the form of l.p.g., and contracts can be obtained quite readily for the sale of the product at the end of any delivery pipeline.

In fact, with the assistance of the Commonwealth, I believe, a contract has already been signed for a five-year delivery of l.p.g. to the Japanese firm of Idemitsu, demonstrating the very point that I am putting forward, namely,

that, in order to obtain large sums of finance for major projects, delivery of a commodity and contracts for the purchase of that property are readily available or already concluded, and the people from large financial institutions are ready to make available sums of money to permit those contracts to be met and for payments to be received.

I believe that that is not an argument that could be put forward by the Government for having in effect pared down the original responsibilities and functions of PASA, as it became known in 1974, to an extent which is deleterious to the welfare of the people of South Australia on whose behalf the original legislation was introduced in 1967 with the support of both sides of the House, and with support over the years from the Pipelines Authority of South Australia as it has evolved to its present state. The purpose of this amending Bill is to vary what originally were the requirements of the legislation in South Australia with respect to the construction of pipelines of this nature, their operation, and so on. Both this House and the people of South Australia are entitled to an explanation of why—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You'll get it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I welcome that interjection, but I trust that the Minister will not attempt to use an argument that finance may have been difficult to obtain. The Minister might argue that to obtain approval for semi-governmental borrowing, in relation to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, might have been difficult in relation to South Australia's other requirements involving construction of the Northern Power Station and possibly other projects which may be coming on stream in South Australia in the next two or three years. If the Minister puts that assertion forward, I would doubt such an assertion. One of the things I constantly observed with the large financial entrepreneurs and institutions with which I came into contact over the years that I was fortunate enough to be a Minister was that they are business people first, last and always, and that, when presented with a worthwhile businesslike proposition wherein they can see a return for the money that they may be called upon to advance, which is virtually guaranteed by the nature of the product concerned and the provision and conclusion of contracts involving that product, it is not difficult to obtain the funds. If Santos could obtain those funds, surely the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, with its governmental backing, could also obtain those funds. It would seem to me that there was an additional increment due to the people of South Australia, that is, the charge for the carriage of the liquids concerned, as well as the royalties to be obtained from the sale of those liquids at the end of the pipeline.

My reasoning may be subject to argument, and I look forward to the Minister putting forward any argument that he can in relation to that proposition. However, I still believe that this project could have been handled by the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. I do not understand, with a matter so vital to the welfare of South Australia as this is, why the Minister has approved the alternative which now applies. It may be that blind adherence to the private sector philosophy that is constantly put forward by the Minister and his Government is the reason why this has occurred.

I do not saddle the Minister with that view always because, particularly in relation to the South Australian Gas Company and certain undesirable share transactions that were occurring or likely to occur, the Minister had the guts to act and to go against that hidebound ideology behind which at most times this Government shelters, and to take sensible steps based on the interests and welfare of South Australia, and not on political diatribe. At the time the Minister took that step, I was one who applauded his sensibilities. In this case he, together with the Government, has chosen otherwise.

Clause 2 amends section 10 of the principal Act. There appears to be a small contretemps existing in relation to the amendment the Minister is asking us to approve. The Bill seeks to strike out from paragraph *(a)* of subsection (1) the passage 'or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed', and substitute another passage. Presently, section 10 of the principal Act provides that the authority may construct, reconstruct or install or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed pipelines for conveying petroleum or any derivative thereof within this State and petroleum storage facilities connected therewith. The words that the Minister is asking us to take out are 'or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed'. He asks us to agree to insert the words 'cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed or facilitate the construction'. If we do that the passage now reads, '. . . the authority may construct, reconstruct or install cause to be constructed'. This is a small point, but one needs to read these amendments. As the Minister said he wanted to place certain things beyond doubt in this amending Bill, I suggest to him that it might be better to re-word the amendment so as not to take out the word 'or'. From the hurried way in which the Minister left his seat and sought advice, I suggest that he never read the amendment or related it to the parent Act. It is advisable to check these matters. I speak from experience; I was occasionally called upon to administer matters in the House and, if one does not do this, larger and more important mistakes can be made than the very minor one I have drawn to the Minister's attention.

The remaining amendments we are asked to consider seem to be sensible. The Bill seeks to add to section 17 of the principal Act, that section providing 'power to resume land under Crown or pastoral lease and of bodies corporate to grant authority easements, etc., for pipelines'. The amendment that we are asked to agree to makes certain provisions relating to property, and they are those additional requirements of which the Minister has spoken in relation to easements to authorise the use of an easement under new subsection (3). For example, as is proposed, it is necessary in the amending Bill we have before us that the words, 'Then the person to whom the authorisation is given has without derogation from the rights of the authorities, such of the rights of the proprietor of the easement as are set forth in the authorisation.' That is the point that the Minister put forward initially in his second reading explanation. I believe that the amendment we are considering in that particular part of the amending Bill will provide, in the way that the Minister has outlined in the second reading explanation, the need to empower the authority to grant licences over its property and to authorise the use by some other person of easements that exist in favour of the authority.

I have pointed out that the question of who ought to be the constructing authority in respect of a pipeline, the length, and a project of the magnitude that is connected with the amending Bill that we have before the House would most properly and quite rightly, under the auspices of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, have been placed with that authority, and that finance for the construction of that pipeline could well have been handled by the authority. It would seem that the finance could have been organised in a number of ways, one or two of which I have suggested only briefly in my remarks. It would not have been of harm to the State's progress in other areas in relation to the projects it may have in the offing or under way.

I can only suggest to the Minister that he ought to give very grave consideration to these matters when steps are

taken by the present Government to downgrade the original concept in respect of legislation which has been put before this Parliament on an earlier occasion, which is of a very substantial nature in respect of the interest of South Australians, and which has stood the test of time since 1967 in relation to the construction of a project, for example, and the operation and maintenance of a natural gas pipeline successfully, and with very little complaint and very little need for alteration in that legislation over that long period of years.

For the Minister to have taken the step that he has, in effect, allowing the consortium to take on and to keep within their confines, albeit on a Government easement, as is now proposed, the construction of such a pipeline is a very serious step, and I trust that when he is considering it in the limited time this Government has left to it before the next election, when it will vacate the scene, the Minister will not be so hasty in winding down legislation which has stood the test of time and which has not been argued to be all those things that are anathema to the Minister and his Government.

No-one has run around screaming that it is a socialist plot, or that it is not right and correct for the people of this State, through the authority, to have a direct interest and an involvement in the operation of a transport medium in respect of a commodity such as gas, which is so vital to the State's day-to-day living. Trite though those words may appear to be on reading, I stand by them. It is not one of those areas where it is argued that the previous Government, or even the Government going back as far as Frank Walsh's time, had ventured into an area where it should not have gone. It was seen by the people of the State, by the Opposition, and succeeding Oppositions that this authority was well conceived, had been brought into being by sensible legislation, tailored as necessary along the way, and was functioning for the betterment and benefit of South Australia as a whole.

Why has the Minister found it necessary, in effect, to downgrade it from its previous standing? I trust the Minister can give some suitable answers to the query that I have raised. I doubt it, but I indicate at this stage that the Opposition will be supporting the amendments contained in the Bill, for the reasons the Minister has put forward. If he is intent and hell-bent on the course of action that is really contained within the whole proposal, obviously there is a need for some amendment to the parent Act, and this form of amendment would appear to provide for what the Government of the time intends.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My motivation in entering this debate is twofold. First, I want to make clear that it is my belief that environmentalists should not be opposed to all forms of development. Secondly, I want to make one or two comments about the environmental aspects of this project.

As my colleague who has just spoken has indicated, as Minister of Development and Mines some years ago I did introduce legislation very similar to this. One does not change one's convictions simply because of a change of portfolio or shadow portfolio.

Indeed, the point is that certain forms of development can be environmentally benign. In relation specifically to this project, the hydrocarbons propane and butane are clean combustion gases. They produce carbon dioxide, but, unless we are going to do away with all forms of combustion as sources of heat energy, we are going to have to put up with the production of carbon dioxide. However, they are clean combustion gases. Therefore, the net result of a project such as this is to produce products that will be benign in their environmental effects, which is true of a great deal of development that takes place.

Having said that, however, one cannot then go on to argue that, therefore, that particular development, because its outcome is environmentally benign, should be uncontrolled and that there should not be considerable environmental constraints on various aspects of the project. The proponents of the project have well understood this, as no doubt the Government has, because two environmental impact studies have been released in relation to the project.

The first was released some time ago. It was the Bechtel-Kinhill joint venture on the route of the pipeline from the Cooper Basin to Stony Point. I want to turn to that matter shortly. The second, released some time after that, with a follow-up in the past few days, is the environmental impact study on the site itself. I want to say one or two things very briefly about the environmental impact study so far as the site is concerned before I turn to the main point of my remarks, which is in relation to the route of the pipe.

First, I think that latter study is extremely well done. There are very few questions about environmental aspects of the site which are left unanswered by the particular study. There is a degree of controversy about the siting; one need only turn to a press report in the *Advertiser* on 20 August to read that the Whyalla City Council had approved the Santos proposal to establish a fractionation plant at Stony Point under the $750 000 000 Cooper Basin liquids scheme. The report went on to say that after a lengthy discussion the council voted four to three to support the development.

I do not quarrel with the decision taken by the council, but I find it rather surprising that a project that certainly will bring some modest increase of employment to that area should have scraped through by a narrow majority of one vote in the council. That does indicate a degree of concern that we cannot simply dismiss out of hand.

One of the things that has been said in relation to this matter is that the specific siting of the proposal at Stony Point, or at Weroona Bay, to be a little more specific, takes from the people of Whyalla practically the only decent beach in the region. Having been a citizen of Whyalla for 12 months in 1963, I have some degree of sympathy for the people in that respect. The beaches in that part of the gulf are pretty awful, particularly for someone who has been spoiled by the beaches at Semaphore, Glenelg, Brighton and Port Noarlunga. There is not too much to choose from if one wants a swim of the type one can get along the Adelaide beaches. I would hope that the company would do what it possibly could to preserve the coastline to the best extent possible so that beach facilities will be available.

There have even been those who have suggested that there is some deep dark plot in calling the site Stony Point rather than Weroona Bay. It was suggested that, if it was called Stony Point, people would think that it must be a worthless area and that Weroona Bay conjures up a rather better image. In fact, I think that the naming arose in a very innocent way. On the ordinance survey map of that part of the coast, there is no mention of Weroona Bay. The area that stands out is Stony Point, and to the immediate east of that small headland there is obviously a bay that has a good deal of sand exposed at low tide, but the bay is not identified on the map and Stony Point is identified. I would suggest that the naming of the site is as innocent as that.

There have been those who have put in specific pleas for the preservation of shacks in the Weroona Bay area. Again, I would hope that the company would do all it possibly can to preserve as many of the shack sites as possible. On the other hand, I also agree with the company's contention that to go to Black Point, closer to Whyalla, which is the alternative proposal that some people have put up, would involve much greater cost, because the loading facility

would have to go a much greater distance before it got into deep water.

I do not want to spend much time on the environmental aspects of the site itself but I would conclude on one particular point. There is one danger signal which I would give to this Government. In the second document released on the site itself, which is in effect the comments on the feedback to the draft environmental impact study, reference is made to statements by Professor Radok and others, including, I guess, the member for Mitcham, who took up Professor Radok's case in this House some time ago. Reference is also made to these observations, which suggest that any oil spill could have devastating effects on the upper gulf because of the proximity of Weroona Bay to Point Lowly, which in effect marks the entrance to the upper gulf.

The people doing the e.i.s. tried to take on board these objections and to quantify the probabilities of an oil spill getting into the upper gulf. They suggest (and they say this would be a maximum figure) that there is a probability of one in four of an oil spill involving some contamination of the upper gulf. They suggest that for the most part the currents would take the oil into False Bay but there would be a probability of one in four, and this alarms me a little. It suggests that there will have to be some pretty good housekeeping in relation to the use of the facility.

I have obtained a copy of the trajectory study which has been done and which leads to that conclusion but I have not as yet had a chance to read it in depth. In any event, if the mathematical analysis is fairly sophisticated, although I guess I have done more maths than have most people in this Chamber, nonetheless I would have to take advice on the way the argument runs.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You did Maths 3?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, I did not. If the Minister has done Maths 3, he has done certainly more than I have. I would still suggest few people in this House have done Maths 1. The conclusion is there. If in fact on proper analysis it can be shown that the people who have done this study are wrong, what is the effect of what the real conclusion should be? Is the probability less than one in four or is it greater than one in four? If the probability is greater than one in four, if it is one in two, then I would suggest there are real question marks over the site itself.

However, I take it that this work has been done with the same care and concern as was the general draft environmental impact statement, and therefore I accept the conclusion. It means to me that it is not enough to suggest that the site should be abandoned on environmental grounds, but nevertheless it certainly suggests there has to be some tidy housekeeping done and I know the company has some ideas in relation to this matter which I hope will be accepted by the Government.

In relation to the loading facility, I direct the Minister's attention to Port Stanvac. There have been oil spills at Port Stanvac over the years, too many, and almost invariably where a spill has occurred it has been at the ship end rather than at the loading end, at the landing. In this respect, it is not possible to criticise the people who run the refinery. Almost invariably, it happens at the ship. If the Minister shares my concern and agrees that some tidy housekeeping will have to take place, then I suggest that he has to look closely at the ship end of the process.

In relation to the route of the pipeline itself, as I said earlier, Bechtel-Kinhill brought out a draft environmental impact study on the route of the pipeline from the gasfields to Stony Point and their preferred route follows the dry gas pipeline down the eastern side of the Flinders Range. It then crosses the Flinders on a route which roughly follows from Martins Well through to Neuroodla on the old railway line and then roughly follows from there southwards to Stony Point.

I and others criticised this recommendation. In a statement that was fairly widely reported quite some time ago I suggested that, in fact, not only could the engineering hazards but also the environmental hazards of having to go through a mountain range be avoided by a route which followed the gas pipeline down to the, I think, compressor station 2 and then skirted the northern and western sides of the Flinders Range, picked up the recommended route at Neuroodla, and proceeded southwards.

I raised this matter in the House on a number of occasions; I did not get much of a response from the Minister of Environment and Planning. All he was prepared to suggest was that I put in an official submission to those who were evaluating all of the feedback from the e.i.s. I suggested to the Minister that there and then he could take my speech away as my official submission. From that time on there has not been any indication from the Government that the draft e.i.s. has been approved.

Therefore, I was very surprised to read in the *Financial Review* some time ago that tenders were to be let and even more surprised to read the statement from which my colleague has just quoted several days ago that, in fact, the contract had been let. I therefore endeavoured to make contact with certain people in the industry and it all seemed to be a bit of a mystery to them; I do not think anyone was trying to withhold information from me, but the best they could tell me was that they understood the matter was to go to Cabinet Monday of this week for approval.

