

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 24, 1973

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.8 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.39 p.m. and the Speaker resumed, the Chair.

DEATH OF HON. H. K. KEMP

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this House express its regret at the recent death of the Hon. H. K. Kemp, former member for Southern District in the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious public service; and as a mark of respect to the memory of the late member, the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.15 p.m.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. The late Harry Kemp was a stalwart of his Party, and devoted to the principles he saw in it. It is most unfortunate that the situation that has arisen was so closely associated with the events of the most recent session of Parliament. The late honourable member showed, in his determination to see a certain piece of legislation through, that he would not bend or look to save himself in any way. Even against the advice of medical advisers and of others that he should leave the precincts of the House sooner than he did, he saw fit to say, "My vote may yet be required." I believe that the late Harry Kemp died with a smile on his face, in the sense that he had been able to discharge his responsibilities to the organization that saw him into the Upper House.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 12.43 to 2.15 p.m.]

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, informed the House that he had reserved the following Bills for the signification of Her Majesty the Queen's pleasure thereon:

Constitution Act Amendment (Franchise),
Constitution and Electoral Acts Amendment (Council Elections).

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

STATE AID

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith. I think I should point out that the motion I would seek—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Couldn't you get your Leader—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister cares to listen to the terms of the motion I should like to move, he may understand the purpose for my moving to have Standing Orders suspended.

Dr. Eastick: We work as a team.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Government will permit me, in the 10 minutes allowed me by Standing Orders to canvass the reasons for my motion to suspend Standing Orders, I will proceed to give those reasons. If my motion to suspend Standing Orders is successful, I intend to move the following motion:

That in the opinion of this House the recent decision of the Commonwealth Government to withdraw aid from some independent schools should be revoked.

I think my reasons for seeking to bring this matter before the House should be readily apparent to all members. The fact is that at present there is grave concern and disquiet amongst members of a large section of the community in South Australia on this matter.

Mr. Wright: Whom are you talking about—St. Peters?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Adelaide cares to listen, he may perhaps be enlightened by what I say, even though my remarks are limited by the terms of the present motion.

Mr. Wright: They'll be limited all right; I know that much.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that many people in the community who are involved with independent schools are concerned about this matter. I submit that this matter is of interest to this Parliament, because the question of State aid to schools is a matter of State Government policy. The State Government has enunciated a policy in connection with State aid, and I believe that policy conflicts with the policy of the Commonwealth Labor Government. The State Labor Government has commissioned reports on these matters, the most recent being the report of the Cook committee, an expert committee set up by the Minister of Education in this State. The results of that investigation were made public only last week. Anyone who has studied that report will realize that it conflicts directly with the recommendations of the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, I submit that it is within the competence of this House to debate this matter, which has caused considerable divisions within the community.

I believe that there is general acceptance amongst people that the matter of aid to independent schools should come within the province both of the State Government and of the Commonwealth Government. I realize that, whilst I am speaking to this motion to suspend Standing Orders, I am not at liberty to canvass many of the matters concerned. Although my subsequent motion relates to an action of the Commonwealth Government, there are many precedents of other motions in this House dealing with other matters with which the Commonwealth Government was involved. I remember that, soon after I entered this House, a motion was sponsored by the Government (I think the Premier moved it) relating to the 50c a gallon (4.55l) wine excise imposed by a Commonwealth Liberal Government. That motion, which was debated at length in this House by Government and Opposition members, dealt with an action of the Commonwealth Government, so let there be no argument on this occasion that the motion I seek to move does not come within the jurisdiction of this House. I urge all members

to consider this matter seriously. I believe the impact of this Commonwealth Government decision—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has the right to speak for 10 minutes in explaining the reasons, why he has moved that Standing Orders be suspended. The debate must be confined purely to the reasons for the suspension; there must be no debate on the subject matter of a subsequent motion that the honourable member intends to discuss later. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am canvassing the point that an objection may be raised that this topic is not within the competence of this Parliament. However, I submit that Standing Orders should be suspended, because this matter is within the competence of this Parliament to consider. Furthermore, precedent for such action was set by the Labor Government in this House: I recall vividly the Government's debating the matter of wine tax at great length in this House. I ask for the co-operation of the House in this matter, because it is an issue of grave concern not only to those administering independent schools in this State (and I refer to Catholic schools as well as to those run by other denominations and organizations) but also to the parents of students attending those schools. This matter should be debated at the first opportunity in this House. This is the first opportunity we have had to raise this matter in the proper place, which is in the Parliament of this State. We seek the co-operation of the Government in allowing us to debate this motion, and we look forward to that co-operation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member, but the Government will not co-operate by agreeing to a suspension of Standing Orders for a discussion on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members (at least those who have been in this House for a little while) will realize that there are proper means for the Opposition and for private members to bring discussion of matters before this house.

Mr. Millhouse: And this is a proper one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not, and the honourable member knows well that it is not.

Mr. Millhouse: But there is something—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If honourable members will listen for a moment—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am discussing the motion to suspend Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: That is the only matter that can be discussed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; that is all I intend to discuss. Regarding the merits of the motion, there are some things that I could say with some force—

Mr. Millhouse: Then why not agree to a suspension of Standing Orders? Why not open it up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite have an opportunity to do that. There are two occasions when Opposition members or private members have an opportunity to pre-empt Government business before this House, apart from occasions when private members' business is open. More assistance and opportunity is given to private members to raise matters in this Parliament than in any other Parliament in this nation. This is something I have always supported, and I will continue to do so. Standing Orders provide two means or bases of pre-empting Government business. First, apart from the grievance areas or

the times when honourable members may move private members' business in this House, there is an urgency motion, but this is not one and cannot be contended to be one within the meaning of Standing Orders.

Dr. Eastick: But don't you think it is an important matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite know what Standing Orders provide on matters of urgency. The other—

Dr. Tonkin: We want to have it discussed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will have an opportunity within a few days to discuss this matter fully in the Address in Reply debate, and he knows that perfectly well.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He can discuss it to his heart's content.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and members opposite may discuss it for as long as they choose to sit here for the Address in Reply debate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The other opportunity available to honourable members, as they know, is by moving a motion of no confidence in the Government, supported clearly by a sufficient number of members opposite who call for the immediate suspension of Government business to deal with the matter.

Dr. Tonkin: We can do it that way, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, honourable members opposite have an opportunity on matters concerned with urgency or with the government of South Australia, but I do not intend (and it will not happen in the Parliament in which we are the Government) that Government business will be pre-empted for a pure matter of opinion relating to another Government to be expressed by members of this House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's more than an opinion.

Mr. Gunn: What did you do in the past?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What we have done in the past is introduce matters to this House in the proper order of business.

Dr. Tonkin: Popycock!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite have the full opportunity to do that under Standing Orders. I can imagine what honourable members opposite would have said (including the member for Mitcham, during the time he sat behind Sir Thomas Playford) if the Labor Opposition had had the gall to stand up on the first day of a session and move a motion on a matter of opinion about the Commonwealth Government, thus pre-empting Government business. Sir Thomas Playford would have given such a motion short shrift.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Sir Thomas Playford and other honourable members would have given them short shrift.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What business that is more important have you to discuss today?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite may be interested in certain Ministerial statements that are of considerable importance.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You know you will get time for them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We know that we will, and that time will not be at the expense of pre-empting Government business on a matter that is purely seeking an opinion about another Government.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the wine tax debate? That's a bit embarrassing!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is not the slightest reason for this debate, and the honourable member knows it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the attention of honourable members to Standing Orders. If honourable members will not confine themselves to Standing Orders, they will be dealt with accordingly. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders will prevail and I think that all honourable members, irrespective of the length of their service in this House, understand the provisions of Standing Orders in relation to the Speaker when he is on his feet. I will not tolerate any deviation from Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: For the motion say "Aye", against say "No". As I hear a dissentient voice, it will be necessary for the House to divide.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hoppood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

GRANT HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Grant High School, Mount Gambier (Additions).