How is it possible to let a tender for a project for a pipeline along a route which has not yet been approved by the Government, or indeed, had the real approval taken place and, if so, why had not there been public notice that the Bechtel-Kinhill recommendation had been approved? I hope the Minister answers that. Was the whole matter of the request for public feedback from the draft e.i.s. a complete sham, a front to hide the fact that the decision had already been taken? I take this very seriously indeed.

I do not oppose the project: I believe it is a good project. I do not oppose the siting at Stony Point but I think there are some problems to be overcome. There are equally serious problems in lots of other areas where it might have been sited. Nor perhaps should I oppose the route of the pipeline. It may be the Government, the company, the authority, and all of the people involved have some facts and figures up their sleeves which will convince me that indeed I was wrong in calling for a route which by-passes the Flinders. I have not been taken into the Government's confidence, the general public has not been taken into the Government's confidence, and yet we have a contract let.

How is it possible to cost a project if one does not know what the route of the pipe is? I now suspect that those in the know have known the route of the project and it was on the basis of a decision that had been made at the very time when this Government was asking for public feedback on the draft e.i.s. It was on that basis that it was possible to call for tenders, to put in tenders, and to let a contract.

Had I been able to get the call this afternoon in Question Time, I would have asked the Minister of Environment and Planning this question, and that may have cleared the matter up on the spot. You well recall, Sir, that I did get the call with one minute to go, and it was obvious it was not possible to ask that sort of question and to get any sort of answer back from the Minister in the time available. I therefore take this opportunity to pose the question to the Minister. I will not prolong my speech, because I am anxious to hear his answer.

Is it only as of yesterday that the final decision was taken for the route of the pipeline and, if so, how was it possible

to call for tenders and for people to put in tenders for a project, the configurations of which had not at that stage been decided, or alternatively, was the real decision taken some time ago? Will the Minister agree that all this business about getting feedback from the Bechtel-Kinhill draft e.i.s. has just been a sham?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I suppose one could say we have had an interesting contribution from the members opposite, although not a particularly enlightened one, as I will point out as I go through the remarks that they made in contributing to this debate. The plain fact is the Opposition is supporting the Bill: it has made that quite clear. Regarding the rest of what has been said, particularly, I may say without seeking to hurt anyone's feelings, particularly by the lead speaker, it is not very hard to despatch the points made by the member for Mitchell when he was padding out his remarks—

The Hon. G. R. Payne: If I did not make any, you wouldn't have to despatch them.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They will not be hard to despatch. For some minutes the member wandered around the question of who got the contract to lay the pipeline, and had two bob each way. He applauds the fact that McMahon, a South Australian firm, is to do a great deal of the work, and I point out to the House and the member that the Government sought from the operating companies an assurance that a maximum amount of South Australian content would be involved and employment would be generated as a result of this activity. That was agreed by the operating companies and it could be—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is that in writing?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: An indenture will be presented in due course and all will be revealed to the member. If the member had read the whole of Mr Carmichael's speech to the luncheon last week, he would have found some other matters referred to in that speech that would have been reassuring for the honourable member. Mr Carmichael said he was impressed with the Government's negotiating team and that they were fair but we were driving a hard bargain in the interests of the State. He was quite impressed with the way the team were operating. The member would have read that and, also, I think Mr Carmichael made reference in that speech to the fact that there would be considerable employment in South Australia, particularly as a result of this activity.

I have not read today's *Financial Review*. Obviously, the company concerned has been on to the *Financial Review* reporter and has given its side of the story. I do not believe it is the function of the Government to dictate to the company which tender it should accept when we are not privy to the details of the document or of the contract. It would be quite improper for the Government to seek to do so. The member was having two bob each way. I do not know whom he thinks he would please by raising that matter. I do not know the details of what was being raised by Red Ru, but I am aware of the fact that telexes have come to the Premier. I was not aware they had gone to the Prime Minister. I have seen the telexes to the Government and I am in no position to pass judgment as to the benefits that would have accrued from acceptance of that particular tender.

The honourable member acknowledges that the fact that it may be the cheapest does not mean necessarily that it is the most satisfactory. I am in no position to comment, nor should I buy into that argument. I was surprised that the honourable member canvassed the matter. The Government's request to seek to maximise the amount of activity generated in South Australia as a result of the project has been acceded to. The member for Mitchell went on to read to me, as Minister, and the Government a lecture about this sudden opening of our eyes to the benefits of this scheme. Let me put the facts before the House. When this Government came to office there was no scheme. To suggest that the Government has just become aware of the potential of the Cooper Basin liquids scheme is patent nonsense.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It wasn't in the platform.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Soon after our election, which from memory was in September 1979, I was prompted by the Opposition to make a policy speech to the House in relation to energy development, and I acceded to that request.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That was after—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In October 1979, I made what I thought was a major speech, but obviously it did not have much impact on the honourable member opposite. It was a speech of some magnitude in which I outlined the Government's approach to energy and referred specifically to its desire to see that a liquids scheme was implemented as soon as possible. From some of the remarks we have heard subsequently from the member for Baudin—and I will deal with this in a moment—if honourable members opposite had been in Government this scheme would have been delayed, and there would have been no hope of having it up and running in 1983.

There was no liquids scheme when we came to Government, and now there is one. Together with the producers and Pipelines Authority of South Australia, we are prosecuting the early implementation of that scheme. To suggest that the Government has realised this only in recent months is absurd, to put it mildly. I refer the honourable member to the speech I made in October 1979, if his memory needs any further refreshing. He talked about the sudden awakening of the Government to the existence of the gas supply; he said that the Labor Government had built a gas pipeline but that this Government had woken up only in recent times. I think he used a colourful turn of phrase when he referred to our belated perspicacity.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I listened carefully to what the honourable member said; he referred to our belated perspicacity. From the first day of this Government, we have realised—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: —how incredibly short-sighted was the former Administration, not in building a pipeline, but in seeing that the gas through the pipeline was ensured to South Australia only until 1987. Here we have the honourable member telling us what wonderful planners they were. They got the Pipelines Authority of South Australia to raise the funds and build the pipeline. They were looking for a supply of cheap fuel for South Australia, but unfortunately they dedicated most of it to Sydney into the next century.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Here we go again. Steele Hall tried to take credit—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: And he was very sharply rebuffed by the then Premier Dunstan, who took all the credit. I have looked at the minutes of those meetings. If the honourable member leads with his chin, he must expect to have it knocked. If he continues to lead with his chin, as he has today, he must take what comes. The previous Government built the pipeline, but ensured gas supplies only until 1987. A bigger pipeline was built to Sydney, and gas supplies were contracted for Sydney to flow well into the next century.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Without that contract there would be no Cooper Basin now, and you know it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He doesn't want to talk about it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will talk about it if I am allowed to do so.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The former Government wrote contracts for supplies to Sydney, but the terms of the contracts were quite irresponsible. I have been told by people who were involved in the contracts, including one of the producer groups, that they pleaded with the Government that the State's interests were not being protected, and I have seen minutes on that.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Unnamed, as usual.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Bob Blair, of Delhi, is quite happy to be named. I suppose that because a prisoner was named last week there will be something wrong with my saying that. I will name him, because I have discussed the matter with him two or three times. If members opposite want to check with him, I suppose they can get him in Dallas.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He pleaded with the Government not to do it?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He suggested that the interests of the State were not being protected. I have discussed the matter with him, and there are others.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There will be an opportunity for questions and answers in Committee. The Minister is concluding the debate, and I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There were others, but it would be quite invidious and quite wrong for me to name public servants in this context. There was clear advice to the Government that the interests of the State in the long term were not being protected.

The question of finance was a major matter in the speech of the member for Mitchell. Again, I can only state the facts: Loan Council borrowings were not forthcoming for this project. I make no apology for suggesting that, in the first instance, the Government intended that the Pipelines Authority would construct and finance this pipeline. I make no bones about that. The present situation with Loan funds is quite different from the situation that existed when the gas pipeline was built. I was with the Premier when we went to the Loan Council meeting, and I thought we made it clear, on our return to South Australia, that extreme constraints were being placed on us by the Federal Government in respect of all Loan borrowings and certainly special borrowings for resources projects and the like.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did you try for the special category?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We tried for Loan funds in all categories.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In the special category?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, we did. The screws were right on. There was a—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is Federal Government policy, but I temper that with the comment that the national economy was in need of considerable restraint when the Federal Liberal Government was elected. However, Loan Council borrowing was refused. We were told quite bluntly, not necessarily at the Loan Council meeting, but in our talks with the Federal Government at various times, that the companies concerned in resource projects must be expected to raise the funds. That is part of the Federal Government's perception of the need for constraint in the governmental borrowing sector.

The funds were not forthcoming, and so the Government had no option but to look at alternatives. The alternative suggested to us by our Federal colleagues was that the company should finance the bulk of the infra-structure for all such projects. We were in no position to finance it out of our normal Loan borrowings, because they did not increase in any terms, and certainly not in real terms. They were held, in real money terms, at last year's level, which meant a cut of about 14 per cent. The borrowing was not there.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is sad that the economy of this country was in such a howling mess as a result of three years of Whitlam—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Here we go.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member says 'Here we go', but that is the fact of life. We have had 10 years of Labor Government in this State, and we are just starting to climb out of the trough. The borrowing authority was not there; it was not forthcoming and would not have been forthcoming. I doubt whether the Pipelines Authority could have raised the finance had it been given the authority; we had the same problem. The honourable member mentioned the Northern Power Station. As a result of fairly dramatic increases in the cost of that station, because of work on the foundations, and so on, there was some difficulty in getting the Commonwealth to agree to an escalation of the borrowing authority for the Northern Power Station. However, we were successful in getting some more money in relation to that borrowing. The honourable member indicated that he would not be satisfied with that answer, but that is the answer: the borrowing authority was not given and would not have been given.

The Government could have contemplated some other schemes; maybe it could have gone into what is known as leverage leasing, which I understand is a scheme used particularly when there is a fairly short pay-back period. If that had been perceived as a way of getting around Loan Council, I am quite sure that in a fairly short period the Federal Government would have realised as much, and the clamps would have been on us. The companies concerned were quite happy for the Government to build the pipeline, finance being available through that path at favourable interest rates, whereas it is not available at the same interest rates elsewhere on the world market. Their repayments could well have been less than they would be if they were faced with building the pipeline themselves. However, there was no other alternative. For a short period the Government contemplated other means of financing the pipeline to beat the system, but in the end, and having to make a decision fairly quickly to expedite the scheme, the Government agreed with the producers that they should finance the pipeline.

The honourable member referred to the role of PASA in these circumstances. The Pipelines Authority is not excluded. It will have a very important role to play indeed. At the moment the authority has had technical advisers working closely with the companies in relation to acquiring the easements. The Pipelines Authority will own the track, the easements, and it will maintain the pipe and the communications network.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Will it be paid for that?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It will be paid a fee for that. The Pipelines Authority will certainly be involved, and my understanding is that the authority is reasonably happy with this arrangement, as I have heard nothing to the contrary. We then had a lesson in English from the honourable member, suggesting that the drafting did not make sense. I am assured by experts who are probably better qualified than I am in relation to drafting legislation

that what has been done is entirely sensible and strictly grammatical. With regard to the amendment that is being mooted the argument concerned the deletion of the word 'or'.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In relation to that sentence.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The amendment deletes 'or' and inserts a comma. In this instance a series of circumstances are listed, and the 'or' is merely moved towards the end of the sentence before the last alternative is listed.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I know that, but it does not really read as flowingly as I would have liked.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am assured by people who are rather well practised in these matters that that is the way to write it. One does not put the word 'or' in where it is not needed. The commas are used to separate the alternatives and the 'or' is placed at the end to link up the last of the alternatives. That is the logical and grammatical way of doing it. The honourable member would admit that it is a matter of opinion, and one could quibble about this, but I choose to have it read as it will now read, namely:

> Subject to this Act, but without limiting the generality of paragraph *(b)* of subsection (2) of section 4 of this Act, the Authority may—
>
> *(a)* construct, reconstruct or install, cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed, or facilitate the construction, reconstruction or installation of.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Read it without—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Commas are a punctuation mark that are put in a sentence to indicate a pause.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Dear oh dear!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member seeks to ignore commas, he does not understand what their purpose is. A comma is used to break up a sentence where factors may be listed.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! This consideration is more appropriate to the Committee stage of the Bill.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has raised the matter. The fact is that it is perfectly sensible and grammatical the way it is being done.

Mr Keneally: The old schoolteacher—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, the honourable member asked for it, and there are plenty of authorities to show that what he is suggesting is not sensible English construction.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I think you ought to change it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was not going to change it against the advice I had received.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell brought forward a point in the debate which has been answered by the Minister, and interjections from there on are out of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member had to pad out his speech, and he quibbled about that, but in my opinion he was wrong. The member for Baudin mentioned the environmental aspects of the matter. When this scheme was first mooted we were criticised by the Leader of the Opposition for not jumping up and down and shouting from the rooftops. From day 1, the project was heartily endorsed by the Labor Party and, I was interested to note, by the Conservation Council. An announcement was made by the companies that they intended to construct the pipeline to Stony Point, and before the ink was dry on the announcement out came the Labor Party under the leadership of Mr Bannon indicating that they were all in favour of the scheme, and so was Mr Sibley from the Conservation Council. This was after we had had all this hoo hah about Redcliff, when the Labor Party did not know where to jump, and it wanted the Government to be in trouble; it loves to stir; it likes the environmentalists belting hell out of the Government, but the Opposition really could not say much, because it was its scheme initially.

However, from day 1, without any environmental question at all being addressed, the Labor Party said that it was all for the project. It is a bit late in the day for the member for Baudin now to suggest that oil may flow into the upper reaches of the gulf. One of the reasons why the Government did not get up on the rooftops and trumpet this abroad, as we might have expected from the Labor Party, was that we were conscious of the fact that at that stage very little was known about the environmental constraints applying to the area. The Government would have been rightly criticised if it had blurted to the world, as the Leader did, that it was 100 per cent in favour of the project, because there was precious little known then about the environmental impact. I do not take too seriously the reservations that come from the member for Baudin after the event, when his Leader from day 1 got up and said that the Labor Party was in favour of the project.

Let us deal with what he had to say. First, he gave us a lecture on the benign products that flow through that pipeline. He said that he is not one to change his mind. We know that he has had to change his mind on Roxby Downs, because he made a speech supporting that at one stage: a very supportive speech. He has had to change his mind on that because the numbers were not there. He talked about the benign effects of these products. If l.p.g. spills on a road it can be a quite dangerous product. If it is not blown away, it hangs on the ground, and—

Mr Kenneally interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is all right for me to sit here and be lectured, given an English lesson and all the rest of it. However, when I rise and put the record straight it is no good. We are well aware of the environmental constraints that are required. For the honourable member to suggest that these products are benign is patently absurd.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: When did I say that?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: When the honourable member started he said 'benign products'; I wrote it down.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Come on! It is the process itself: what is in the processing.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: A couple of backbenchers were even surprised.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Even your back-benchers!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They were surprised that the honourable member was so foolish leading with his chin, as the honourable member for Mitcham led with his chin.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What is preferable; petroleum or l.p.g. from an environmental point of view?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know that butane and propane were mentioned by the honourable member. It has to be more than butane and propane; that is more than l.p.g. Butane, propane and l.p.g. can be quite dangerous unless handled and contained adequately.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Why is your Government interested in converting your fleet in part to l.p.g.?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am saying that devices can be designed for the safe handling of these products. To suggest that they are benign is absurd. Petrol is not benign. Let the honourable member light his cigarette by an open drum of petrol and he will find out how benign it is. These products are highly inflammable and must be handled with extreme care. We had to watch the gentleman who brought in his fuel from Victoria because he could

have cooked half his customers by sloshing it around in buckets, and Lord knows what. Petroleum products are not benign. We were then told that carbon dioxide is benign.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I didn't say that. I said that we had to put up with it as long as we had combustion as a source of heat. You didn't write that down, did you?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member was voting for combustion. He has had to back off.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It is going to be with us for a long time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He had to back off uranium, which is probably the cleanest burning fuel of any in a nuclear reactor.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Except that it doesn't burn.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In a sense.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It doesn't burn. If you want to be precise, be precise.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It does not burn in the sense that it uses up oxygen and forms carbon dioxide. It produces energy by degeneration of atoms.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Right!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: But, the honourable member has had to vote against that.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I have never been in favour of it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was in favour of the Roxby Downs thing in all the speeches he made.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I was not.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: For a non-gambling man the honourable member knows how to hedge his bets. That is all that I can say. If that was not a supportive speech, then I have never read one. Do not let us dwell on this for too long. The fact is that there are serious doubts now about the level of carbon dioxide that is building up on the global scene. It may well be that within 20 or 30 years people will be crying out for a fuel such as uranium to contain this build-up of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You better close down the Sedan thing, then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has had a fair go.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: A couple of points were made by the honourable member in relation to the e.i.s. The honourable member was pleased that the site study was well done, but he was surprised. Why was he surprised? I did not complete that note. I merely noted that he was surprised. He was perturbed to notice there was a one in four chance of oil flowing into the upper gulf. His Leader was quite happy, without any environmental study at all, to endorse the project, which I found hard to accept. Then there were the comments by the honourable member on feedback. It was suggested he might—

Mr Keneally: Is Roger pouring cold water on the project?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not pouring cold water on the project. I am merely pointing out some of the absurdities that honourable members opposite have been saying. The Government is concerned to see that all environmentally necessary factors and constraints are fully met.

Mr Keneally: You'll have to call another meeting, Roger. Have you had enough of those meetings up in my part of the world?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I enjoyed that meeting up in the honourable member's part of the world. He chaired the meeting very well. It was a good thing that he was in the Chair because he would not have known which side to be on at that meeting. He was in a no-win situation for the local member. Out of compassion for the local member I invited him to chair the meeting so that he would not have to—

Mr Keneally: Saved you from lynching, I did.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I had to save the honourable member from a lynching. The honourable member loves to stir, but Redcliff was initially their project, so he could not really batter it too hard. The honourable member suggested that we look closely at the ship end. I assure him that we certainly are looking closely at the ship end. I am well aware of the conditions that obtain at Port Stanvac where there is a private wharf and where the Department of Marine and Harbors has very little input to what happens there. Quite frankly, that is the problem.

The honourable member for Hartley was, I think, Minister of Marine; he was a very good Minister, too—a great loss to the Labor Party from the front bench. The honourable member thinks that I patronise him, but I do not. Now that the honourable member is not on the front bench his true worth is recognised by us all and we know what a loss he is. He would know only too well that the part played by the Department of Marine and Harbors down there is an after-the-event role. It is really not aware of what the story is until the oil is spilt, and then it is a bit late. I assure the honourable member for Baudin that the Government is certainly cognisant of the fact that we are going to have to be careful at the ship end in relation to the loading of oil and other products. We are well aware of that. I reassure the honourable member on that point.

There is then the question of the route of the pipeline. The preferred route certainly crosses the Flinders; we are aware of that. I recall the honourable member criticising the route and advocating the western route. As a result of queries raised, not only by the honourable member but also by others, particularly conservation groups, further studies of the western route, which went to the west of the Flinders Ranges, were commissioned. The Government insisted on that. Wherever the pipeline goes there will be some environmental impact. That area to the west of the Flinders Ranges is what is described as a fragile wilderness-type environment in which considerable damage could be possible.

Studies were commissioned and have been included in the revised e.i.s. of that western route. We were aware of queries that were being raised, not only by the honourable member but also by other groups for whom I suspect he was spokesman. Those revisions have gone to all the people who put in a formal submission. If the honourable member had taken the trouble of putting in a formal submission, he would have received a copy.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: When was the decision taken?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We will come to that. The question then said that the decision was taken before the event so that it was a *fait accompli* and that all this was a sham. That is in effect what the honourable member is saying. Let me point out that the tenders that have been let are conditional, and they could have been cancelled. They could be cancelled. That is a fact of life. All the ordering of pipes has been done in this climate. Until the e.i.s. and all the environmental procedures are satisfied, nothing can be absolutely firm.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is the first time that anyone has been told that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You asked me to tell you, and I am telling you.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But there has never been any statement to the press on that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that it is the first time that it has been raised, to my knowledge.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's incredible.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was raised here, and I am telling you what the score is. The fact is that they are conditional contracts and they could be cancelled.

An honourable member: So if you don't ask questions you don't get any answers.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If one asks questions, one will get answers, if the questions are sensible enough. I point out that, wherever the route, there is going to need to be a pipeline. That is sensible.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought that was perhaps what the honourable member had in mind, because whether it goes the western route or whether it goes the route that is preferred, they are going to have pipe. They are going to have to order. They are going to have to let contracts. The distances would be commensurate. The fact is that allowance could readily have been accommodated if a change of route had been forced. What is the big deal? Are we going to have a pipeline without any contracts for pipes or something?

An honourable member: I'm surprised that people would tender in that situation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They knew there was going to be a pipeline. They knew the approximate length, whatever the route. That should be finalised within a couple of weeks. The fact is that those contracts could be cancelled. They are subject to the environmental constraints being met. I repeat: what is the big deal anyway? The fact is that there is going to need to be a pipe, whether it goes through the Flinders Ranges or to the west of the Flinders Ranges. so what is wrong with ordering the pipe for a scheme you know is going to go ahead?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are a bit sensitive there.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not the slightest bit sensitive. Any change in the normal modulation of my voice is because I just cannot understand the point that we are going to have a pipeline without ordering any pipe. That has got to be crazy. If we follow that thinking, and if the Opposition were in Government, we could wave goodbye to any oil, and so on, coming on stream in 1983. If the companies were to be precluded from ordering pipe and they were not allowed to raise a finger until all the environmental studies have been completed, all I can say is that the companies concerned would not have been impressed with that administration, and there would have been no hope of meeting a schedule for oil and liquids to come on stream in 1983. I do not really see what the point of the member's question is here. It must be important to him, because he is telephoning one of his advisers on the matter or something. The fact is that you cannot have pipeline without a pipe.

An honourable member: You are a bit uneasy.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not the slightest bit. It was not a very high-class debate from the Opposition. There was a lot of padding.

An honourable member: It's got worse since you got up.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Worse from your point of view, because I have shown how hollow were the points raised. The fact is that I am pleased the Opposition is supporting the Bill, because the Government has acknowledged all along that this is a most important project for South Australia. Despite the comments by the member for Mitchell, this Government came into office when there was no liquids scheme proposed. There is now a liquid scheme, and the Government intends to see that it comes on stream as quickly as possible, and this Bill will help achieve that end. I thank the Opposition for its support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Powers and Functions of the Authority.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the Minister for his English lesson, for which I will not have to pay other than having had to suffer it. I point out that in my view the matter I raised at the time (and the Minister carefully did not mention this) was only a minor point. That was how I saw the amendment. I am perfectly willing, as I said at that time, to support the amendment in the form in which he has put forward. I still believe it to be wrong. I also agree with the Minister that that can also be a matter of opinion.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Powers of acquisition.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would just like to canvass one point the Minister made in his reply relating to the attempt he made to demolish the very good points that were put forward by my colleague, the member for Baudin, relating to the possibility of oil spills. The Minister was at some pains to avoid that actual question, and to utilise the old diversion tactic that every member of the Committee knows is used on those occasions. The point I wish to raise in relation to the new subclause is this: in view of what the Minister has said only moments ago about the danger area and the danger time being at the end, that is, at the ship end, will the Minister review the proposal for loading to take place on an interim basis before the final construction of the jetty proposed for Stony Point?

The Minister was laughing and joking before, but this is quite a serious point. He has agreed that the problem occurs at the ship end. I think it would be reasonable to extrapolate on that, that before the final construction of the terminal end of that berthing facility, it is my understanding (in fact, I have been advised by Santos) that the company wishes to conduct loading operations before the completion of that full loading facility. It may well be that this could lead to the very problems raised by my colleague, the member for Baudin, that is, spillage, and I think the Minister would be the first to agree that it would be very unfortunate if the project were marred by some unfortunate happenings at the beginning before the total completion of the project. I would just like to say that, if noted, I am happy with that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I did indicate in my reply that I was well aware of the problem, certainly conscious of it, and mentioned the problem at Port Stanvac as we perceive it. I am discussing currently with the Santos Chairman, and the Department of Marine and Harbors officers are discussing with some of the managers from Santos, the role that the Department of Marine and Harbors will play in the loading of the product at the ship end of the wharf. I give the member that assurance, or whatever it is he seeks, that I am aware of that problem. I have certainly taken it on board, and it is a matter that I have been discussing with the producers in recent days.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, lines 23 and 24 (clause 9)—Leave out 'or at some closer point of delivery determined by the Minister'.

No. 2. Page 4, lines 27 to 32 (clause 9)—Leave out subsection (11) and insert subsection as follows:

'(11) The Minister may, upon the application of a person liable to pay royalty, having regard to the effect that payment of royalty as required by this section would be likely to have on the viability or profitability of mining operations or related

processing operations carried on by that person, waive payment of royalty, or reduce the rate at which royalty is payable, on minerals recovered in the course of those operations'.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The amendments seek to give some further discretion to the Minister as to what royalties shall be paid to the State. When it left this House the Bill provided that the method of computation would have been f.o.b., in other words, the value of the mineral after upgrading as a result of further processing would be included. However, that could in some circumstances lead to such an enhanced value of a commodity that it could make the project with that level of royalty uneconomic. The Upper House has been cognisant of the fact and has sought to give more discretion to the Minister so that in circumstances where a project may be put in jeopardy as a result of that changed royalty arrangement, some discretion is given to the Minister to effect some variation.

For that reason the Government believes that is a desirable discretion, because it certainly would not be the intent of this Government to put current enterprises out of business. The amendments are acceptable to the Government.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Although I have no quarrel with the Minister in asking us to accept the amendments, I would not be as charitable to the Legislative Council as he was in relation to its having given some extra thought to the matter. The second amendment relates to a change of wording in that the Minister may be in possession of information or have an application made to him that a certain mining operation might be uneconomic if the normal royalty provisions were applied and in that case the Minister would have a discretion to vary the rate of the royalty. When the Minister suggested that to us, we thought that that was reasonable. It seems to me that the only change that is suggested is that the level of the royalty may be altered upon the application of a person liable to pay the royalty.

I do not see how that gives the Minister greater discretion. In fact, I would have thought that it gave him less discretion than he had previously. As it stands at the moment, the clause refers to the opinion of the Minister. One would have thought that that was a greater discretionary power than to have such a power on the application of a person. After the English lesson I was given by the Minister earlier, I am a bit nervous and I defer to his apparent superior qualifications. If the Minister believes this amendment will give him a greater discretionary power, I have no quarrel with that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would hate to cower the member into submission. I find it hard to believe that he is cowered as a result of anything I said earlier. The first of the two amendments leaves out 'or at some closer point of delivery determined by the Minister'. That was supposed to give the Minister some discretion. At the moment the royalty is computed at the head of the mine. Minerals are upgraded by various methods and they can end up as an oxide or some further refined product.

The original amendment was that the Minister could go in anywhere along the line and say that was where he would compute the value. It was pointed out after the Bill left this place that it is difficult to go in half-way through a process and establish its value. For instance, copper may be processed to become copper oxide and it is difficult to know where to cut in and make a real calculation that is based somewhere along that line of processing. I suggest that the extra discretion comes in the latter part of the second amendment, which gives the Minister the ability to waive payment of royalty or to reduce the rate of royalty, because it was pointed out that it is difficult to cut in arbitrarily somewhere along the process of upgrading. Upgrading may take place in different buildings and it would be difficult to compute the value half-way through the enriching, refining or upgrading process. It was put that it could be difficult to choose a meaningful point at which to do the computation and make a sensible computation. There was something arbitrary about the fact that it could apply at that point, so that to make the discretion real, a royalty can be waived or varied. I think the member would have to agree that that is a wide discretion that is sought to be written in.

Motion carried.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1537.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill deals with a number of matters relating to stamp duties, the most important feature of which is an increase in stamp duties on cheques from 8c to 10c, which is a 25 per cent rise. It is one of the elements of the 1981 Budget which has been canvassed at considerable length in this House and which I do not wish to go into in detail. Of course, this Bill highlights one particular aspect of that Budget, namely, that it is a high tax Budget.

We are well aware of the large number of increases in taxes and charges which have been levied and which are summated in the Budget document. It is quite extraordinary that this type of Budget and a measure such as this come from a Government that made so much while in Opposition about its approach to taxes and the encouragement of the tax revolt, the cutting back of Government revenue sources, and the maintenance of what it calls small government. The Premier made that a major plank of his economic development policy.

We are now reaping the terrible effects of that economic policy. Two years later we are finding every indicator going bad for this South Australian economy. One of the prime planks of his strategy was the cutting of taxes, tax cuts to stimulate the State economy. State taxes, he said, were too high. He made a number of promises in the area of taxation. He said they were ruining South Australia and forcing people to leave this State. All of that was a lot of nonsense, but it seemed to strike some root at the time among people. It seemed to attract some support and it was certainly encouraged by the press at the time.