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LAND PRICES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. On May 16 the Government announced that a land commission would be established to exercise restraint over the price of building blocks in the Adelaide metropolitan area. It was explained that no vacant allotments below half an acre (0.2025 ha) in size, with water services, purchased as from that date, could be resold at a price in excess of the purchase price, plus an additional annual 7 per cent of that price, plus rates and taxes. This was followed by a further announcement that a land development unit, headed by a steering committee to advise on land purchase and development activities, had been formed under the control of the Minister of Lands to enable the Government's policies on land price control to be administered in a co-ordinated way.

The unit, which has commenced its operations under the guidance of the steering committee, is responsible to the Director of Lands for direct dealings with private companies responsible for the subdivision of Government land. It will work with Government departments and authorities in the

co-ordination of services to subdivisions and with the Housing Trust in the preparation of subdivisional plans. The unit will advise on the purchase and subdivision of available land parcels and will oversee the co-ordination of such services as roads, sewerage, gas and electricity to new subdivisions. As several questions have been raised relating to the Government's policy on land price control, I would like now to clarify these points. The questions which have been asked and the Government's replies are as follows:

(1) How long will the controls be in existence? Answer: In terms of the investigations made by the working party on the stabilization of land prices, the application of controls should be for an indefinite period in order to ensure that a balance is struck between the supply and demand for vacant serviced allotments.

(2) Does the 7 per cent mark-up suggested allow for expenses incurred in buying and selling the allotment? Answer: The percentage mark-up of 7 per cent a year will apply to the contract price for the sale of the land. An additional amount may be allowed to the vendor for expenses actually incurred in meeting his proportion of rates and taxes, stamp duties, registration fees and road moieties, if the latter have been incurred. No allowance will be made for legal fees directly associated with the transfer of the land, brokerage fees, interest paid to a mortgagee, selling commissions, and expenses associated with the holding of the land, such as the erection of fencing, surveying fees, and fire break clearing.

(3) Does the percentage mark-up commence from the time a contract is signed or when the transfer is lodged for registration? Answer: It is intended that the proposed legislation will be made retrospective and that the percentage mark-up will commence from the date on which the contract is signed and not from the date on which the memorandum of transfer is lodged in the Lands Titles Office.

(4) How would the legislation affect sales made on agreement for sale and purchase? Answer: My comments on the previous question are relevant. The operative date would be the date of signing the sale and purchase agreement.

(5) How would this legislation affect the sale of allotments by public auction? Answer: As the proposed legislation is intended to control the price of vacant allotments, consequently no exemption to the application of the 7 per cent mark-up would be made in respect of land sold by auction.

(6) Is it intended to control all building allotments? Answer: As the intended price control relates to all residentially-zoned land, therefore it would apply to all vacant allotments.

(7) What protection can be afforded to those persons dealing in real estate matters as their livelihood, that is, solicitors, land brokers, agents, and salesmen, against unscrupulous members of the public (it has been announced that agents, etc., will lose their licences if they are a party to transactions where "they should have known" about black market practices)? Answer: It is intended to introduce a validation test on each transaction and this will rely on the completion of an information notice by the land agent, who will therefore be required to discharge his normal responsibilities in respect of any transactions relative to the 7 per cent mark-up, and these of course will then include the completion of the notice. Bearing this in mind, it is intended that the legislation will place the onus for malpractice on the vendor, and also on the agent where collusion is proven.

(8) How is the 7 per cent calculated: on a monthly or annual basis? Answer: The 7 per cent mark-up applicable to any transaction would be calculated on a pro rata basis, but the actual manner of application is still under consideration and will be announced shortly.

(9) What is the present position regarding the responsibility of agents who have listed and perhaps sold land for clients since May 16, before the queries raised had been clarified? Answer: As previously stated, the proposed legislation is intended to be retrospective. However, each case will be treated on its merits.

QUESTIONS

PROCEDURE

The SPEAKER: Before calling on Question Time, I indicate, especially for the benefit of new members, that Standing Orders provide that a brief question may be asked seeking information but that the approval of the Speaker and of other honourable members of the House must be obtained before an explanation may be made. If the Speaker or any other honourable member withdraws his leave for the explanation to be made, the honourable member must immediately ask his question and may proceed no further. I bring the provisions of Standing Orders to the notice of members, not so much for the benefit of those who have been members of previous Parliaments but mainly for the benefit of those members present in their first Parliament, so that they will be conversant with Question Time procedure.

STATE AID

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what action his Government has taken to acquaint the Commonwealth Government of its grave concern that the decision of the Commonwealth Government to withdraw aid from some independent schools is in direct conflict with the policy of the South Australian Government? The so-called Karmel report, which is actually the report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, is contrary to the information made available to (and acted on by) this Parliament through what is known as the Cook report. Indeed, the action taken by the Government of increasing the sum to be distributed in this State to \$550,000 in 1973-74 is in direct conflict with the action now contemplated by the Commonwealth Government. As this is a matter of policy, rather than one specifically for consideration by the Minister of Education, and so that this House may be made fully aware of the action taken by the Government at the highest level, I direct my question to the Premier.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Discussions on this matter have occurred between Ministers of Education and—

Dr. Eastick: How fruitful?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has been made clear by the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) that the Commonwealth Government does not expect any change to take place with respect to the policies that the State Governments are following on aid to independent schools. However, before members opposite really start to raise scares about independent schools in general, I think it is worth noting that the proposals of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission which have been adopted by the Commonwealth Government involve an increase in aid for independent schools in South Australia, in the years 1974 and 1975, from about \$6,750,000 to about \$9,750,000 and this covers the whole range of Commonwealth aid.

Therefore, the Leader's argument, if he has an argument, is in relation not to the total amount of assistance that is being granted by the Commonwealth Government in terms broadly of the report of the schools commission but to the fact that the schools commission recommended that the money made available should be allocated on a different basis. I suggest to members opposite, especially the Leader, that they carefully examine the report of the schools commission, because the basis on which that report reached its conclusion with respect to category A schools was that independent schools showed standards of resource used per student which ranged from a figure below the Government's standard to a figure greater than two and a half times the Government's standard. In other words, if the index for the standard of resource used per student in Government schools was put at 100, in independent schools it varied from as low as 70 to as high as 260, and there were some independent schools whose standard of education, in terms of the criteria used by the committee, was almost four and a half times higher than that of the poorest independent schools. There was this factor of extreme variation in standards.

Further, in its recommendations the committee aimed for a certain target to be achieved by all schools in 1979 (six years hence) in terms of increased educational effort per student, and it had to face the question of what to do about those schools which, in terms of its own standard of measurement, already had a standard of education greater than the 1979 target for all other schools.

Mr. Rodda: Through self-help.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I sincerely suggest to the member for Victoria that it is not just a matter of self-help: it is also a matter of the ability to pay fees.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And that hasn't been assessed.

The SPEAKER: Order! As Speaker of this House, I will not tolerate any Minister or other honourable member prolonging a reply by further questioning and by interjecting. Interjections will be immediately ruled out of order, and I will not tolerate what has happened previously. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The committee had to face the question of what to do about those schools whose standard was already higher, even if Commonwealth aid were withdrawn, than the 1979 target for the rest of the schools in Australia, and it reached a certain decision, which the Commonwealth Government has accepted. At a meeting of the National Council of Independent Schools held here in Adelaide, I made the same point: that what needs to be done, if there is any argument about the interim committee's report, is either to challenge the basis on which the educational standard is measured or, if that cannot be challenged, to challenge the moral conclusion that was reached by the interim committee to the effect that the Commonwealth Government had a priority to assist those schools that were below the 1979 target for schools on average, rather than to continue assisting those schools which in 1973 already had a standard of education above the 1979 target for the remainder of schools throughout Australia.