The facts were that we were not and never have been a high tax State in that sense. The facts were that we did not have an over-burdened and flaccid public sector. It was efficient, it was operating well and what this Government has done to it, I think, and the immediate effect that that has had on the economy has caused many of our economic problems today, and that is not to go into the social effects that are showing up.

Here is a Government that came to office with this great boast about tax cuts and what it was going to do with taxes and the instant favourable economic effects that would follow. Certainly, some taxes were cut and they were cut quite substantially. The notorious errors that were made in costing those tax cuts are a large part of the budgetary and financial problems that this Government faces.

It is certainly clear that the tax cuts that were made have not stimulated the economy. If anything, the change in the tax burden away from taxes such as succession duties which fell on a distinct section of the community and which in fact did not apply to the vast majority of people, on to

the back of everyone, including business, by the increasing of charges for basic essentials such as power and water, has put this State at some disadvantage economically.

Interestingly, the Premier in justifying or attempting to justify this particular tax increase on the stamp duty on cheques from 8c to 10c, says:

> That increase will bring the rate in South Australia to the same level as is now operating in New South Wales and Queensland and to the reduced level which it is understood will operate in Victoria shortly.

That is well below that put into the 1981-82 Budget of the Tasmanian Government. What he is saying is we were enjoying a particular tax advantage in this area and, in order to raise revenue, he is getting rid of that advantage. I am not suggesting that that in itself is a bad thing. What I am suggesting is that it cuts completely across everything the Premier has told us about the policies of his Government and his recipes for economic development in this State.

He has been raising those charges, thus reducing our ability to compete interstate, and now he raises a specific tax and uses as his justification that he is bringing it into line with other States. Incidentally, we notice that in relation to pay-roll tax exemptions, he is not prepared to bring those into line with other States in the traditional way because he wants to collect a bit more money from them by the operation of inflationary effects.

The Government's economic policy in this area has failed and finally, when the crunch has been reached, the Government is forced to tax and begin raising taxes and this Bill deals with one of those increases. Am amount of $30 000 000 is shown as being the annual value of the tax reductions made by the Premier in the 1981 Budget. If we take into account this particular tax, plus the other range of costs and charges that are being increased so substantially, having given away $30 000 000 to a particularly more privileged sector of the community, he is taking somewhere nearer $40 000 000 from the community least able to pay and those whom we are meant to be actively encouraging to invest in this State. That is a very topsy-turvy and uncoordinated economic policy.

The tax increases that are being applied are inflationary. The taxes that are being replaced by the current increases in no way could be termed inflationary in their effect. For instance, in the area of succession duties, the incidence of that tax was constantly being adjusted by the Government to reduce the burden of it. The actual collection of the tax was related to current property values on estates, but these taxes running ahead of the inflation level in themselves fuel inflation, because they are taken into account in assessing the general cost of living in the State of South Australia.

The last consumer price index highlights the problems faced by this State. As a result of our high unemployment, way above the general average, it might be expected South Australia would have low cost pressures, but in Adelaide we have above average inflation, the second highest in the past 12 months. In the last quarter Adelaide had the highest fuel and light index—a factor in ETSA charges. Tobacco and cigarette prices were up, reflecting an increased tobacco tax in South Australia. Public transport charges were up and this reflected a 50 per cent rise in average fares over the past two years. Together, these three items, all of them a result of conscious Government policy, accounted for nearly one quarter of the Adelaide c.p.i. rise.

Now we have a further item which in turn will find its way into our general cost of living and inflation rate, so the cost advantage talked about by this side of the House and by the other side that we try to enjoy in this State in order to render our industry competitive is simply being whittled away, whittled away by some factors which are not totally in control of the Government but, more importantly, whittled away by many factors which are under the Government's direct control. The Tonkin Government's taxation policies could endanger this State's important cost advantage, and this is already showing up, and I have mentioned already the power and water changes, which are the most obvious of that area.

It is to be hoped that this Bill does not permit tax avoidance by users increasing stocks of cheques by 1 November. There is nothing in the Bill to stop this. Let me deal with a few of the specific problems in the Bill, some of which could be explored more precisely at the Committee stage. The Premier says that it has been suggested that some cheque users may take advantage of the period to 1 November to increase their stocks of cheque forms in order to avoid the increased duty.

I point out that these increases were announced in the Budget in the beginning of September; this legislation was introduced into the House only last Thursday and is being debated today. Therefore, there has been some considerable time before legislation has appeared and we are going to have to battle to get it through this week in order to ensure that the legislation is in place and operative by 1 November. We are going to have to scramble together in a hurry, and, as the Premier pointed out, suggestions have been made that one could avoid some of the increased duty by piling up stocks of cheques. He goes on to say:

> . . . if evidence showed that cheques were being issued during this period at a rate which past experience showed as being beyond normal requirements, then the Government would have to consider removing the exemption and, for the future, may have to consider seriously returning to the system under which the amount of duty is printed on each cheque form. The Government is sure all parties would want to avoid the necessity for such a cumbersome and expensive arrangement.

We are, in fact, in the last few days before the new duty will apply. I would hope that the Premier could tell us something about the experience that is being monitored in relation to this particular practice and whether he does feel it necessary to remove the exemption or if, indeed, he is quite satisfied that there has been no avoidance in this area. I am sure he has the research material to put before us on this particular matter.

It has been pointed out that the Bill does deal with four other matters. It provides for an exemption from the aggregation provision relating to duty on conveyances of land. This was a loophole in the legislation. I am not sure whether it was the loophole that allowed the Liberal Party to purchase property through a particular company by dividing it up into small lots and thus avoiding the full incidence of stamp duty at that time. The member for Hanson probably well remembers it. I think Senator Messner was the Chairman of that company that, within the law, I am told ensured that considerable amounts of stamp duty was avoided by the Liberal Party at that stage.

I do not know whether this is the particular clause or the particular provision that was introduced to close that loophole. This was worked by many others in the community, incidentally I am not putting the finger on just the Liberal Party, although I thought they would have a higher social conscience in this matter. I suppose it does not require much reflection: that was a rather foolish statement to make. We are now told the legislation was not meant to apply to a situation where larger rural holdings are broken up into smaller plots and broken off, provided they were to remain for primary produce. I wonder whether this would involve the situation of hobby farms. I refer to those blocks that are, in fact, while ostensibly for primary produce purchases, are being used by the owners of them for recreational purposes, coupled with tax avoidance.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: There is a simple test.

Mr BANNON: Yes. It may be that these will not be gathered up under this amendment. I think the Premier should explain more specifically what is involved in this exemption in relation to rural properties. Would the Premier like me to repeat it?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I heard you.

Mr BANNON: I thought the Premier was consulting with his advisers.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I was listening, but I could not understand you.

Mr BANNON: To simplify it for the Premier, I am referring to that passage in the second reading explanation—he might not have read it, because he inserted it in *Hansard* without reading it—which states:

> It has been drawn to the Government's attention that any transaction involving the sale of a single property in separate portions where each sale is contingent upon the other . . . falls within the current legislation. We do not believe that this was the intention of the legislation, and the proposed amendment excludes those conveyances of land to different purchasers where the land is used wholly or mainly for primary production and where the Commissioner of Stamps is satisfied that each portion of the land will continue to be used for primary production separately and independently from the other.

My questions are these: first, what is the evidence that this was not the intention of the legislation; secondly, how does that affect the hobby farming situation where it can be demonstrated that primary production is involved but, if one looks further into it, that might not be the case? Does the Premier understand now?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I am quite clear in my understanding that you do not.

Mr BANNON: Thank you very much. No doubt he will answer that point. Secondly, let me deal with the exemption relating to odd-lot specialists. That is something that we are told applies in the stamp duties legislation of all other States, and it is a matter of convenience for it to be introduced into this Act. For the first time, the Stock Exchange of Adelaide has appointed such a specialist, so the need for this amendment is demonstrated. We have no objection to that, on the basis of the arguments put up for it.

The third point mentioned in the second reading explanation refers to the repeal of sections 31l and 31p of the Act, designed to prevent the duty payable on credit or rental business or instalment purchase agreements being passed on to the consumer. I am not satisfied, from what is said in the second reading explanation, that it is necessary to repeal both sections. They represent, on the face of the Act, a protection to the consumer. It may be, as the Premier has said, that they achieve little in practice, but, even if it is only little that they achieve, the fact that they are on the Statute Book indicates some intention of the Legislature in this area.

The Premier says that the Government has obtained assurances from credit providers that consumers will not be disadvantaged by the repeal of those provisions. I would like more evidence of those assurances; more particularly, I would like to ask whether the Premier can demonstrate that consumers will not be disadvantaged by the repeal of the provisions. The second reading explanation does not go into sufficient detail to enable us to be assured that we should repeal these sections. For whose convenience are we doing it? It may have little effect on consumers, but I would have thought that those sections represented a safeguard which should remain in the Act.

Finally, the Premier alludes to a simplified procedure for denoting payment of duty in respect of share transfers arising from take-overs. It is a matter of convenience that does not affect the amount of duty collected. It means that each instrument of transfer, if this section were written into the Act, would not have to be separately assessed or stamped; it could be done overall. Obviously, it would overcome a considerable amount of clerical work which is required but which is not very productive. I can understand why the Government would feel the need to introduce it, with the extraordinary spate of take-overs which we have have in the last couple of years and which have rendered South Australia into a branch office State. Some of our great names and finest institutions have been or are under threat of take-over, and there has been frenetic activity in this area. The Government has a lot to answer for in this trend of South Australia's becoming the branch office State. It is building up many problems for the future in terms of investment in South Australia, but that is another matter. That spate of take-overs obviously has put pressure on the Government to introduce this amendment. As an amendment of convenience, I do not see much objection to it.

With those remarks, because this is part of the financial measures of the Budget, I indicate that we will allow this Bill to pass the second reading stage. We have in Committee some questions to ask and possibly some attitudes to take in consequence of the response to those questions, and we will see what happens to the Bill as it emerges from Committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): There is not a great deal that I can say to answer the Leader's speech. He spent some part of it defending the actions and policies of the previous Government, and then proceeded to repeat the same old stale chestnuts about the State Budget, on a very boring and familiar theme, one which is wearing very thin. I find it difficult to reconcile his arguments. He advocates increased taxation—and I think that is the policy of his Party—and then complains because this Government increases stamp duty in one very small area. I find his lack of consistency quite remarkable.

He says that the cost advantage of South Australia is being whittled away, because costs are going up and up. I refer him to the comparative consumer price index figures for each State and to the record of South Australia, which is still going very well. He referred to water costs as something that is whittling away our cost advantage. I think he should examine those costs, and perhaps take note of the costs involved in water filtration. Even with water filtration, our levels of water costs are comparable with those of other States.

The most remarkable thing is that he apparently seriously advocates that we should not have abolished State taxes which have been abolished in other States. How he can promote the continued cost advantage of South Australia and say in the same breath that we should not have abolished those taxes, that we should have retained taxes which have been abolished in other States, I do not know. It does not make sense. I am afraid that very little of what he said did make sense.

As to the questions he has found, there has been no intention of any stockpiling. I am sure he will be pleased to hear that. The point has been made by a number of people, and I point out to the Leader, that, even if people were tempted to stockpile, it would not pay them to do so with the interest rates now payable, about which the Leader has had something to say many times. It would not be a practical proposition to tie up a lot of money in stockpiling cheques.

Referring to the primary production question, and the matter of hobby farms, I think that the Leader does not quite understand the legislation as it applies in relation to exemption from land tax of land used for primary production. The legislation as it applies to stamp duties is very

much an extension of that principle. I take it that he is trying to suggest that, while it is perfectly satisfactory for separate parcels of land used for primary production to be exempt from the aggregation provisions, that is perfectly in order in normal circumstances, provided that the land is to be used for primary production; if it were not used for primary production it would not be in order. Is that the gravamen of the argument?

Mr Millhouse: Say, 'Yes'.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Obviously the Leader is not interested, but I thank the member for Mitcham for his assistance.

Mr Millhouse: I am always ready to help either the Leader or the Premier if I can.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Quite obviously, as I have pointed out and as the Leader knows, a very definite principle is attached to exemptions from land tax: for instance, for land which is not primarily used for primary production, where the question of the source of the income, whether it is from primary production or from some other source, is very carefully weighed by the Commissioner of State Taxation. Exemptions are not given where they are not properly due. Odd lot specialists have been dealt with, and I do not think that that matter is in dispute at all.

The question of the repeal of sections 31l and 31p of the Act which apply in South Australia only is quite straightforward. The principle that has been adopted in other States in the corresponding legislation ought, in the interests of uniformity, to apply here. It may be that that cost will in a small way be transmitted to the consumer if these provisions are repealed. I see no reason why that should not occur. I cannot in any way accept the Leader's opposition to this matter.

The Leader had a few things to say about a spate of take-overs. I think he is again exaggerating enormously, as he is wont to do. There certainly have been a large number of take-overs and there will be take-overs again. I hope that they will apply either way, in or out of the State. Indeed, it is now just as likely, with the amount of investment coming into the State, to work the other way. The whole point is that it is archaic and not in keeping with today's technological advances for people to be required to stamp share transfers individually. There has been an instance (and I cannot recall the company, although it probably does not matter) where it took about a week or more to stamp the transfers in relation to a recent take-over. I will be happy to deal with the various matters in Committee if the honourable member wishes me to.

Mr Millhouse: When does the stamp duty on cheques go up?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is hopefully planned to go up on 1 November.

Mr Millhouse: I must buy some new cheque books then.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am surprised that the member for Mitcham should act in a way so contrary to the spirit of honesty, co-operation and good common sense that has been shown by the remainder of the community almost without exception. Unfortunately, the honourable member was not in the Chamber when I was talking about stock piling.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham now has his name in *Hansard*. He can now quite cheerfully go home to dinner knowing that his name has been recorded for the day. I do not think there is any point in our dealing with the matter any further as far as he is concerned.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Repeal of section 31l.'

Mr BANNON: Clauses 3 and 4, which are contingent on each other, provide that the duty payable on creditor rental business or instalment purchase agreements shall not be passed on to the consumer. The Premier dealt with that to a certain extent in his second reading reply. It seemed that the main burden of his argument was that these sort of provisions were not present in other States and that we might as well bring our Bill into line. That is a pretty poor argument. The principle is there; it is some protection to the consumer. Will the Premier provide us with the evidence that this has no impact and no effect as far as consumers are concerned? What precise evidence has he got in this regard?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader asks a question that he knows cannot be answered. It is a hypothetical question, and I see little point in taking it further.

Mr BANNON: The Premier sees no point in taking it further. I suggest that what is being removed is a section of an Act that provides some benefit for the consumer. The Premier simply refuses to say whether that benefit is computed and what the effect of repealing these sections will be. He makes reassuring noises but provides no hard facts. If we are going to remove this consumer protection clause from the Bill, we ought to be fully assured about it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: My advice is that the finance companies themselves have given an undertaking at this stage that the consumers will not be disadvantaged and that they do not intend at this stage to pass on the increase to their clients.