That is the critical question on which one has to make up one's mind. One may agree or disagree with the interim committee's conclusion, but to suggest that that conclusion was not arrived at without a reasonable assessment of the situation, or without a reasonable consideration of it, is completely without foundation.

Dr. Eastick: Is the Cook assessment—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is done in a different way. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker: I realize that the Leader of the Opposition has great difficulty in observing Standing Orders, and I must not offend even though he does. St. Peters College has been in existence in this State for about 123 years, and for 119 years of that period it had not even one cent of aid from either the State Government or the Commonwealth Government: it has only had any aid over the last four years. If anyone suggests that St. Peters College, or a school in that situation, will go out of existence because of this, he is talking through his hat and raising fears unnecessarily. Certainly, some of these schools will have various difficulties but to suggest that they will close their doors is a load of rubbish.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Some will.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may know more about which schools are in that category than I do, but I shall be very surprised if any schools whatsoever close as a consequence, because the basic fact of the matter is that in the years 1974 and 1975 the Commonwealth Government is increasing the total amount of aid to independent schools, over and above the amount of assistance they had previously, by 45 per cent. It has been argued that this discriminates against those schools that are better off. In fact, the taxation system operating in this country already discriminates in favour of the schools that are better off. Be that as it may, the argument (if there is an argument) is an argument as to how aid should be allocated among independent schools. To suggest that the Commonwealth Government is against independent schools when in this State it has increased the amount of aid from \$6,750,000 to \$9,750,000 is the greatest lot of hogwash I have ever heard. Even if the Leader (who I see has a copy of the report) is under pressure from his colleagues, especially his shadow Minister (who ought to know better), I am surprised that he would suggest what he has suggested in his question. I ask him to think again. The question at issue is not independent schools as against Government schools; it is not that independent schools in aggregate have been hard done by, because the amount of assistance is increasing. The total enrolments at independent schools will increase as a consequence of the actions of the Commonwealth Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members may laugh, but I am willing to put my money where my mouth is, instead of following the normal practice of members opposite, who usually place their feet in that position.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier inform members about the sittings of the House during this week and for the rest of the session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the business before the House follows its normal course, it is not intended to ask members to sit during the evenings this week. Members will not be asked to sit on Thursday this week. So many Ministers will be away attending Ministerial conferences in other States that it is not intended that the House will sit on Thursday. From next week until the end of the session, honourable members will be asked to sit on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. During show week, there will be the normal adjournment of one week. Otherwise, the House is expected to sit until the end of November. The House is then expected to rise, returning for the completion of the session about the middle of February.

TARIFF REDUCTION

Mr. COUMBE: As South Australia could be the State most affected by the Commonwealth Labor Government's recent decision to cut tariffs by 25 per cent, because in the manufacturing sector we are so dependent on the motor vehicle and pressed metal industries (including consumer durables), can the Premier say whether the Government, in an effort to protect the workers of this State, has had undertaken a study of the adverse effects these tariff cuts will have on employment in South Australia? Further, does the Premier agree that the future security of many jobs in these sectors could be in jeopardy and that most workmen want security and tenure of employment rather than relocation, as has been suggested by the Commonwealth Government? I point out that what the Commonwealth Government has suggested could result in several cases of reclassification that would be unsatisfactory to the workmen concerned.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally enough, the Government is concerned about the effects of the tariff reduction on South Australian industry, and we immediately consulted with the Senior Government Economist and with our tariff advisers on the effect of the tariff cuts on industry in South Australia. We undertook several discussions with industry leaders in this State regarding the effects on their area of industry. The reactions to the tariff reduction have varied widely, often even in the same sector of industry. Indeed, the responses have not by any means been uniform in forecasting the result of the tariff reduction on industry in South Australia. However, I assure the honourable member of our concern in this matter and indicate that our investigations are proceeding. The Government has made clear that where an industry foresees a grave and adverse effect the Government will give every assistance in the preparation of a case for special assistance to be put to the Commonwealth Government so that that industry can counteract the effects of the tariff reduction. Our work in this area is continuing, as this is an area of constant concern to us.

CO-EDUCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Education indicate the policy of his department on co-education at Le Fevre Boys Technical High School? Will the school commence the 1974 school year as a co-educational secondary school? If so, what effect will this development have on Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School if this school is to remain a segregated secondary school? I was recently approached on this matter by constituents whose daughters at present attend Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School and who are concerned that the implementation of a co-educational system at Le Fevre Boys Technical High School will require their children to leave their present school and attend the Le Fevre co-educational secondary school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should make one point clear from the start: if we make a school co-educational during one year and retain a single-sex school such as Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School, (here is no compulsion on parents to transfer their children, say, from Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School to Le Fevre Boys Technical High School. The position regarding the establishment of co-educational schools and comprehensive schools in South Australia is that it is the Government's policy to move in that direction. However, it is not possible to wave a magic wand and make all these changes overnight. Regarding the situation at Le Fevre, we must ensure that the transition to a co-educational situation at that school is married in with the transition at Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School, and that is what we intend to do. It will not be possible to achieve a

transition at Port Adelaide before 1976, and we have therefore decided to postpone any generalized development of a co-educational high school at Le Fevre until 1975. However, next year we may further develop the existing situation where there is at the Matriculation (or fifth-year) level co-operation in education between the Le Fevre school and the Port Adelaide school. From that situation may develop what is virtually a co-educational Matriculation class at Le Fevre, but I point out that such a decision would be made entirely in terms of the interest of the schools in general in that area, and not with any purpose of delaying the transition to co-education generally.

The Government and the Education Department see advantages in co-education and in the development of comprehensive secondary schools. Indeed, the transition of Le Fevre Boys Technical High School to co-education will be easier than the transition of Port Adelaide Girls Technical High, because of the inadequate craft and science facilities, in particular, at the Port Adelaide school. The decision that both schools shall be transformed into co-educational and comprehensive schools is clear-cut, and that action will be taken. In the case of Le Fevre Boys Technical High School, it will mean co-education on a full basis in 1975.

GLADSTONE GAOL

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question concerning the Gladstone Gaol?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary is not aware of the origin of any rumour regarding the Gladstone Prison. Plans for extensions to shower and messing facilities are far advanced. No departmental recommendation for closure has been made. Any decision on the future of the prison will be considered in the light of the forthcoming report from the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee. With regard to the Gladstone police station, the original contractor accepted for this work, encountered financial difficulties soon after work commenced and a new contract was let on May 16, 1973. It is expected that work will be completed in February, 1974.

PRISONER DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to consider the introduction of a schedule of payments to be made to prisoners who suffer a residual disability as a result of an accident sustained during employment in penal institutions in South Australia? I understand that, if a prisoner is injured at present and suffers a residual disability, perhaps the loss of a finger, the Government makes a gratuitous payment, but I do not believe this is good enough. A schedule should be prepared so that a prisoner is adequately compensated in such a situation. The death of a prisoner, when the prisoner is killed during the course of his employment as a prisoner, should be covered by the payment of the full benefit provided under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask the Chief Secretary to look into the matter and provide an answer.

FALL-OUT PROTECTION

Mr. HALL: What will the Minister of Works and his department do if the radio-active level in our water supply exceeds the safety level recommended by the World Health Organization? I refer to the report in this morning's *Advertiser* of the Minister's comments on this matter, as follows:

"Depending on atmospheric conditions, it will be two to three weeks before any fall-out from the French nuclear tests in the Pacific passes over Australia," he said. "We have based this estimate on the experience in 1971 and 1972

when radiation was recorded at Bolivar after French tests." Mr. Corcoran said a peak of 860 pico-curies a litre had been recorded in September, 1971.

Will the Minister now add to this brief statement on this topic? By taking his statement as reported, it means that in 1971 tests had shown that we used 86 per cent of our safety level: we had absorbed 860 pico-curies a litre out of an allowable 1,000. If that is so, it represents a close approach to the danger level for the South Australian community. However, I do not wish to cause undue alarm and I therefore ask the Minister to explain his remark. I hope he can shed a light different from the statement attributed to him in this morning's press.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the statement I made was perfectly clear. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has been testing for radio-activity in water not only in its reservoirs but also in rainwater tanks in certain parts of the State since 1968. In 1971 and 1972, when the French Government conducted atom bomb tests, the results of the tests taken, as indicated in the statement, revealed that the highest level reached was 860 pico-curies a litre. I thought the figure was 840. However, 860 was the highest level, and it applied for an extremely short time following rain.

Mr. Hall: Was that in the reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it was in a rainwater tank, and this was the point intended to make. The honourable member would be aware that the result of a sample taken from a rainwater tank would be likely to be much higher than one taken from a reservoir, because the large body of water in a reservoir would quickly eliminate, reduce or diminish any radio-activity. That is the difference, in fact. Yesterday I stated categorically that I thought it was not likely that there would be any danger from the present tests to the drinking water in this State. However, I did give the undertaking (which I thought was perfectly reasonable) that tests would be stepped up and that at any time that it rained in the State tests would be taken not only from rainwater tanks but also from reservoirs in various parts of the State, and I said that, if there was any significant increase in radio-activity, I would make the public aware of it. I think the highest count reached in 1972 was about 130 pico-curies a litre and, as the honourable member has already said, the World Health Organization standard rests at 1 000 pico-curies a litre. I may say that this standard, as with all World Health Organization standards, is a fairly stringent requirement. In other words, it is perfectly safe. That is the standard laid down, and I have no fears that that standard will be anywhere near approached in the tests that are taken. If there is any significant increase in radio-activity, particularly in rainwater tanks, I will advise the people not to use rainwater. Of course, I would be advised on that matter by health authorities: I would not act without advice. I think that would be as far as we could go. Perhaps, if the worst happened, we could turn to beer, soft drink, or something like that. Seriously, however, I do not think the position will get as bad as that. I made the statement merely to let the people of South Australia know that we would be watching the matter closely and that we would tell them if there was any change in the count.

UNIVERSITY LECTURES

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of allowing lectures provided by the universities to Matriculation students in the various subjects that can be studied at the universities to be either

video-taped or taped so that all country Matriculation students may have the benefit of hearing these lectures? At present these lectures are given at the universities, and country Matriculation students must come to Adelaide to get the benefit of them. However, unfortunately these trips to Adelaide are made at the inconvenience and expense not only of the students and parents but also of the schools. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will investigate the possibility of having the lectures taken to the students rather than have the students come to Adelaide for the lectures.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up the matter with the universities and find out whether they are willing to meet, from their own budgets, the cost of taping or video-taping such lectures.

PETROL STATIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier give his assurance that the independence of privately owned retail petrol outlets will be preserved in any proposed legislation to rationalize the number of petrol outlets in the metropolitan area? Furthermore, will he give his assurance that such privately owned retail outlets may transfer their franchise from one oil company to another without penalty and without losing their right to retail petrol under such legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am perfectly willing to give an assurance on both those matters. The legislation is designed, as far as it is possible to do so, to retain private ownership of petrol reselling outlets. One of the big problems that arose from the one-brand petrol station activity was that the oil companies entered petrol reselling to the detriment of the previously privately owned and independently owned petrol reselling outlets.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am pleased to hear the applause from members opposite, because those who are applauding were not here in 1955 when I, as a private member, introduced legislation in this House designed to do exactly what I am talking about, and that legislation was refused by the then Liberal Government as being an interference with the private rights of oil companies.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There's been a change of heart.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, the objective is to retain privately owned outlets and to allow a change in the brands of petrol being sold through those outlets, so far as that can be arranged. The honourable member must be aware that part of the problem for those who had signed one-brand petrol station agreements while owning their outlets was that the companies then got together in some kind of an ungentlemanly agreement that one company would not take over an outlet that had been operated previously by another oil reseller. The objective is to ensure adequate competition.

STATE INSURANCE

Mr. SLATER: Will the Premier find out whether it is the standard practice of the State Government Insurance Commission to suspend an insurance policy following a claim on the policy by the insured? I am aware of an instance of a suspension of a policy following claims by an organization in relation to the policy. I know that the organization complied with all requirements of the policy, and the commission made the suspension by formal letter, without any discussion with the insured party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will do that, and I shall be grateful if the honourable member gives me the details of the case so that I may inquire of the commission.

ELECTRICITY TARIFF

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works negotiate with the Electricity Trust of South Australia to have that organization change its regulations regarding the conditions of supply of J tariff power so that no consumer is penalized for conserving energy by installing a solar energy collector plant for use in his house? The Minister knows that the whole world is now conscious of the need to conserve power because of the reducing deposits and resources of fossil fuel. The Electricity Trust regulations provide that, if a person installs equipment to supplement the normal electricity supply, he loses the right to a J tariff. I believe in this modern day and age that we cannot afford to impose that penalty on a person who has the enterprise, initiative and ability to install a solar energy plant. I therefore ask the Minister to negotiate with the trust to have this regulation changed so that people can still obtain power at the J tariff rate when they have a solar energy plant installed on the property they own.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have already discussed this matter with the Electricity Trust. The trust does not believe (and I agree with its view) that it should have to provide a service wherever it is required at whatever it may cost and then have people wanting to do something else to obtain power and at the same time use the power supplied by the trust at the same rate as is charged to people who utilize Electricity Trust of South Australia power completely. In other words, we give an incentive to encourage people to use the trust's power for such appliances as water heaters because of the very large capital cost the trust has incurred in supplying electricity throughout the whole of this State. The honourable member is suggesting that people who choose to install a solar energy plant should receive the same incentives as those received by people who use only the trust's power. The trust is certainly interested in looking at the use of solar power, but on a very much larger scale. In spite of what has been said recently about developments in the use of solar power, my information is that we have still got a very long way to go and that it will be a long time

before we will have a cheap and efficient means of pro-

ducing power from solar energy.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: At least 15 years.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be longer than

that.

Mr. Evans: Not for domestic use.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Sacred Heart College has had a solar energy plant for some time, and other units exist throughout the State. In this morning's *Advertiser* it is reported that a person has asked the Commonwealth Government to develop this type of thing. Because of the large capital outlay the trust incurs in providing power to people throughout the State, it has no intention at this stage of changing its regulations to provide an incentive to people to install solar energy plants. We want to provide incentives to them to use the trust's power, not for them to use power from other sources. I do not think many people would be interested in using solar energy power if they examined closely the economics involved, as I think it would be cheaper to use the trust's power. I will raise the matter for the honourable member and get a considered report, but until the situation changes radically

I will certainly not be making any recommendation to the Government on behalf of the Electricity Trust to change the regulations.

STUDENT TEACHERS' ALLOWANCES

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether increased allowances for student teachers are being

considered by the Government? In representations from student teachers in my district, the main points advanced have been that an increase is justified because of the rise in the cost of living and because some Commonwealth unemployment benefits are greater than the allowances paid by the State to student teachers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter (not only the question of the size of allowance but also the terms under which allowances are paid) is being actively considered.

Mr. Millhouse: Let us hope that you bring it to a speedy conclusion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that the member for Mitcham has had difficulty in being able to ask a question this afternoon, but of course he does not hold the same position of prominence now as he did in days gone by and therefore has to wait his turn. That does not alter the effect of Standing Orders in this House, and it would be wrong of me to reply to the honourable member's interjection.

The SPEAKER: It would be out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Dramatic changes have been proposed for next year in providing Commonwealth allowances. We know that the Commonwealth allowances are to be reviewed and a review of State allowances will be made in conjunction with that review. Also, the allowance is a scholarship and not a substitute for unemployment benefits. It is not a wage, but is a scholarship or bursary or similar type of payment, and must be considered in that light. The whole question of allowances and the terms under which they are to be granted, the question of marriage and hardship allowances, and the way in which they can be integrated with Commonwealth allowances is being considered now.