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier explain the nature of these assurances? Are they contained in letters, an agreement with the Government, or in some other written form? Is it simply what credit providers have said to the Government?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that they are verbal assurances. The Leader does not like finance companies very much, but even he would accept that their undertaking is worth something.

Mr CRAFTER: I am not sure whether I heard the Premier correctly, but I believe he said that the finance companies have given assurances that no increases will be passed on to consumers at this stage. If that is the condition on which we are removing from the legislation this safeguard for consumers, I think it is indeed a very limited safeguard. Will the Premier explain to the Committee the details of his condition at this stage?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is through existing arrangements. There will be no passing on of the things which are already agreed or are in train.

The Committee divided on the clause:

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

Noes (20)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Evans. No—Mr McRae.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Computation of duty in case of certain real property transactions.'

Mr CRAFTER: I am concerned about the exemption that is to be provided for rural properties. I note that the Minister in his second reading explanation stated that in

1975 the legislation intended to close the loopholes that had been explored by persons seeking to avoid the proper payment of duty by multiple transfers. As the Leader of the Opposition has told the House, the Liberal Party itself, when purchasing its property on Greenhill Road, avoided the payment of proper duty by those means.

The Premier, when explaining the Government's policy in this matter, stated that there was a wellknown policy with respect to rural properties. I would be pleased if the Premier could explain to the Committee the precise nature of that policy and the reason why rural properties should be exempted in this way from the payment of duty, and, for example, why they should receive more favourable financial benefits than, for example, in the case of strata titling of factories where small business men cannot receive those same benefits. Yet, there may be a vastly different set of circumstances where indeed very wealthy rural property owners could receive benefits but struggling small business men establishing factories and trying to purchase properties will not receive that same benefit. It could apply also to doctors who are encouraged to enter into strata title arrangements in order to set up their practices in new developing suburbs, and the like. Yet there is this financial incentive for farmers. What is the Government seeking by granting this exemption?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. He was doing very well until he got on to the question of wealthy land owners and farmers, which was unfortunate really because he was making a lot of sense until that moment. However, I will accept that he is concerned about the matter. I would think that the honourable member would be in a better position than anyone in this place, other than perhaps the member for Playford, to understand the difficulties involved. It is a question of one parcel of land being split into separate parcels, of necessity, because of the primary producing nature of the land rather than its being split, as was the other case previously, with the intent to defraud or to avoid paying stamp duty.

I think that the primary producing side of the question is pretty clear. Occasions arise where it is totally impossible to make appropriate sales of land unless it is sold in small parcels to surrounding landholders. This applies basically to rural land because that is where that situation arises, and nowhere else. I take the honourable member's point concerning strata titles on factories, which is something that I will certainly be pleased to look at. However, regarding the present proposals, it is a matter whereby primary production and the use of such land makes it essential that the land be sold in that way. There is certainly no intention to defraud. I refer the honourable member to the detailed explanation given during the second reading, which states in part:

> The Commissioner must be satisfied that the separate parcels are to be used wholly or mainly for primary production.

That of course, brings in the same sort of policy that applies to land tax assessment on rural property. In other words, one must be a genuine primary producer, the land must be used for primary production, and the Commissioner must be satisfied. That is set out quite clearly. The Commissioner must also be satisfied as he must be in other transactions, that there is no arrangement or understanding between purchasers under which those parcels of land conveyed separately are going to be used together for the benefit of one individual or one company. That seems to me to be perfectly straightforward and a matter of common sense.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HONEYMOON PROJECT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to inform the House that the Commonwealth has advised the South Australian Government this afternoon of its approval to allow development of the Honeymoon uranium project. This follows final Commonwealth approvals under the environmental impact procedures and the Foreign Investment Review Board Guidelines. As a result of these approvals, the operating company, Mines Administration Proprietary Limited, will now seek tenders for the construction of a pilot plant with a view to commissioning this plant by September 1982. The pilot plant will allow the *in situ* mining technology to be fully evaluated and its commercial viability to be optimised.

The project will then proceed to the construction of a full size commercial plant, and present plans are for full production to begin in 1985. On present estimates, the project will have a life of at least seven years based on an annual production rate of 450 tonnes of yellowcake. The *in situ* leaching technology proposed for the project has received intensive study by the South Australian Department of Environment and Planning following two years of consultation between the South Australian Government and the company aimed at minimising or eliminating possible adverse impacts of the project.

In its assessment of the project, the department examined in detail the possibility of groundwater contamination and the effects of radiation, and reported that no significant impacts had been identified. The Honeymoon project is located in the Lake Frome South area, about 60 kilometres north east of Olary. A number of other deposits, including those at Beverley, East Kalkaroo and Gould's Dam, have been identified in the general Lake Frome area. It is possible that development of these deposits may follow successful establishment and refinement of the *in situ* technology at Honeymoon. More generally, final approval of the Honeymoon project heralds the beginning of a new era of uranium mining in South Australia.

The South Australian public has the State Government's assurance that it is pursuing its uranium policy in a manner which, while seeking the maximum economic benefit to the State from uranium mining projects, at the same time ensures that these projects are undertaken according to nationally and internationally agreed standards with regard to the safety and well-being of personnel directly involved in mining and processing, the wider South Australian community and the public in customer countries.

PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. D. O. Tonkin:

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

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1535.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This motion deals with the report that has been tabled in relation to guidelines for the appearance of South Australian public servants as witnesses before Parliamentary committees. It has a long and fairly inglorious history. The Opposition

indicates that, as in another place, we are opposed to the adoption of this report because we think it is, basically, a lot of nonsense. The whole purpose of the report and of the committee's deliberations was not really to assess guidelines for public servants but to get the Premier off the hook for his very hasty and ill judged action in tabling totally unacceptable guidelines in this House in order to overcome some temporary political embarrassments without consultation with any of the parties involved and, perhaps even more gravely in some respects as far as this House is concerned, because it involved Parliamentary procedure, without consultation with the President and the Speaker of the House or the appropriate Standing Orders Committees.

It really was a quite extraordinary action. The guidelines were slipped in one afternoon without any fanfare. It was only on a closer examination of those guidelines that the full extent of their impact could be seen by members. Such has been the controversy surrounding that matter that we have already had at least one full-scale debate on the matter on 20 August 1980, during which the Opposition moved an urgency motion which sought to highlight the way in which this matter had been handled and, of course, the substance of those guidelines, which included such abhorrent things as having some sort of watch dog from the Public Service Board sitting at the side of the public servant giving evidence to tell him whether he should or should not answer a question or in what way he should answer it. That is quite clearly an invitation for some sort of contempt of the Parliament. That aspect alone made the lack of consultation or discussion with the officers, the President and the Speaker of this Parliament, quite culpable on the part of the Government.

The matter, as I say, has been canvassed at length in its original form. It was arising out of that debacle, and in an attempt to save face because of the universal rejection of these guidelines, that the idea of forming some sort of committee to examine guidelines was dreamt up by the Premier. It was, if you like, an attempt to simply save face, to get out of the problem that had been created by the tabling of the guidelines without any kind of consultation. The rejection, incidentally, of those guidelines by the various bodies involved was swift indeed. In fact, a report appearing in the *Advertiser* on 21 August 1980, headed 'P.S.A. rejects Government's guidelines', revealed that the Public Service Association, representing some 24 000 members, had adopted the unanimous view that the guidelines announced on 7 August, a couple of weeks previously, were totally unsatisfactory, unnecessary and undesirable. I quote from that article, as follows:

> The P.S.A. said the guidelines contained vague and ambiguous provisions and control measures which might serve to intimidate public servants who were trying honestly to carry out their legitimate duties to their department, their Ministers, the Parliament and the public. It should be made clear that, contrary to the impression created when the guidelines were announced on 7 August—

the Premier indeed tried to create this impression—

> the P.S.A. had not called for such guidelines to be drawn up;
> had not seen, much less approved, the document tabled in Parliament by the Premier, Mr Tonkin;
> had not been told the issue was due to come before Parliament.

In fact, they understood that certain discussions were going on but had not reached any sort of resolution. Their reaction was prompt, and they rejected the matter out of hand. It was interesting, too, that the President in another place (Hon. A. M. Whyte) found it necessary to write to the P.S.A. on 26 August 1980 putting his views about this matter very clearly on the record, as follows:

> Prior to your letter of 22 August 1980, I had already read in the paper the concern expressed by the Public Service Association regarding the controversial guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees. I must say that I was completely surprised by the issuing of the guidelines in their present form. You may be aware that Mr Speaker Eastick and I, together with the Clerks of the respective Houses, met on two occasions with Dr Corbett from your association.

I interpolate there that the President was in error, because I think he was referring to Dr Corbett, Commissioner of the Public Service Board. Nonetheless, whoever the meetings were with does not affect the substance of the letter, which continues:

> We discussed guidelines and on the second occasion thought we had reached a formula that was acceptable to the public servants and one which met with our approval. I want to make it quite clear that the guidelines, as tabled in Parliament, are not those which we believe were acceptable, and also to point out that I had no indication that the agreement we had reached would be varied. I had not been contacted by anyone regarding the document which was tabled.

That expresses in plain terms just how badly the Premier had erred in his desire to get these muzzling provisions on to the table. Remember that we were then discussing them in the context of forthcoming Estimates Committees. I suspect cold feet on the part of the Government that public servants insufficiently muzzled might, in fact, be speaking far too frankly about the administration of various Government departments, and so the guidelines were tabled and purported to be documents which represented some form of agreement. They were not that, as the P.S.A. made quite clear. They were certainly nothing like any documents that the President of the Legislative Council or you, Mr Speaker, had considered in the course of some preliminary discussions with a representative of the Public Service Board.

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

Mr BANNON: So we now come to the nub of this whole debate, which is the document that has been produced by the committee. I might say that it is not a unanimous view of the committee because, in fact, there were two minority reports. The majority of the committee comprising the Chairman, the Attorney-General, the Speaker, the President and Commissioner Corbett of the Public Service Board did find that there was some need for guidelines and have produced a set of guidelines. The Public Service Association representative, Mr Connelly, whilst signing the original document appended a number of comments which constituted a minority report and, of course, my colleague in another place, the Hon. C. J. Sumner, presented a three-page minority report which disagreed with the necessity or desirability of establishing these guidelines.

The composition of the committee was such that obviously the Government representatives on it were keen to produce something—anything—as a face-saver, while others on the committee were probably prepared to go along with a modified document, which is what we have before us. Two others on the committee were not even prepared to accept that much or that degree of face-saving. In his speech to the House introducing these guidelines, the Premier said that the document was the result of months of extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association, and one would be excused for thinking he meant the document we are discussing now. In fact, he did not; he is advertising again to the guidelines that he tabled in this Parliament, and that is quite an extraordinary assertion. I think I dealt with that assertion and its falsity adequately before the adjournment. He went on to say:

> The intention of the Government is to safeguard the political impartiality of the Public Service without compromising the Government's commitment to strengthen the Committee system.

Again, I would stress that the whole way in which the original guidelines were produced indicated that the Government, having made a fairly ringing commitment to

strengthening the Committee system and allowing it to explore a number of areas, was suddenly confronted with the implications of that, namely, public servants speaking frankly and fearlessly before those Committees, and wanted to back away from that very rapidly to do what it claims is safeguarding the political impartiality of the Public Service but what others would claim, in effect, means to muzzle the Public Service.

In this context I think it is worth looking at some of the remarks made by the Deputy Premier to the Public Service Association annual conference at the weekend, where he made quite an extraordinary attack upon public servants in relation to the question of leaking documents. Again, I think that has been adequately dealt with in another forum. But it is symptomatic of the Government's whole attitude to the Public Service and its inability to understand that these leaks, which have so alarmed the Government, derive as much from its excessive secrecy and offensiveness with public information and the loss of morale within the Public Service as from any desire of the Public Service to embarrass or compromise the Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Out of his place, the Minister of Agriculture asks, 'What loss of morale?' I am not sure of the situation in his own department.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BANNON: He believes it is top-shelf, and in that case that is one of the few departments in which it could be said. I cannot comment on the Minister's department; he may be right but I doubt it. Anyway, I think the lesson is that the Government, having opened this Pandora's box of committees and investigations and full and frank information, tried to sit on the lid of it to stop anything escaping, by its hasty introduction of these guidelines. This committee was set up and given terms of reference which were framed as follows:

> To advise the Premier as to the necessity for and content of a statement of principles and procedures.

As my colleague in another place pointed out, those on the committee really felt that there was no necessity for such guidelines at all. That is what we have said all along. It was only by, in effect, altering the terms of reference—putting a gloss on them and suggesting that rather than necessity, desirability was the term of reference—that they could produce the report they did and sign it.

It was clear that the terms of reference were to advise the Premier as to the necessity for and content of a statement of principles. The committee backed away from that and substituted, if you like, the desirability of having some form of guidelines, because that is the way in which the report reads. The minority view was that, even within that extended definition, the guidelines were not needed: no-one wanted them, and no-one was asking for them. Indeed, the attempt to impose them was seen as some kind of interference with the proper flow of information and proper Parliamentary procedure. However, as a face-saving device we have been presented with this document. The Opposition cannot support it, because while the document certainly is an improvement on what was originally tabled and while it certainly has removed a number of the most obnoxious features of the original document, nonetheless, it still is really unnecessary; it adds nothing to what public servants need to know in terms of appearance before Parliamentary committees.

I think we should go right back to the occasion when the document was tabled, when my colleague the member for Playford picked up the nuances in the document and actually looked through it sentence by sentence and saw its implications. If we go right back to that evening and the consequent reaction from the Public Service Association, the President, the Speaker and everybody else involved, we see that all that has been going on, consuming enormous amounts of time and energy of public servants and Parliamentarians, has been a face-saving operation for the Premier to help him avoid looking totally compromised and stupid in relation to the document he produced.

The committee has done the right thing by him; it has produced a document which by reinterpreting the terms of reference has set out some sort of conclusions and recommendations—recommendations that do remove the obnoxious features but really do not contribute very much to the principles. I refer members to the minority report tabled by the Hon. C. J. Sumner, who in his summary, says:

> The evidence did not establish that guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees were either necessary or desirable.
>
> Secondly, some broader but related issues such as the concept of Ministerial responsibility and Ministerial appearance before Select Committees, the control by Parliament of the Executive and freedom of information, including the availability of Public Service advice to Ministers and public comment by public servants were referred to by the majority but require additional comment. These items should be referred to the Premier in the same way as matters contained in paragraph 9.2 of the majority report.