Mr. Coumbe: Can we expect a determination?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has every right to expect a determination, but I am unable to say when.

Later:

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government has considered increasing allowances payable to student teachers?

The SPEAKER: Order! As this question is identical to one already asked and answered this afternoon, I rule it out of order.

STATE FINANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say for how much more money did he ask for South Australia at the recent Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings? In his Speech this morning, which, as honourable members know, is prepared for him by his Ministers, His Excellency said: ... the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to provide other than minor additional revenue grants beyond those available through the application of the formula contained in the legislation will mean that, even taking action to increase its revenues in a number of areas, my Government will not be able to avoid budgeting for a substantial deficit on Revenue Account . . .

When the Premier returned from those conferences he expressed in somewhat muted terms his disappointment at the action and attitude of the present Commonwealth Government. One can only speculate on what he would have said if the Government had been of another political colour. As the Premier has expressed disappointment at the sum given to this State, I ask how much more he sought on behalf of South Australia: in other words, how far short are we of what he regarded as desirable?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: \$20,000,000.

CAMELS DESTRUCTION ACT

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Premier a reply to my question of June 21 concerning the Camels Destruction Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I give this information, because there has been a wide expression of interest in this matter. The Camels Destruction Act seems to be an Act that does not require the administration of a Minister of the Crown. It provides that an occupier of any land, after giving the required notice in the *Government Gazette* and the press, may without reference to any Minister destroy camels trespassing on the land. Similar action may be taken by the Minister of Lands in respect of camels trespassing on Crown land. Camels licensed under the Crown Lands Act are deemed not to be trespassing, provided they are wearing authorized discs, and are excluded from the provisions of the Camels Destruction Act.

YANKALILLA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Education consider providing the following facilities at Yankalilla Area School: (1) change rooms with toilets and showers; (2) home economics centre, containing needlework, cooking, and laundry rooms with the associated facilities; and (3) completion of the library complex in accordance with the plan accepted and commenced before 1971? The Yankalilla Area School is applying for these facilities in order to bring the school into line with other State area schools: it does not seek preferential or special treatment. Concerning item (3), I am informed by officers of the school council that the contractors left the library project during 1971 and have not completed the work in accordance with the plans. I ask the Minister for his assurance and co-operation in these matters.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to investigate this matter for the honourable member.

CALLINGTON AREA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works say whether investigations have been made into a water scheme for Callington and Hartley, with a possible extension to Strathalbyn? Following earlier representation to the Engineer-in-Chief, assurances were given that these investigations would be made when the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main was completed. I understand from the noise that has been made that this project has now been completed, and it is hoped that these investigations, as promised, will be made fairly soon.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of the present situation, although I have discussed the matter from time to time with the Engineer-in-Chief. The honourable member has previously made representations to me on this matter. Further, some time ago a deputation waited on me. The Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main is on limited operation at present, and probably next October it will be fully commissioned. I shall let the honourable member know what the current situation is.

RAILWAY INQUIRY

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Transport say what action the Government intends to take in relation to the 221 recommendations of the Lees report into the operations of the South Australian Railways? Having studied the report in detail, I am now fully aware of why the member for Heysen has been so critical of the Minister's attitude to the railways. I shall therefore be interested to know what action the Government intends to take in connection with the recommendations I have referred to.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am delighted that the honourable member has at long last been able to encourage

the Leader or the Opposition Whip to make available the copy of the report that I suggested he might get. I put a copy in the Parliamentary Library for the benefit of those members who made their way there. The recommendations in the report are currently being considered, in some instances by the Railways Commissioner and his staff, and in other instances by the South Australian Railways Advisory Board, which I established. In due course recommendations will be made to me, and decisions will be made.

OODNADATTA SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Works explain why the new Samcon school at Oodnadatta is enclosed by a five-wire fence, whereas most new schools have a wire mesh fence? During a visit to Oodnadatta last May my attention was drawn to several matters relating to the new school, the most important matter being the flooding that occurred before the school was occupied. Also, it was pointed out to me that Oodnadatta has many Aborigines, who, as members know, are very fond of dogs, with the result that many dogs stray in the streets of Oodnadatta and frequently visit the schoolyard in search of food. This matter has been raised in the House several times, when members have pointed out the danger of stray dogs in schoolyards. A similar school which was completed at Marree last year has been enclosed with a wire mesh fence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I cannot answer the honourable member's question, but I shall certainly make inquiries. I take it that the fence is of normal height.

Mr. Allen: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question of cost could have been involved, although it appears that the two types of fence would cost about the same. In view of what the honourable member has said about stray dogs, I shall see what we can do about the matter. I know that some departmental officers are scheduled to visit the school soon; only yesterday I had a docket before me dealing with the general question, but not the fence. I shall bring down a report as soon as possible.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PREMISES

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier a reply to my question of June 27 about the opening of a regional centre of the Agriculture Department in Struan House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Agriculture Department will move into Struan House during this month and Struan House will become a regional centre for the South-East.

BRINKWORTH SCHOOL

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Education ensure that student accommodation, such as classrooms and craft units, is not shifted from the Brinkworth Area School before the end of the 1973 school year? Yesterday the following report, headed "School units to be moved", appeared in the country edition of the *Advertiser*:

Craft units at the Brinkworth Area School are to be transferred to Quorn. The move follows approaches to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hudson) by the Quorn Area School Council. . . . The Public Buildings Department was seeking a contract for the work and it was hoped to have the buildings re-erected towards the end of the year.

The question arises whether accommodation at the school will be adequate near the end of the year. Further, I point out that much unfinished craft work can be completed in the closing days of the school year. Because craft units were specifically mentioned in the newspaper report, I was approached by parents who were very con-

cerned about the possibility of the units being moved from the Brinkworth Area School before the end of the academic year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My instructions in relation to this matter were that the move was to take place so that the craft facilities would be available at Quorn for the beginning of the 1974 school year. In those circumstances it seems to me that there should not be any interruption to craft programmes at the Brinkworth Area School this year. As the honourable member knows, the secondary students at present at the Brinkworth Area School will attend the Clare High School next year; hence the proposition that has been referred to. I shall check the matter and ensure, to the best of my ability, that there is no interruption to craft programmes at the Brinkworth Area School.

FRUITGROWERS' FINANCES

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Attorney-General say what action the Government can take to protect the financial interests of growers in connection with claims against Brookers (Australia) Limited (in liquidation)? The statement of assets and liabilities as at July 31, 1972, lists 600 growers as unsecured creditors. When the growers made claims, they received back from the liquidator (Mr. G. J. B. Pridham) the following duplicated letter:

Take notice that as liquidator of the above-named company I have this day rejected your claim against the company on the following grounds:

That your claim is barred by virtue of the provisions of the Limitation of Actions Act, 1936-1959.

Dated this 13th day of July, 1973.

Can anything be done to protect the growers' interests? The Act referred to provides that a person is disqualified from making a claim if he does not make it within a six-year period. At the time of the delivery of the fruit in 1956-7 the company sent its normal statement to the growers, setting out the details of the delivery of the fruit and the amount owing. Each grower accepted that statement in good faith, but he is now suddenly faced with a situation where he, the unsecured creditor, the small man, is left in the dark, because of his lack of knowledge of the law, whereas the bigger companies involved will undoubtedly have covered themselves, because they have legal advisers and accountants on their staffs to look after their interests. Can the Government do anything in this situation to take care of the financial interests of the growers and to see that they get their share of the estimated \$242,000 that will be realized from the Brooker organization's liquidation, or are the growers to be left out completely?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am extremely sympathetic to growers who find themselves in the position described by the honourable member. Of course, the legal position is as he describes it, namely, that a debt is Statute barred after the expiration of six years. I do not know whether there is anything in the circumstances of this case that will take these debts out of the operation of the Statute. Also, at the moment I am unable to say whether the Government can do anything about it, but I will have the matter looked into and let the honourable member have a further reply.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to operate as a private enterprise organization, especially concerning the activities of the Public Buildings Department? The following advertisement, in part, was inserted by the department in the *Advertiser* of July 14:

The departmental construction function is to be expanded and the department is seeking the registration of people who may be interested in joining and contributing to construction.