In his substantive document, the Hon. Mr Sumner elaborated on those particular points. I think the essence of his report is contained in the first paragraph. Evidence was heard, and the committee deliberated at length. I believe that it tried to do a face-saving operation. The overall effect of the evidence and the deliberations was that really this whole business was absolutely and totally unnecessary. Of course, the Premier produced a seven-page, large-type, double-spaced statement to somehow try to beef up the findings of the committee and suggest that there was some reason for it.

The Opposition stands by its original assessment: the whole exercise was totally misconceived. It was another example of the Government's inability to think through some of its rhetorical stances or policy positions; its inability, having plucked these things out of the air, to actually work them into some sort of document; its inability to consult with the parties involved and arrive at some kind of consensus; and, finally, as has happened on so many occasions, the necessity for it to find some face-saving formula to cover up its hasty action in producing a document that was totally unacceptable.

The committee has attempted to assist the Premier, but I do not think that this Parliament should also be involved in the job of attempting to assist the Premier. We ought to declare quite clearly that the whole exercise was totally unnecessary and that this report, while it may be an interesting academic exercise, has wasted a lot of the time of the committee that considered it and the Parliament that has to debate it. Accordingly, the Opposition rejects the committee's majority view and accepts the Hon. Mr Sumner's report, which I think eloquently points up the very matters to which I have just referred.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the remarks made by my Leader. I will briefly address myself to the report that really matters, that is, the minority report of C. F. Connelly, representing the Public Service Association of South Australia. It seems to me that this gentleman has really focused on one of the key points that affects not just South Australia, but the whole of Australia. I was astonished to find, in a recent survey that I conducted for a paper that I published, that one must look at countries such as the U.S.S.R. or South Africa to find a country where so little information is readily available to the public. In the United States of America, following the fiasco of Watergate and the disgrace of President Nixon—

Mr Max Brown: Is he coming back?

Mr McRAE: No, I doubt that President Nixon will be coming back, thankfully. In the aftermath of all that, extensive legislation was passed in the United States Congress and the Senate resulting in no less than approximately 75 per cent of all public documentation becoming readily available. The only basis on which documentation cannot readily be made available falls into the category of definite security risk: something that an officer or a Minister under the United States system, and I accept that it is very much different from ours, could properly say would place the whole country in jeopardy if it was produced. The fact is that, in the United States, on proper request being made, one can obtain 75 per cent of all Government information.

That was never made so evident as when I visited Washington last year as the guest of the gentleman who controls the agency known as Inter-governmental Relations in Washington. He is responsible to both Houses, the President and, in fact, he is responsible to all the people of the United States. He handed me a draft report which he proposed would be the basis of a document that he would later submit to the President of the United States. I was totally and thoroughly amazed that such a thing was possible. On reading the document, I could see nothing in it that should not have been disclosed to me. However, I am afraid that, over a period of time, all political Parties in Australia have entrapped themselves into a situation of almost paranoia.

I can recall in late 1971 and early 1972 when the Labor Party was gearing up for office, Mr Clyde Cameron, M.H.R. for Hindmarsh (as he then was) telling me how he admired the freedom of information that prevailed in Scandinavian countries, Canada, and certain other countries which he named. Unfortunately, as the Federal Labor Party went further and further into its term of office, so, further and further it went into a situation of secrecy. I have seen that occur with successive Governments of different political persuasions. I have always been amazed by that, because so little is gained. The fact of the matter is that, if Public Service morale is greatly undermined, public servants will feel that they are under a duty to make information available as best they can. Really, it is to their credit that they come to the Opposition or see that the Opposition has the information, rather than simply spread-eagling themselves across the community and letting the information flow where it will.

The result of my survey was that, in comparison with the top-ranker in the whole world, undoubtedly the United States with 75 per cent of all Government information made available, Australia ranks a dismal 25 per cent. Allowing for the fact that in the U.S.S.R. one could generously allow around 10 per cent, perhaps in South Africa, again, a very generous 10 per cent, and perhaps in Chile the same rating or even less, that does not reflect too kindly on Australia.

That was the main point that I picked up from the minority report of Mr Charles Connelly, who was representing the P.S.A. He stated that most of the complaints concerning so-called harsh treatment of public servants and most of the difficulties into which public servants might have been put were really brought on by lack of freedom of information. You, Mr Speaker, were not in the Chair during the Estimates Committees, but your Deputy and also one of the regular Acting Speakers, the member for Goyder were, and they would have noticed a couple of spectacular examples of this.

The first example was when the member for Eyre (the Deputy Speaker) was in the Chair and the Attorney-General was giving evidence in this Chamber. I must choose my words carefully when I speak about Attorneys-General, because they are dignified people and one would not want to denigrate them. The Attorney-General had an almost obsessive view of secrecy. For example, I asked him a simple question regarding the Liberal Party policy in 1979 in relation to the holding of a State Constitutional Convention. I asked the Attorney what he proposed to do about it. His answer was, 'Some progress has been made, but I cannot say much more than that.' Six days later we were suddenly told that there had been so much pre-planning that, for instance, Professor Castles, Dean of the Law Faculty of Adelaide University, had been commissioned to write a paper, a well-known constitutional authority, Professor Howard, from Melbourne had also been commissioned to write a paper, and all sorts of plans had been made. Those plans must have been made before I asked that question. What was the need for that excessive secrecy? What was the point of it all?

Surely the honourable gentleman could have said, 'Yes, certain progress has been made. In fact, I have commissioned certain papers, and the Government has decided that there will be a convention on such and such a day in November.' Nothing like that was said. The Attorney did not tell an untruth but, by the same token, he did not tell the truth. I wonder whether it was because he did not want to tell the truth or whether he was under such pressure from his own Cabinet that he was forced not to tell the whole truth.

The other example that occurs to me in the context in which Mr Charles Connelly commented was in relation to the Committee over which the member for Goyder presided on that memorable day on which the Chief Secretary was questioned. The honourable gentleman will recall that he was asked certain questions and sought certain advice in relation to what was happening in the Police Force. Very briefly, the topic dealt with certain inquiries that were going on in the Police Force and the relationship between what the Attorney was doing and what the Chief Secretary was doing. The honourable gentleman was not prepared to make available any information. Furthermore, he was not prepared to let the Police Commissioner reply. At the time it struck me that either someone was being obsessively secret or excessively stupid, because, surely in the context of the questioning that was going on, the obvious thing to do was simply to let the Police Commissioner answer the questions. The Police Commissioner has 40 years experience in the force and he is well known and well liked in the community. The questioning was along the lines of, 'What is happening in the inquiry? Who is running the inquiry? Who is being inquired into? What is the inquiry about?'

It occurred to me at the time that, if I had been in the Police Commissioner's place, I could very simply have answered those questions without in any way disadvantaging anyone, least of all the Government, and without being secretive. My answers would have been, 'Yes, there is an inquiry; yes, there is an inquiry into the drug squad; yes, I know the people who are conducting the inquiry, but I am not prepared to give their names because, in giving their names, perhaps I could tip off people who are being inquired into.' Then, in answer to the logical further question, 'Who is being inquired into?', my logical further answer would have been along the lines, 'No, I will obviously not give those names, because that would mean I am pre-judging people. I could be grossly defaming those people, or I could be tipping off the guilty while damning the innocent.'

They are just two examples of the obsessive sort of secrecy that seems to surround this Government, and they are not the only examples. Many other examples came up before the Estimates Committees. Another example that I recall (and I know that the member for Goyder will recall this vividly) was when the Minister of Health was being

questioned. She had with her Mr McKay, head of the Health Commission and a very distinguished gentleman.

I asked her certain questions concerning the position of State and Commonwealth finances, a topic which has always intrigued me. On the first occasion that she was questioned, the Minister indicated that there had been a reduction of 22.5 per cent or thereabouts in direct State financing of Government-recognised hospitals. Later in the course of the day, when she was questioned by the member for Newland, the Minister revised her calculations. It was the way in which that was done which annoyed me: mathematics can be contorted and twisted in all sorts of ways, and statistics are notoriously able to be used in this fashion, but it seemed strange to me that in the morning the Minister was quite willing indeed to admit that funding had been slashed by 22.5 per cent, which is a very formidable figure, greater than any other figure I can remember in the Budget, save perhaps the public buildings reduction, yet in the afternoon after some consultation with her colleagues the Minister managed to reduce that figure to 9 per cent. That is rather typical of the way that this Government has behaved.

Let me give the House one final example of this. I was appalled the other day when a law officer from the Crown Law Office (not one of the officers attached to the Parliamentary Counsel's branch, but one of the normal law officers one often sees down here on a particular assignment), well known to me, passed through the visitors' lounge adjoining this Chamber. I said 'Good-day' to that person, who responded with a very restrained 'Good-day' to me. He did not even use my christian name. When I said, 'What is wrong?' that officer indicated that it was now an instruction of the Government that I was not to be spoken to in regard to law reform matters. How absolutely unbelievable!

The final nonsense about all this I think I can highlight by returning to the Attorney and the Crown Law area. Although I know I must not refer to any Bill on the Notice Paper in detail, I merely name my private member's Bill to amend the Wrongs Act so that private citizens will have an action against persons who have let their animals stray on the road. In the course of Estimates Committee A, chaired, I think, by the member for Eyre on that occasion, I asked the Attorney whether he was aware of that Bill, and he said that he was not. That staggered me for a start, because I know that there are joint meetings these days of members of the Liberal Party in both Houses. At one stage I do not think there were, but there seem to be today. That reply staggered me for a start, because I assume that they have a quick look through the Notice Paper, at the very least.

However, what amazed me even more, when I inquired of the Attorney what he proposed to do about that Bill, was his answer that he would oppose it because he was going to bring in his own Bill. How ridiculous and stupid can one be? That means that I have wasted all my time and effort in getting that Bill prepared, in having discussions with the stockowners and farmers, in having discussions with the dairy farmers and the Cattlemen's Association and so on in getting broad agreement, at least in principle, on the whole matter, only to be told that that Bill will be defeated so that the Attorney can bring in his own Bill.

Mr Mathwin: That happens all the time; it has happened to me on numerous occasions.

Mr McRAE: The member for Glenelg says it happens all the time. If it does happen all the time it is a disgrace and it is an example of ludicrous secrecy. There is another example, and before I sit down I want to give a final example. It really highlights the ludicrous extent to which this situation can be taken.

A member of a Government department mentioned to me the desirability of a small Bill being introduced to enable Acts of Parliament to be referred to by the year in which they originate. To take a fairly complex example, in the Commonwealth one can now refer to the 'Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904'; one does not have to look through every amendment and refer to it by its amending years. I thought that it was a fine idea, so I telephoned the Parliamentary Counsel and told him what I had had put to me. He said, 'I have got a Bill here. This has been done. It has been sitting here for the last four years, waiting for something to happen.' I asked him to send it around, and that was done.

I gave notice of it and introduced the Bill in the normal way. However, to my amazement I find that not only was it defeated last year but that it will be defeated this year, so that the Hon. Mr Griffin can introduce exactly the same Bill, word for word, as I am trying to introduce here. Tomorrow, or at the first available opportunity, I will be challenging members opposite to defeat both of them, to highlight the stupidity of the system in which we are involved.

I have strayed a little in the course of my remarks, but part of that was as a direct result of the invitation given to me by the Premier. I want to get back to what Mr Connelly said, before I conclude my remarks. He said:

> If there were openness and fairness in the way that this Government dealt with the whole situation, then there would be no need for these tensions or, if there were tensions, they would be attended to very quickly.

I think that this nonsense of the guidelines is just going too far.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier to conclude the debate, I refer to the fact that, in moving the motion, the Premier sought and was granted leave to insert his speech in *Hansard* without his reading it. Whilst the House is master of its own destiny in regard to its day-to-day actions, I point out that there is no provision in the Standing Orders for such a speech to be so inserted, although there is provision for second reading explanations to be so inserted. Therefore, I was in error in asking the House to grant that leave. I do not want my action on this occasion to be taken as a precedent for any such future motion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I must apologise, Sir, if any request from me has in any way embarrassed you. I am very pleased that the matter has been so amicably resolved. I hesitate to suggest that I should read it now. I think we can take it that it is part of the record.

I would like, first, to thank all members of the committee for the time and attention they have given this matter. I think it says a great deal for them that the report has been prepared in the way in which it has, in such clear-cut terms, and, indeed, that all but one member of the committee were prepared to sign the report. I appreciate that Mr Connelly and the Hon. Mr Sumner may have had their reservations, and I respect those reservations, but the fact remains that the committee itself came down with the view that there was a need for guidelines, and it has also prepared those guidelines for the benefit of this House. I thank especially the Chairman, Mr Gordon Combe, an officer who, as Ombudsman, and earlier as a table officer in this House, has a wealth of experience and was able to contribute that experience towards the preparation of this document.

The speeches by Opposition members have raised very little that is new. Obviously, and predictably, they hold the view that there is no necessity for guidelines, because it suits them to have that view. It is not a view that is shared

by the committee. I would take up two points that have been made, because they have been made with the customary lack of attention to accuracy and even of the truth in detail that we are coming to expect from the Opposition.

First, the Deputy Premier made no attack on the Public Service; the claim that he did so is a gross exaggeration. In actual fact he made it absolutely clear that he upheld the fine reputation and standing of the Public Service. I believe very sincerely that that Public Service and its reputation have been severely damaged by the actions of one or two people who are failing to live up to its fine reputation for impartiality and retaining confidentiality.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Just because the Leader of the Opposition is petty and niggly and trying to draw attention away from what I am saying now does not excuse him in any way for what I believe was a disgraceful exhibition of virtually inviting public servants (it could well be said that he did invite them) to break those long-standing traditions. I hope he is ashamed of himself.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The other argument from the Opposition is that the Government wants to withhold information. That is an extraordinary argument to come from the Opposition. With programme performance budgeting more information is being made available to the Parliament than has ever been made available before. The fact, as I pointed out before, that the Opposition is not capable of adequately using the information presented to it is not my fault nor that of the Government. I repeat that more information has been made available by this Government to the Parliament than has ever been made available before. The guidelines are there simply to assist public servants, and that is the key to the entire matter. It is not a question of withholding information; that is a red herring.

The need for guidelines has been set down to give some protection to a public servant who may feel, by reason of the circumstances (rightly or wrongly), that he is under some pressure to attempt to answer questions which he is not really able to answer. In other words, the subject matter may not be within his direct knowledge or may not be within his direct sphere of operation. Nevertheless, because of those circumstances which we, as members of Parliament, now take very much for granted, he may believe he is under some obligation or pressure to attempt to make an answer when he is not really able to do so. It is everyone's right (and that applies to public servants) and responsibility to answer questions to the best of their ability but it is also everyone's right to refuse to answer questions if in fact the answer is not known properly or if the question is not within his sphere of competence. The guidelines indeed give public servants appearing before Parliamentry committees quite clearly that defined right. The guidelines set out their rights. As has been said so many times before, public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees have rights and privileges which are no less than those of other people.

I thank the committee for the work that it has done. I believe that the guidelines regarding the appearances of South Australian public servants as witnesses before Parliamentary committees will prove most valuable indeed to the Parliament.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Goldsworthy and Wotton. Noes—Messrs Corcoran and Slater.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 1486.)

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): The Opposition does not intend to oppose this Bill at the second reading. However, there are a number of things concerning the Bill that I would like clarified. On the surface, the Bill may appear to be quite innocuous. The Minister in his second reading explanation pointed out that a rather conglomerate-type situation exists, and that the Bill is attempting a major rationalisation of existing leglislation. 'Rationalise' means to render conformable to reason or to explain on a rational basis. I hope that the Minister will do that later, because my colleagues and I are a little concerned about some of the problems that we have found in relation to this proposition. Having received the Bill last Thursday evening, we found that it entailed the repeal of two quite substantial Acts.

Of course, this puts the matter apart from what one might, for want of a better term, call an ordinary amending Bill. If this Bill is passed, we remove from the Statutes the Bus and Tramways Act, 1935-1975 and the Railways Act, 1936-1975, so, a considerable amount of existing legislation will disappear. The Minister suggests that it is only a matter of rationalisation. However, the Opposition feels obliged to scrutinise the proposals before it can agree to the proposition in total.

One thing that concerns me greatly is that since receiving the Bill I have made some inquiries to ascertain how much the propositions have been canvassed amongst those people who will be quite radically affected by them, namely, the unions that represent the members involved in the industries concerned with the operation of these Acts. As late as this afternoon, two of the major unions had no knowledge of the proposals, which concerns me. The unions concerned were the Australian Railways Union and the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees Association. Officers of both those organisations informed me this afternoon that they had no knowledge of the proposed repeals and amendments. Indeed, they certainly had no discussions—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It does nothing but help them.

Mr O'NEILL: If that is the case, I would be happy to agree to it, but that is not the response that I got from the unions. In fact, quite the contrary: they were very annoyed that they had not been consulted and expressed considerable concern about some of the ramifications of these proposals. One of those points relates to the provisions in the Railways Act in respect of appeals to the authority. I make clear to the Minister that I am not attacking him: I am merely relaying to him what has been put to me. If that is not correct, the Minister can point that out in his reply.

Section 40 of the Railways Act relates to appeals that employees can make to the authority. It appears that some employees (whom one might call staff employees) are covered in as much as last year apparently the S.T.A. agreed to the establishment of a board of reference, which has the power to look at classification, discipline, and promotion

appeals, in addition to general board of reference matters. That concerns staff who are members of the A.T.O.F. Also, members of the officers' division of the A.R.U. have apparently been able to arrive at a similar accommodation in respect of their position. However, it appears that, if the Railways Act is repealed, daily-paid employees will be without a facility that is currently available to them. That may be something that the Minister has taken into account, and he may be able to explain it at a later stage of the debate. However, that does concern me somewhat.

While I am referring to the Railways Act, the Minister may make some comment on the constitution of the board expressed under section 42 of the Act proposed to be repealed. He may be able to put at rest the minds of the people who have complained to me. It may have been advisable (although the Minister is quite sure that it is going to do these people nothing but good) for him to consult with these people beforehand. Then, the House may have been saved this exposition by me. Nevertheless, it did not happen that way.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Now we have to put up with you.

Mr O'NEILL: Yes. I am very glad that you are staying on to put up with me. Section 62 of the Railways Act states:

> The authority shall not be bound to fence or make any compensation in respect of the fencing of any line or railway authorised by any Act assented to on or after 27 July 1876 where that line abuts upon waste or other lands of the Crown, whether unoccupied or leased for pastoral or mining or other purposes, or upon any waste or other lands of the Crown granted or leased after 20 September.

The important part of that is that the exception applies to Crown lands, and the implication is that the authority is required to fence lines that do not fall into that category. Therefore, I hope that somewhere in the new Act there will be a provision to ensure that railway lines or other lines are fenced to preclude injury to members of the public and/or their property.

There are a couple of other matters which I will not go into in detail. However, section 65 relates to railways connecting with wharves and section 66 relates to sidings. There are some matters at which it may be advantageous to look, as this Act will cease to exist if the amending Bill or the repealing Bill is carried.

There are other matters to which I would like to refer in respect of the railways. In fact, it relates to more than railways. Clause 4 refers to the exclusion of services of which the predominant purpose is the carriage of goods. Although I recognise that the main purpose of the public transport system is to transport people, it seems that we could do without that exclusion without doing any great damage to the Bill.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They can carry goods as long as they do not exclusively carry goods. I think you would find that that is so. However, we will talk about it later.

Mr O'NEILL: The Minister says that it relates to services that are confined to the exclusive carriage of goods. He may be able to put a good argument in respect of that. In relation to the Bus and Tramways Act, some matters have been raised with me and others concerned me when I noted them. One of the first is the new provision under clause 6 of the amending Bill, which relates to the authority of the Minister. The tramways union has expressed some concern that there has been an alteration in the verbiage, in that section 13 of the existing State Transport Authority Act states:

> In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the authority shall, except where it makes or is required to make a recommendation to the Minister, be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

The union is concerned that the proposed replacement clause will read:

> The authority shall be subject to the control and direction of the Minister.

It has been suggested that the phrase 'except where it makes or is required to make a recommendation to the Minister' should remain.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I think it is just better wording. I think they are exactly the same.

Mr O'NEILL: Well, if they are exactly the same it would probably make some people happy if it was left as it is—that would result in no injury to anyone. The other point that I am somewhat concerned about relates to the powers of delegation. Clause 12 (1) of Division II, which deals with delegation, states:

> The authority may delegate to any member, officer or employee of the authority any of its powers or functions under this Act or any other Act.

There is a significant omission from the existing provision, in that section 14 (1) of the State Transport Authority Act states:

> The authority may delegate to any member, officer or employee of the authority any of its powers or functions, except this power of delegation, under this Act or under any other Act.

I wonder why that exception has been excluded. Perhaps the Minister can explain that at a later stage.

Another point that I would like the Minister to clarify relates to the relationship between the State Transport Authority, road authorities, local government and so on. Clause 22 states:

> (2) Where the authority proposes to commence using a public street or road, on a regular basis, for the purposes of providing public transport services, the authority shall, at least one month before it commences regular use of the street or road, give notice in writing of the proposal to the relevant road maintenance authority.
>
> (3) Before making a determination under subsection (1) *(b)* in relation to a public street or road, the authority shall consult with the relevant road maintenance authority and shall take into account the views of that road maintenance authority.

I seek some clarification. Section 33 (2) of the Bus and Tramways Act provides:

> A road authority may refuse its consent under subsection (1) of this section only on the ground that the operation of motor omnibuses on the road would cause unreasonable damage to the road.

I understand that, regarding roads to which there may be some damage, in the past a compromise has been reached and financial responsibility has been accepted by the S.T.A. in relation to upgrading such a road. I wonder whether this will be the position in the future or whether some change is projected in the Bill. Will the Minister clarify that point? Section 67 of the Bus and Tramways Act states:

> Except with the consent of the Governor, the authority shall not assign, lease, or grant licences to work its business or any part thereof.

I believe there is an argument for retaining this provision, because I understand that the assent of the Governor in cases of this nature requires that the information must then be made public. In view of the well-known commitment of the Government to keep the public informed, there should be no argument about maintaining such a provision.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister suggested that the current legislation did not provide for the modern automated and semi-automated vehicular systems that were now becoming possible because of the advance in technology. Will the Minister indicate to what he is referring? Some people who are employed in the various industries are concerned about the effects that such automated or semi-automated systems may have on employment in various services. Will the Minister say whether he was referring only to vehicular systems or also to ticketing and other systems that are integral to the industry? This information

would be of some assistance in overcoming the very real concerns of some people in the industry.

I believe that other members on this side at a later stage in the debate will want to raise certain matters. I am sure that the Minister has noted the matters that I have raised, and I would be most grateful if he indicates, when he replies in this debate, the effect of the Bill in those areas.

The last point relates to the Railways Transfer Agreement Act. Concerned people in the railways have suggested to me that this may be the thin end of the wedge to undermine the agreement and to sink and destroy railway passenger services in South Australia. The Minister is shaking his head, and I appreciate that. Nevertheless, that has been put to me. I am pleased to see that that is not the case. As there are a few other points that I would like to raise, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 6 to 8 (clause 2)—Leave out 'the health of the community would be endangered, or the economic or social life of the community seriously prejudiced' and insert 'the community, or a section of the community, would be deprived of the essentials of life'.

No. 2. Page 2, line 13 (clause 3)—Leave out 'twenty-eight' and insert 'fourteen'.

No. 3. Page 2—After line 40 (clause 4) insert subclause as follows:

(2a) A direction under this section shall not impose any form of industrial conscription.

No. 4. Page 6, lines 1 to 3 (clause 11)—Leave out the clause.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

I have moved this motion, as the amendments will make the Bill unworkable.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I am pleased to see the Minister of Recreation and Sport in the Chamber. I am sure that he would have been proud of our Parliamentary bowling team which, last Friday, beat the Sturt bowling club. This was a 'first', but we are not asking for a subsidy. I think history has been made for our bowling club.

Many people in this State, including my constituents, are worried by the claims made by the Premier when, as Leader of the Opposition, he opened the Opposition's campaign at the last State election. Some of the claims made at that time were far from the truth, and many promises have not been carried out. The Liberal Party is receiving only 35 per cent of the vote in the opinion polls. We are told that no-one takes any notice of the polls, but any member who moves around in his district, as I do, knows that, unless something drastic happens shortly, this Government will not survive at the next election. I do not think it has any chance to recover from the mess in which it has put the State.

The Liberal Party claimed that it would not impose double tax, that it had no plans for new State taxes, and it also said that, far from making this State great again, more taxes would destroy it. However, some taxes in this State have increased by 1 000 per cent, although the Premier said that this would not happen. Although he said he would make the State great again, we are going backwards. Something will have to be done soon to remedy this situation, especially to help those members who will be contesting seats where there will be a close fight. Everything augurs well for a change of government at the next election.

When the Liberal Party claimed at the last election that State taxes would be cut, it also claimed that those cuts would be carefully costed. The abolition of succession and gift duties, as well as land tax, has had a drastic effect. More money will have to come from somewhere. The abolition of gift and succession duties has helped only a chosen few, and that is why the present Budget deficit is so great.

The position is not improving in any way. Daily, we hear of people being unemployed and having to cut down. The people must take it. Unemployment is one of the worst things that can possibly happen to anyone. When I spoke to the member for Hartley when he was Premier, he told me that when the Labor Party lost Government the Treasury was in good condition. Money had been put aside for special projects, but that money has now gone. I do not know what the Government will sell next in this State. There is the question of the sale of the Frozen Food Factory. When will it sell the State Administration building in Victoria Square? It may be sold one day.

Mr Olsen: What do you reckon it is worth?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know—I am not in that sphere. The Government is selling off everything. We will not have any work in the Government sphere, and we will not own any buildings. We will have to start again. Nothing is better than owning your own buildings. It saves rent over a period, and in this way a building eventually pays for itself. That is not so with this Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I do not want to be sidetracked by members opposite. The member for Rocky River will be here after the next election but I am not sure about his colleague next to him.

I have heard the Premier say that he has created 14 000 new jobs. That is only natural. At the end of the school year, people get new jobs. However, we have the worst unemployment rate in Australia, and with the way we are going that will continue. The percentage of unemployment is higher in this State than in any other State, and the position has not improved at all. The only hope the Government has is in getting uranium mining going.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: Members should go around the inner suburban areas and find out what people think of the Government. I have done plenty of doorknocking lately and I can assure members opposite that they and the Premier are not going too well at all. I do not say that I am the Labor member for Unley; I just tell people my name. Some people know me and some do not, but they are not frightened to tell me how the Fraser and Tonkin Governments are going.

It is a myth that lower taxes will mean more money in one's pocket, more money to spend and more jobs created. Ever since this Government has been in power it has done more than any other State Government has done and more than any Labor Government did in increasing taxes. It had to look after the rich. I become worried when I read the press. One of the most incredible headlines I have seen was in the *News* of 8 September 1981, where the Premier stated, 'We're sick but don't give up'. What a statement to be made by the Premier of the State! How that would build

up people's confidence! People do not like headlines such as that.

Why should we not build up the State—we are not sick. The only thing the people of this State are sick of is the Tonkin Government. Parliamentary procedure has totally changed. As I pointed out recently at a conference at Raratonga, members opposite are handed questions to ask. The member for Henley Beach today asked a question concerning the lights at Football Park and the Minister, during his reply, said that the question was of interest to people throughout the State. Maybe it is, but there is more than one sport in this State, and everyone knows that the Football League had the opportunity to have an oval near Regency Park. In any case, it would be a better idea if members of this House stuck to questions concerning their own districts. The question was a Dorothy Dixer.

Mr Becker: What did you do when you were in Government?

Mr LANGLEY: Never mind about when the Labor Party was in Government. There have never been so many Dorothy Dix questions in this House, written out by Ministers (who can deny it if they like), as there are now. Furthermore, some of the members cannot even read the writing when they get them. Members opposite know that the Government is in great jeopardy, and it is about time that they bucked themselves up and looked after the people of this State.

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): It is quite amusing to sit here and listen to the rantings of the member for Unley. I do not know whether he judges other people by his Party's performance or by his own performance, but to imply that members on this side of the House do not have the capacity to think of questions themselves is certainly a gross misjudgment on his behalf. One need only look in this House from time to time to see members opposite (and on occasions I have had visitors come to this House who have been absolutely astounded by the performance of members opposite) endeavouring to read speeches written for them, and fumbling over words that they have no idea how to pronounce. They have obviously been given speeches which are totally out of character with their own personalities. So, the member for Unley should not try to judge other persons by his own dealings or by the activities of members of his own Party.

We can recall that during the debate after the Estimates Committees there was a lot of hoo hah concerning the fact that members of the Government supposedly asked Dorothy Dixers during the Budget Estimates Committees. If members will recall, on one of those occasions one of the shadow Ministers got up and, after he had thwarted progress for quite some time, suddenly said, 'I am sorry, Mr Chairman, I do not know where we are up to.' For a shadow Minister to have to ask the Chairman the stage the proceedings had reached, because he had spent the first 10 minutes raving and ranting about the validity of the Estimates Committees, does nothing for the Labor Party's own standing. I reiterate that the honourable member should not judge others by himself, because there is an old proverb which says, 'He who points the finger has four fingers pointing back at himself.' So, the Opposition would do well not to try to point a finger because it will only reflect back on themselves.