The division is a production unit concerned with manufacturing and on-site construction of all types of buildings . . .

Group 1—industrialized building fabrication . . .

Group 2—general construction . . .

Group 3—engineering and ancillary services . . .

Does the Government intend to go into private enterprise, thus proving that it has seen the light?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not quite follow the honourable member when he asks whether the Government intends to go into private enterprise. Certainly, if he says, "Does the Government intend to compete with private enterprise", he is absolutely right: there is no question about that at all. In fact, I hope to be able to demonstrate to him that not only can we compete with private enterprise but that also we can make it more efficient than it is at present.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't mean private enterprise!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has referred to the Public Buildings Department: let me tell members that that department, although it has been denigrated by some members in this place and by many other people over the years, has in the past few years turned in a magnificent performance. Last year, as members heard in His Excellency's Speech today, the Public Buildings Department was able to spend almost \$30,000,000 on school buildings alone, whereas only two or three years ago, even if the department had had the money given to it, it could not have spent more than \$15,000,000, because it was not geared to do so.

That is an indication of the improvement in the department's performance in recent times, and it is the result of efficient management at the top of the department. I refer here not only to the Government. The Government has been expected by members of the top management of this department to co-operate and to adopt some of the suggestions they have made. One of those suggestions was to employ the Civil and Civic organization in this State to build two high schools as a package deal, it being considered at the time that we would be able to examine the methods employed by that organization with a view to setting up our own construction branch within the department. Having examined the methods used by that organization and others that venture into this field, we are confident that we can set up our own construction branch, which will operate efficiently and lead to greater efficiency in private enterprise when it has to compete with this authority in tendering for Government work. I make no apology to the honourable member for that decision. Moreover, I am confident that it will work and that we will attract people with the ability that we are seeking through the advertisement who will help set up this construction branch.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how many additional trained social workers and other officers have been appointed to the Community Welfare Department in the last 12 months? Further, will he say whether he is satisfied that his department is adequately staffed at present and that the individual case load is reasonable and conducive to a high level of work satisfaction within the department? It is always difficult for officers of this department to operate within the levels of the case loads with which they are expected to cope. In the past, there has been a chronic shortage of people; one could almost say there could never be enough social workers in the department. I understand that the conditions under

which social workers and other people in the department are working at present are not as desirable as they might be and that, therefore, the additional work that has been caused is leading to a spirit that is not conducive to the best possible work.

The Hon. L. J. KING: True, there is a shortage of trained social workers, and it is an Australia-wide shortage. Every effort is being made to recruit trained social workers even to the extent of sending an officer in the last few months to the United Kingdom, where some success has been achieved in recruiting social workers from that country to accept employment with the Community Welfare Department. In addition, the department has been active in recruiting social workers who have completed their training at the various educational institutions and, moreover, it pursues its in-service training programme for the purpose of training additional workers in this field.

Nonetheless, we are under-staffed concerning social workers and we suffer in South Australia some of the effects felt in all parts of Australia from the chronic shortage of social workers. This undoubtedly places strain on those social workers who are employed in the department, because they are faced with the necessity of carrying case loads greater than those we would like to have. Every effort is made to recruit additional social workers. The expansion in this area of community welfare has been quite dramatic. Expenditure on community welfare has more than doubled over the last two years, and the expansion achieved as a result of that expenditure has been quite dramatic and has produced considerable benefits for the community.

The expansion in community welfare expenditure will continue; the efforts to attract social workers will continue; the efforts to train social workers will continue; and it is hoped that, by degrees, the case load carried by each social worker can be progressively reduced. In addition, of course, the new district offices which have been established, together with the two new community welfare centres which have already been established and others which are about to be established, will provide more congenial surroundings in which the social workers can operate. The plans to situate the central office of the Community Welfare Department in a new building will also tend in the same direction.

Dr. TONKIN: Because of the shortage of trained social workers, does the Minister intend to slow down the rate of establishment of regional community welfare centres so that each one in turn may be staffed adequately with trained social workers, without adverse effect on the staff of existing Community Welfare Department facilities? Some concern is being expressed that the rate of community welfare centre establishment is such that additional strain is being placed on the existing staff of the department. Because of that, it seems desirable that the establishment of such centres be regulated so that there is no adverse effect on the general attitude of the staff of the department.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The rate at which community welfare centres are established and services expanded in existing district offices must be regulated according to the availability of trained personnel to operate those centres. To the extent that we have a shortage of social workers, that limits our ability to increase the number of community welfare centres and to extend the present range of services in district offices.

LAND PRICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say how advanced is the appointment of staff for the conduct of the validation tests to which he referred in his Ministerial statement on

the control of land sales? The Premier indicated that there would be validation tests so that any dispute, I took, it, could be determined by the test group. Will the group be another empire within the Public Service or, more particularly, will the group be drawn from other areas of the service and be similar to the State Planning Office and the Land Titles Office, which have a tremendous amount of work placed on them as a result of the introduction of legislation for which they do not have adequate staff.

I want to be certain that the creation of this group will in no way impair the activities of other areas of government that have a serious effect on the community at large if they are unable to function satisfactorily. Many applications lodged at the State Planning Office in December, 1972, have not yet been processed. Certain legislation requires that staff of the Agriculture Department, the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department shall give advice to the State Planning Office before action can be taken. However, on many occasions the advice received is delayed as a result of the demands on the time of officers of other departments, and this delay has caused considerable economic difficulty to many people. I want to be certain, on behalf of the South Australian community, that due consideration has been given to these appointments so that there will not be any unnecessary time lag.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has exercised the Government's mind. The Government is studying the position in order to see that we have adequate administration for the work given to the officers concerned. This is something for which the Opposition also has some degree of responsibility. So long as the Opposition's attitude is that money should not be spent on staff to carry out the work that arises as the result of legislation passed—

Dr. Eastick: When was that?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Opposition has often in its official publications said that the extra staff in the Premier's Department (including the planning appeals tribunal and for a period the State Planning Office, to which the Leader has adverted; it includes the policy secretariat section, which deals with land prices) is Government extravagance. The provision of officers within the Premier's Department has been constantly attacked by the Opposition as being extravagant.

Mr. Mathwin: With good cause, too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to answer the interjections. The Leader has the proof out of the mouth of his own supporters. If the work is to be carried out in accordance with legislation passed by Parliament and supported by the Opposition, we must have the staff necessary to carry it out, and they should not be attacked on the grounds that this is extravagance.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Premier say whether the Government has set a fee, probably at an acre or hectare rate, for the leasing of land that the Government has acquired in the designated area of Monarto? I believe that at this time the Government has made certain purchases within the designated site. As I have had several inquiries whether the properties purchased are available and, if they are, under what conditions they are available, I should appreciate this information from the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

RESTRICTED PUBLICATIONS

Mr. PAYNE: My question to the Attorney-General, which is consequential to a question asked last session, is whether he can say when the Government proposes to introduce legislation regarding restricted classifications for certain publications. As the representation I have received commended the Attorney-General for his earlier announcement that the Government would study this matter, people are interested in when the necessary legislation will be introduced.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The legislation will be introduced this session.