While I am talking about speeches, it is very interesting that perchance I came across a copy of the Deputy Leader's speech that he made in the House the other night about the Budget Estimates. Incredibly so, almost every word in his prepared speech was verbatim in *Hansard*, yet he was using copious notes. From little changes made to the speech, it was obvious that the thing had been written for use at a different time. However, he found himself giving a speech that evening, so he had to adapt that speech to suit that evening's proceedings. Somebody on the Opposition side must be incredibly busy writing all the speeches for members opposite so that they come out with their co-ordinated campaign or whatever it is they want to promote.

More importantly, I want to refer to a matter to which I referred earlier this afternoon during Question Time, namely, the future of the hospital that has long been a conversation piece, shall I say, in the southern area. This matter partially carries on from a motion that I moved in the House earlier saying that people should be entitled to have made available to them information regarding health facilities, health programmes, and medical advice in their own area. Unfortunately, the people in the south (as was so often the case with the Labor Government) were for many years lead along the garden path concerning the type of facility that would be made available in that area.

One of the facilities that was to be supplied in the area, and I have spoken about this before in the House, is the Hallett Cove to Hackham railway line. As I mentioned before, back in 1971 they ripped up the old line and then, in 1973, started promoting the idea that they would reinstate that line at some future time. Despite the claim that they were going to do this, and despite all their careful planning, they built a primary school smack bang alongside the railway line with the playground going right across the right of way for existing or future railway lines—very careful planning on the Opposition side and we must commend them for that.

The other thing that the then Government did was slap a moratorium on freeway systems. We know that for many years that has been a contentious point in the south—whether a freeway was ever going to be built. We know that a corridor exists for one but, again, for many years councils like the Marion council were able to get away from undertaking a certain responsibility, namely, the building of a road, because they could use as an excuse the fact that the road was too close to a transport corridor that some day might become a freeway. The easiest way for the then Minister to avoid the issue was to slap a moratorium on it to stop his having to make a hard decision as to what should be done. We know that any project put off now is going to cost that much more in years to come.

Turning back to the matter of a hospital in the south, the newspaper article to which I referred this afternoon and which appeared in the *Southern Times* of 7 October 1981, gave the background history to this hospital in the Noarlunga area. As far back as 1977, and earlier, we had certain people in that area promoting the idea of a hospital down there. I think all members of Parliament would be acquainted with one Mr Brian Wreford, who has promoted the idea of a hospital down there, and who has got to the point where he sees it more as his own hospital than as a hospital for the whole southern area. Throughout the whole debate over the years the way that this matter has been politicised has led people astray in their thinking; at all times the hospital was proposed to be a private one. I shall requote the following passage from the *Southern Times* where it states that in June 1977, referring to the then Labor Government, which is now in Opposition:

> The Government of the day ruled out the possibility of both a public hospital or a casualty clearing station for the Noarlunga area.

Quite obviously, the Government of the day had no intention of providing a public hospital in that area, yet through all the campaigning that went on in 1977 and 1979 there was always the innuendo that there was going to be a public hospital with maternity facilities. The people in the area were, shall we say, led into a certain way of thinking, were, shall we say, conned into thinking that the south was going

to be serviced by a hospital with X number of beds, a maternity section and, with a little bit of luck, a casualty retrieving section.

That was a good time to promote that sort of idea because, as was pointed out earlier, the south was isolated. There was only one access road to the city, the Main South Road, which was grossly congested. Now the situation has changed and the congestion has somewhat eased. The 1978 figures show that over 56 000 vehicles a day used the Main South Road. In 1980 the figures showed a drop of 4 000 vehicles a day using the South Road. I would say that that number has dropped considerably more since the opening of Dyson Road. Since that time this State Government has introduced the rescue helicopter. That is the sort of thing I promoted through the motion I placed before the House; medical services in that area have expanded and primary care has expanded quite considerably. The whole situation has changed quite dramatically since the years when this concept was first mooted. Again, over all those years it was never stressed strongly enough that that hospital was always to be a private one and therefore would have serviced only a select clientele.

The people were led astray to think the hospital was a more general public type hospital. The election promise that we made in 1979 was that we, as a Party, would in no way impede the progress of that private hospital, and we stressed the fact that it was a private hospital. I remember the member for Baudin this afternoon making an interjection saying my pamphlet was misleading; it was in no way misleading. It states that we would support the continuation of that private hospital, but as a Government there is no way that we can force an entrepreneur to go ahead with a project if he desires not to do so. You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make a horse drink the water. Whilst we were in no way going to impede the private developers from going ahead with their hospital, if they deemed they could not make it a justifiable project or an economical project we could not force them into going ahead with that hospital.

I feel sorry for the people in the south who over all these years were led astray into thinking that it was going to be more than a private hospital. The beauty of the announcement today was the fact that it would be brought into the public arena, where it will be stressed again and again that right from its inception it was perceived and designed to be a private hospital.

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

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I would like to refer to two matters tonight in my time in this adjournment debate. Last week I received an invitation from the Stirling North Primary School, which reads as follows:

> The Hon. the Minister of Education, the Chairman and Members of the School Council, the Principal and Staff desire the pleasure of the company of Mr G. Keneally and Mrs Keneally at the Official Opening of Stirling North Primary School by Senator Donald Jessop on Friday 13 November 1981 at 2.30 p.m.

I should say at the outset that I am delighted that this school will be officially opened because I believe I played a significant role in past years in the decision that was finally reached. It was my hope that it would be constructed during the period of the last Government but, because of planning problems that existed at that time, that was not to be. Nevertheless, to the credit of the current Government, it continued on with the programme and now we have at Stirling North a school that the State can be proud of. Certainly, the parents in that area are very proud to have it.

Because I was a local member, no doubt, and to acknowledge the role I played, I was invited to open the Stirling North Primary School. I was delighted to accept, and you can imagine my surprise some weeks later when I was contacted by an embarrassed Chairman of the Stirling North Primary School Council telling me that I would be unable to open the school because it was Government policy that Opposition members should not have that privilege. I rang up the Education Officer in my district. He said, 'That is right. We have been instructed that you are not allowed to open the school. It will be opened by someone else.' It would probably be opened by the Hon. Arthur Whyte, I was told. Imagine my surprise when I received this invitation to attend the opening of the school to be opened by Senator Donald Jessop; as a result of that I wrote a letter to the Minister of Education. I would like to read it to the House and to anyone who would like to read *Hansard* to appreciate just how small-minded this Government is. It says:

> My Dear Minister,
>
> I wish to express my absolute disgust at the petty behaviour of yourself and your Government in refusing to allow me to officiate at the opening of the Stirling North Primary School. You would be well aware that the School Council had invited me to do so, and that I had accepted. Your action no doubt greatly embarrassed the Council.
>
> No exception could have been taken to your decision if you or one of your Ministerial colleagues were to officially declare the school open, as is normal procedure. I was advised that the President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. A. Whyte, M.L.C., would officiate and I had little objection to that.
>
> Today I received an invitation which shows that a back-bench member of the Federal Parliament is to officiate at the opening. For you to approve of Senator Jessop performing the opening is not only a calculated insult to me, but insulting to all State Parliamentarians. If a South Australian member of Parliament to your liking was not available why did you not allow Mr J. Steinle, Director-General of Education, to officiate?
>
> I am not unaware of the political motives of decisions of this kind but to have a back-bench member, and a Federal one at that, come into my electorate to perform a function that I was originally to do is carrying politics a little too far.

I have checked to make sure that a similar occurrence to this has not happened before—and it has not. When in Government, the Labor Party was certainly very keen to have its own members, particularly Cabinet members, open Government buildings. I acknowledge that. However, on no occasion am I able to find in my research where a local member had been invited to open a Government building within his electorate and where that had been denied him.

I would not mind at all if it was the Minister of Education or one of his colleagues who was to come to Port Augusta to officiate at the opening, because that is the procedure. I readily acknowledge and accept that. However, the Minister of Education was so desperate to have someone from the Liberal Party come to Port Augusta to open that building that he had to get a back-bench member from Federal Parliament.

It is that Federal Parliament that he and his Government are criticising for not providing the money to South Australia that would enable us to provide adequately for our educational needs. Here we have a Senator who has done nothing for South Australia, who has never voted against the Federal Government's allocation to education in South Australia, opening a school at Port Augusta despite the wishes of the people in that area who want their local member to officiate. I will be at that opening and I wrote to the Chairman of the Stirling North Primary School Council telling him that he did me a great honour, and I appreciated that honour. My criticism tonight is not directed at the school or its council at all. It is directed at the mean-minded, petty, small-minded attitude of this Gov-

ernment. It is an absolute disgrace. It reflects upon the Government and the Minister.

If this is the sort of attitude that members of Parliament in South Australia can expect from the Government it says a lot for the description that I just gave. I am certainly upset. It is worth mentioning that very recently a Commonwealth building was opened at Port Augusta, which Mr Laurie Wallis, Federal member for Grey, was asked to open. He accepted the invitation and, in fact, his office is situated in that building. It was all arranged through the Federal department. He was told by the Federal Liberal Government that he could not open that building. Senator Don Jessop went to Port Augusta and opened that building. For goodness sake, are we to believe that Senators in Federal Parliament are of such significant status within the political arena that they should be performing roles that are obviously those of the Ministers or local members?

The other matter that I want to raise is an action that reflected on the Minister of Transport. Last week I asked the Minister of Transport a question in this House: had 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 within the Police Force? The Minister said, 'No'. However, he pointed out that while he was a member of the Opposition he had drawn his concern to the attention of the Police Commissioner at that time. That surprised me. In fact, the Minister had a temporary victory, because I had good reason to believe that the Minister had knowledge of the things that were discussed last week and had taken that matter up with his colleague. If the Minister of Transport had answered, 'No', here again I would have accepted that answer. However, he had to score a political point. He had to say, 'But I did take the matter up with the Police Commissioner when I was a member of the Opposition.' Less than an hour later, obviously because his conscience pricked him and he knew that, although he did not deliberately mislead the House, that interpretation could have been put on his action, because he knew that we knew that he had taken the matter up with the Minister, the Hon. M. M. Wilson sought leave to make a personal explanation, in which he acknowledged that he had been approached by people with complaints about alleged police corruption in relation to drugs, and that he had referred that matter to the Attorney-General. My point is that, if the Minister of Transport wants to deny that he had relayed information to the Chief Secretary, well and good. However, if he wants to score a political point by saying that when he was in Opposition he had relayed information to the Police Commissioner, it is also reasonable for him to acknowledge that, in Government, as a Minister of the State, he had relayed information that concerned him to the Attorney-General.

I am raising this point tonight because I believe that that is a very petty attitude on the part of a Minister, who, by and large, has won for himself some respect in the community. A continuation of that sort of attitude towards the role of Parliament will see that acceptance and recognition that he has won in the community destroyed very quickly.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 28 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 October 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MUNNO PARA COUNCIL

80. **Mr HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Premier changed the views he expressed when he opened Local Government Week in 1980 that his Government was introducing a form of corporate management similar to that practised by the Munno Para council and, if not, will he use his influence to protect that council's boundaries from attack by four adjoining councils?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There has been no change. Matters of changes to local government boundaries are covered by provisions of the Local Government Act.

HOUSING TRUST APPRENTICES

88. **Mr HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Housing:

1. How many apprentices were employed by the South Australian Housing Trust at 30 June 1981, what years of training were they in and what were their trades?

2. Is there to be a further intake of apprentices in 1981-82 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. No apprentices were employed by the trust as at 30/6/81.

2. No, because work is being carried out by private contractors.

RENDELSHAM SCHOOL

95. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Minister accept the contention made to him in a letter dated 23 July 1981 that a Rendelsham Primary School classroom is a 'safety hazard' and 'health hazard' and that the condition of the classroom is a 'disgrace' and, if not, in what way are the contentions wrong and, if so, what action will be taken and when to rehabilitate the classroom pending construction of the new school?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Contentions, made in a letter dated 23 July 1981 that a classroom at Rendelsham Primary School is a safety and health hazard, have been investigated. The result of this investigation shows that no issues exist which constitute definite health and safety hazards. This building is old and to repair it new footings and flooring are required as the supporting stumps have subsided. The cost involved in upgrading the building cannot be justified. The Regional Director of Education is currently looking for a suitable transportable building as a replacement for this particular classroom.

DRIVERS LICENCES

139. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister given any consideration to marginally reducing the size of the current driving licence and its plastic cover so as to more readily fit into a standard size leather wallet?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: All forms printed for use by the Motor Registration Division conform to metric sizes to take advantage of the most economical cuts of paper. The size of the driver's licence is A6.

H. C. MEYER

156. **Mr PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine:

1. What was the total purchase price of all spares in stock for the *H. C. Meyer?*

2. What is the estimated total replacement cost of all such spares?

3. What does the Government intend to do with the spares and the *H. C. Meyer* and, if they are to be disposed of, in what manner?

4. What is the estimated total current market value of the *H. C. Meyer* and spares?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Spare parts held against the dredge *H. C. Meyer* cost $200 000.

2. $350 000.

3. Some of the spares will be suitable for use on other departmental plant. However, the majority will be surplus and eventually offered for sale by public tender. A decision has not yet been made in regard to the future of *H. C. Meyer.*

4. It is not possible to put a market value, as such, on the *H. C. Meyer* and spares. The vessel, in its present condition, and the spares would be worth only the amount that a purchaser would be prepared to offer and that would be influenced by its intended use.

RESEARCH FACILITIES

176. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What research facilities are available to the Premier and each other Minister, respectively?

2. Are these research facilities and the personnel so employed being made available to other members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and, if so, for what purposes, who are the members involved, on how many occasions and what was the cost involved?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The services of their Ministerial officers, and of public servants in their respective departments.

2. No.

NORTH BRIGHTON LAND

202. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Why was 'allotment 105, a portion of section 235 and other land in the area named North Brighton (L.T.R.O. File Plan No. 2997)', as detailed on page 1904 of the *Government Gazette* of 25 June 1981 offered for sale?

2. Was consideration given to the possible deleterious effects on the coastal environment of the development of this vacant land and, if so, by whom, what opinion was given and why and, if not, why not?

3. Has the land now been sold and, if so, to whom, for what price and under what conditions and, if not, is the Government prepared to withdraw it from sale and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. It was surplus land.

2. *(a)* Yes.

(b) The Coast Protection Board.

(c) It was considered that the range of development options would not be deleterious to the coastal environment and that a better option for possible development has become available.

3. *(a)* Yes, on 8 July 1981.

(b) It is considered inappropriate to divulge the purchaser's name or the sale price.

(c) Vide *(b)*.

(d) Normal conditions of sale applied.

(e) Vide *(a)*.