MALE TEACHERS' RETIREMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education study the question of male teachers who previously opted to retire at the age of 60 years? Under the terms of the Education Act, such male teachers will not be able to do so. The question of the retirement age of female teachers was raised during the last brief session. As a result of approaches made to the Opposition, it would appear that some male teachers opted to retire at 60 years, that is, on their birthday. Under the terms of the Superannuation Act, teachers could opt to do that, whereas under the terms of the Education Act, subsequently enacted, they are required to continue teaching until the end of the year. For argument's sake, in one case the teacher who becomes 60 years of age in March is required to teach until the end of the year. This teacher, and other teachers, believe that this is an anomaly. They elected to retire in good faith, whereas they are now being denied the terms of their election as a result of a subsequent Act of Parliament. As there seems to be a conflict between the terms of the Superannuation Act and the Education Act, is the Minister willing to give any information on this matter? I will give him more detail if he needs it and if he is willing to investigate this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The basic principle of the Government's policy has been carried out in this area, namely, the equality of treatment of male and female teachers and, in addition, a policy to minimize the extent to which the school is disrupted as a consequence of retirement or resignation of teachers during the year. As a result of a previous amendment introduced into the Education Act, teachers were given the right to retire at the end of the year in which they reached the age of 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 or 65 years and, if they retired at the end of the year, they were paid until the following January 31. Under the Education Act introduced at the end of last year, the retirement provisions were altered so that it could take place only at the end of the school year. However, there are five years in which the retirement can take place, namely, at the end of the year in which the teacher reaches the age of 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 or 65. In each case, as a consequence of working to the end of the school year, the teacher is paid until the following January 31. I realize that this means that some teachers, who opted to retire on their sixtieth birthday, no longer have the option; they have to continue to the end of the year in which they reach the age of 60 years. In the interests of minimizing disruption to schools through there having to be a changeover of teachers through the year, and in the interests of obtaining equality of treatment of males and females, certain concessions had to be made all around, and this position is the general outcome.

I may add that I do not regard this as an anomaly; rather, I regard it as an improvement to the previous situation in which almost every retirement resulted in a disruption to the school in which it took place. It seems to me that to have service within schools on a calendar-year basis is a far more satisfactory situation. I make it clear that I do not intend to institute any change in this position. The policy adopted was adopted clearly with regard to males in the knowledge that so long as a teacher taught to the end of the year he would be paid to the following January 31, getting a further six weeks pay in the end.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You have to work a further 10 months.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Only if a teacher opts to retire at the age of 60 years; that happens only in that case. In every other case (for example, if a teacher wants to retire at the age of 65 years and the teacher's birthday is in March) there are two options: either to work until the end of the year in which the teacher reaches the age of 65 years, or to retire at the end of the previous year. I point out also that there is no difficulty in marrying this situation with the Superannuation Act as it stands at present, simply because a member's superannuation contribution does not cease on the day on which he or she retires but ceases on the entitlement day. It depends on which part of the year the teacher's birthday occurs whether the entitlement day is October 31 or April 30. A teacher might retire in February and find that the superannuation contributions ceased on October 31 the previous year. Under the present system there is no change in the date on which the superannuation contributions cease; it is a simple procedure to marry this situation with the provisions in the Superannuation Act. I am sorry if someone has suggested to the honourable member that this provision is an anomaly, as it seems to me that in the overall interests of the effective operation of schools it is an improvement.

STATE TAXATION

Mr. COUMBE: Recently the Premier announced several severe increases in State taxation during the coming year, including (as far as I can recollect) pay-roll tax and electricity and water charges. This followed the Premiers' Conference which the Premier attended last month along with the Prime Minister and as a result of which South Australia did not receive the financial allocations that the Premier apparently rather confidently expected before he went to the conference. As the Premier has hinted strongly since then that several other State taxes will also have to be increased in an effort to solve the problem, and as members of the public have expressed deep concern about the situation, can the Premier now say what these further imposts are likely to be or in what areas they are likely to fall, or will we have to wait for this information until the Estimates are introduced later this session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This will have to wait until the Estimates are introduced; I do not intend to forecast the Budget.

PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on June 20 about part-time employment for mothers who are supporting children?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of part-time employment of females on a pairs or rostered basis is one that has been considered by the Public Service Board on a previous occasion and is, to a limited extent, being used

in the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. General part-time work is offered in a number of Government departments, and the Education Department in particular has expanded the use of office assistants in schools where opportunities exist for the employment of females on a part-time basis. There are limitations to the use of a part-time labour force in the Public Service. As a career industry there is a primary obligation on the Public Service Board to provide full-time employment opportunities. The nature of Government employment, the maintaining of time schedules, and the continuing nature of this work will also inhibit any large scale use of part-time employees.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. HALL: I give notice that—

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide that the first business of the day, with regard to the Notice Paper, is petitions and notices of motion, followed by questions. There is a special provision for notices of motion to be submitted then, that being the correct and proper time.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is the first I have known of a ruling in this matter of this type. Of course, I would respect it, but I draw your attention to the way in which Standing Orders have previously been interpreted in this respect. Certainly to my knowledge in this House notices of motion have been allowed throughout Question Time. I am happy to accede, as I must, to your ruling, but I would ask your discretion on this occasion because, had I understood that this was to be your ruling, I would most certainly have given notice of my motion earlier in the day. Although I will certainly accede to your ruling, I ask your discretion on the basis I have outlined, because I have been relying on Standing Orders in this respect being interpreted as they have been during the last 15 years.

The SPEAKER: For the opening day of Parliament there are special provisions in the Standing Orders, one provision being that there may be two hours of Question Time as from the commencement of the first question. Preceding Question Time, provision is made for notices of motion; all notices of motion should be submitted at that time on the opening day. As special Standing Orders apply to opening day, they should operate today.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In supporting what the member for Goyder has said, I respectfully point out that on the first day of the last session, when you were in the Chair, I gave notice of a motion during Question Time. I had no idea then (and no point was taken by you or any other member) that I should not have done that, but I certainly gave notice of a motion well down the list during Question Time without being stopped by you and without any point being taken by any other member. I suggest, in view of that precedent, which is only about three weeks old, that the honourable member for Goyder should, if he has inadvertently transgressed, be allowed to give his notice of motion at this time rather than ask another question.

The SPEAKER: Two wrongs do not make a right. If a wrong occurred on that day it does not make a right on this occasion. Standing Orders provide special requirements for opening day, and on that day the first item in the order of business is petitions, the next is notices of motion, to be followed by questions for two hours from whenever they may commence. If a wrong occurred on another occasion it should have been raised at that time as a point of order. I repeat: two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Hanson today gave notice of just such a motion well after the appointed time had gone by. That is not a precedent resting on a previous sitting, but on today's sitting—during this Question Time which has not yet concluded. I think I have a very strong claim for equal treatment.

The SPEAKER: I point out that I am not infallible. A mistake probably was made, but it was not brought to my notice until later. I freely admit it was a mistake. I did not realize that the member for Hanson had given a notice of motion, or I would have ruled him out of order. However, it has been accepted. A mistake was made and I will not make a further mistake in dealing with what is happening at the present time. Standing Orders will prevail, and I will not uphold the honourable member's point of order at this time.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I proceed with a question?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is in order in asking a question.

OFF-SHORE SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made at a negotiating level between this State Government and the Commonwealth Government in relation to off-shore sovereignty in the present dispute? The dispute has been evident for some years at the Commonwealth Government and State Government levels. The Prime Minister has been at variance with some of the State Labor Premiers regarding the varied interpretations of these matters. As I understand it, the subject is still a matter of litigation to determine which Government shall have sovereignty over certain off-shore areas. I consider the Government could cut short such litigation by negotiating a settlement, and my question is asked on the basis of whether the Government is trying to negotiate a settlement outside the areas of litigation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no question of negotiating a settlement on the matter of off-shore sovereignty. The position of the Labor Party throughout Australia is that the Commonwealth must have overall control of development and policy off shore.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you subscribe to that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I do. The difference that existed between this Government and the Commonwealth Government was over the administrative results of the precise terms of the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill. On that score, discussions have taken place between the Prime Minister and myself and the Commonwealth Attorney-General and myself. Those were the difficulties which arose from the terms of the legislation, and discussions on that score are proceeding.

TEACHERS' HOUSING

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is the policy of his department, where and when houses are required for headmasters or married staff, or even for single-teacher units, to use only the Housing Trust as a building authority for such purposes, or is the Minister willing to look into the matter of using private contractors to build such accommodation? I know the department does purchase houses already erected that meet the requirements and specifications. The Minister announced 18 months ago that 37 houses for teachers had been built throughout the State at various centres. Can

the Minister indicate what progress has been made with this programme of house building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the member is labouring under a misapprehension. The member for Mitcham would appreciate that it would not be the first time. The Housing Trust is not a construction authority *per se*. When an arrangement is to be made for a house to be built in a country area we get a private contractor to do it. It may be that the person who complained to the honourable member was having difficulty in getting a contract from the Housing Trust. That is probably the situation. The Education Department is not a construction authority for housing, nor do I propose that it should become one. We arrange through the Public Buildings Department for the Housing Trust to construct houses when we require them and the trust makes its own tender arrangements. On occasions we use transportable houses and this would be done directly by the Public Buildings Department negotiating with Worldwide Camps or with Sigal Industries Pty. Ltd. Some of the teacher flats are of this type of transportable accommodation. Where contracts are let by the Housing Trust they are open to public tender, and I suggest the member for Rocky River should contact the trust about it.

BANK AMALGAMATION

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether it is still the policy of the South Australian Government, as announced by the late Mr. Walsh in 1965, to amalgamate the operations of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As has been explained in this House several times since that date, and several times in the past three years, it is the intention of the Government to integrate the activities of the Savings Bank and the State Bank so far as that is possible to give added services to the public. That is not abolishing the dual nature of the banking system, but it is advisable that trading bank facilities should be available to clients of a savings bank, and vice versa. So far as that may be achieved by administrative arrangements between the two banks it is being carried out.

Mr. Gunn: It does not operate at the moment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In some cases it does, and in practice it is a matter of constant study by the two bank boards, and arrangements are constantly being made to provide an all-round service through both banking operations.

DRINK-DRIVING OFFENCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to have those persons convicted of an offence under section 47 of the Road Traffic Act (for driving while under the influence of liquor) warned of the consequences of committing a second offence? During the break between the sessions of Parliament I wrote to the Attorney-General after a fellow member of the legal profession had spoken to me about an instance in which a man was convicted a first time of such an offence at, I think, Port Pirie about 12 months ago. He was fined the minimum and given the minimum licence suspension.

Mr. McAnaney: It should have been more.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not reflect on the penalty imposed, but he has now been charged with the offence

again and he says (this has been accepted by his solicitor) that he was not given any idea that, for a second offence within the period specified, a term of imprisonment was mandatory. Whilst I know that many magistrates are extremely careful to explain the consequences of committing a second offence within the period to those who come before them on the first occasion (and I heard one such warning given only last week in the Stirling court), there may be occasions when this warning is not given, and this reacts unfairly on those persons who are not so warned and who may be, as many people are, ignorant of the law. I inquired about this matter a few days ago because the man concerned was to come before the court again tomorrow. I am pleased that the Attorney has indicated that he has a reply to the question and I ask whether he will give it now.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The reply that I indicated that I had for the honourable member does not relate to this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Drink-driving offences?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. It relates to another matter, namely, a practice to which he referred and which was to be initiated in the Elizabeth court. However, the question having been asked, I remind the honourable member that he wrote to me (and I acknowledged his letter, hope) on the topic about which he has now asked and I have asked for a report on the administrative practicability of having a notice handed to persons convicted of the offence of driving under the influence of liquor as to the consequences of a subsequent offence either under that section or, indeed, for exceeding the blood alcohol level permitted by law. There are difficulties about the matter, of course. There would have to be a formal arrangement by which clerks of court were required to hand a document to the defendant. That difficulty may not be insuperable, but an administrative arrangement would have to be made.

I may say that I do not know that I entirely accept the proposition that it is unfair to a defendant if he is not given that warning. I say that because it seems to me hardly reasonable that a person who sets out to commit a second offence of drink-driving within five years, hoping that he will get away with a fine and a suspension, has much to complain about if his offence is visited with the more severe penalty of imprisonment. Another matter that impressed me when I received the honourable member's letter was that the purpose of the mandatory imprisonment imposed by the Statute is to deter people from committing a second offence and, if giving them a warning on the first occasion will help deter them from committing a second offence, the procedure would be well worth observing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now ask the Attorney-General whether he will give me an answer to my earlier question about drink-driving offences which I thought he was going to give me, but I was mistaken. I thought he had the answer to a question on this topic that I had asked him.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have inquired concerning the proposal for a pilot study on drink-driving offenders to be carried out at Elizabeth, following questions asked by the member for Mitcham in this House during the last session of Parliament. It appears that the approval of the Chief Secretary was obtained on March, 13, 1973, by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board to introduce a treatment and study programme with drink-driving offenders at Elizabeth. Discussions took place between a representative

of the board and Mr. Carter (Senior Magistrate at Elizabeth). Under the arrangement the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board will provide facilities for the treatment of certain persons who are convicted of the offence of driving under the influence of liquor at the Elizabeth court. The court must, of course, deal with offenders before it according to law. Subject to the limits prescribed by law, the order made by the court is a matter for the discretion of the magistrate and is, of course, subject to review by the Supreme Court on appeal. It is for the magistrate, subject to review on appeal, to decide what use (if any) he makes of available treatment facilities. I do not intend to intervene in the matter by way of either approval or disapproval.

PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation regarding pyramid selling in this session of Parliament?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, the Government so intends and I have made a public announcement to that effect. That announcement was reported and I made it at the earliest possible time after the Cabinet decision was taken, because the Government is most concerned that some pyramid selling firms are operating actively and, one suspects, operating more actively than they would be if they were not apprehensive that legislation was about to be introduced. As a result of this, people may well be parting with their money at present, and the Government is particularly anxious to protect those people. Consequently, it is intended that the legislation will include a provision invalidating transactions of this kind entered into after July 1, so that persons who have been persuaded to part with their money in this way after that date will be given the right to recover that money. I hope that this announcement will have the effect of dissuading pyramid-selling companies from continuing their operations, that it will have the effect that the companies will discontinue receiving money from the public pending introduction of the legislation, and that it will have the effect that the companies will refund to those persons money paid since July 1 before the companies' business arrangements become so involved that it is difficult to disentangle them. I have no doubt that money paid since July 1 has not yet been used in a way that makes restitution and a disentangling of the transactions impossible. I hope that this announcement of the retrospective operation of the legislation will have the effect that the companies will cease to receive money now and will refund money paid since July 1.

RAILWAY TAKE-OVER

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Transport say how far he has progressed in his negotiations and discussions for the Commonwealth Government to take over the State railways and what safeguards he has asked for to ensure that present lines remain in existence? In South Australia the Public Works Committee must be satisfied that there is a reasonable alternative service. Has the Minister discussed such a condition in his negotiations with the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have not yet reached the stage where that aspect of the matter has been considered. The preliminary discussions are proceeding fairly satisfactorily, not concerning take-over but rather concerning the transfer of the non-urban systems to the Commonwealth Government. Some important preliminary matters must

first be determined and, subject to the satisfactory determination of those matters, the rest of the negotiations or discussions will proceed. The first report will probably be made to both the Commonwealth Minister and me in about three months time.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs. Arnold, King, McRae, and Russack.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs. Chapman, Payne, and Simmons.

Printing: Messrs. Dean Brown, Crimes, Duncan, Russack, and Slater.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Langley, and Olson be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report tomorrow.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 25, at 2 p.m.