

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 17, 1975

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

STUDY TOUR REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the honourable member for Murray on his overseas study tour during 1974.

Ordered that the report be printed.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

UNLEY TRAFFIC

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have traffic studies on the results of road closures in Unley been completed and, if not, when is it expected they will be?

2. What are the findings of the investigations at this stage?

3. Will the data that has been collected be made available for public scrutiny and will further submissions and suggestions be called for?

4. Will data be made available for evaluation by an independent town planner acting on behalf of residents of the area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The study period will be terminated in August.

2. Preliminary findings indicate a substantial reduction in accidents.

3. The report of the study will be submitted to the Unley City Council. Submissions have already been received and are now being examined by the Road Traffic Board and the council. Consideration of any further submissions following evaluation would be at the council's discretion.

4. The release of the data would be the prerogative of the council.

FISHING AUTHORISATIONS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the State Government any plans to change the system of allocating prawn authorisations from the boat to the individual and, if so, why and on whose recommendation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At this stage no change is being contemplated.

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the State Government any plans to change the system of allocating crayfish authorisations from the boat to the individual and, if so, why and on whose recommendation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At this stage no change is contemplated.

CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When is it expected that the proposed new school at Ceduna will be completed?

2. What type of building will be erected?

3. When is it expected that work will commence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Present planning provides for tenders for construction of the Ceduna Area School to be called early in 1976. It is intended to use Demac buildings for the new school. It is not possible to give any precise date as to the beginning of work or the com-

pletion of the project, but it is likely that up to 12 months would be required to construct new buildings at Ceduna. It is emphasised that planning is subject to revision, and it is possible that there could be delays as a consequence of inflation of present building costs.

KARCULTABY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that work will commence on the new Karcultaby school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Present programmes provide for building of the Karcultaby Area School to commence in August of this year. If these schedules can be maintained, it is hoped that the school will be ready for use by the beginning of the 1976 school year.

MILTABURRA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it expected that the new school that was to be built at Miltaburra will now be built?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of changing priorities in the area, it has become necessary to defer the building of the Miltaburra Area School, and the project is unlikely to proceed. This action became necessary because of the escalation of building costs caused by inflation and the drop in enrolments in the schools that the Miltaburra project would have amalgamated. In September 1971, when the estimated cost of the school was \$400 000, the predicted enrolment for 1974 was 122 primary and 40 secondary students. At present it is estimated that the school would cost more than \$1 000 000 to serve an expected school population of about 109 primary and 13 secondary students. On this basis the cost a pupil would be \$9 200. Furthermore, as the Miltaburra project was conceived as a means of getting together a significant number of secondary students, its basic rationale has been removed.

MEDIBANK

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Which community hospitals have been approached to provide standard ward accommodation under the terms of the Medibank proposals?

2. Which community hospitals have agreed to provide beds and how many such beds will each provide?

3. How many such beds is it expected will thus be made available for Medibank patients on July 1, 1975?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows: The question relates to community hospitals, but does not indicate which of the two distinct groups of hospitals commonly known as community hospitals to which the question refers. In respect of the country community hospitals (private hospitals), no approach has been made to any of these for any form of recognition under the Medibank hospital programme, other than the continuation of their private status.

If the reference is to the metropolitan community hospitals, these form part of a total group comprising the non-profit religious, charitable, and community hospitals. Similar questions have been asked under Question No. 10 in relation to the charitable and religious hospitals and, as these have been dealt with as a total group with the metropolitan community hospitals, the replies have been provided under Question No. 10.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Is it proposed to renovate and convert the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to provide additional standard ward accommodation to meet the expected demands of Medibank patients, and, if so:

(a) what wards will be so converted and how many beds will be made available;

- (b) what accommodation will still be available for patients with infectious diseases;
- and
- (c) will the operation of the recently established rehabilitation centre be affected adversely in any way?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not intended to renovate and convert the Northfield wards of Royal Adelaide Hospital to provide additional standard ward accommodation solely to meet the expected demands of Medibank patients.

2. Renovations and rebuilding are being carried out at the Northfield wards of Royal Adelaide Hospital. (Similar work has been planned for the future.) These renovations are part of the long-term rehabilitation of Northfield wards that was planned before any considerations of the Medibank hospital programme. This work is therefore not specifically related to the provision of additional standard ward accommodation.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Is it expected that the Springbank Repatriation General Hospital at Daws Road will be made available to provide standard ward accommodation for Medibank patients, and if so:

- (a) how many beds will be made available in this way;
- (b) will the Commonwealth Government retain control of the administration of the hospital, or will the State Hospitals Department take over this responsibility in part or in whole; and
- (c) what future arrangements will be made under Medibank for the treatment of patients currently covered under repatriation entitlements?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Which private hospitals (including charitable and religious hospitals) have been approached to provide standard ward accommodation under the terms of the Medibank proposals?

2. Which of these private hospitals have agreed to provide beds, and how many such beds will each provide?

3. How many such beds is it expected will be so provided for Medibank patients on July 1, 1975?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows, incorporating part of Question No. 7: The question of the provision of beds in the non-profit charitable, religious, and community private hospitals is a matter between the Australian Government (represented by the Social Security Department) and individual hospital boards of management. The approaches that have been made relate only to the provision of beds for pensioners with medical entitlement cards and are not necessarily standard ward accommodation. The arrangement is covered by section 34 of the Health Insurance Act, 1973.

1. The following non-profit charitable, religious and community private hospitals have been approached by the Social Security Department to provide beds for pensioner patients with medical entitlement cards: Ashford Community Hospital Incorporated, Blackwood and District Community Hospital, Burnside War Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Calvary Hospital, Glenelg District Community Hospital Incorporated, Henley and Grange Community Hospital, Hindmarsh Memorial Community Hospital Incorporated, Le Fevre's and Port Adelaide Community Hospital Incorporated, McBride Maternity Hospital, Memorial Hospital Incorporated, North Eastern Community Hospital Incorporated, Northern Community Hospital Incorporated, St. Andrew's Presbyterian Hospital Incorporated,

Thebarton Community Hospital Incorporated and Western Community Hospital Incorporated.

2. Negotiations are still continuing.

3. This information is not available, as negotiations are still continuing.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many country subsidised hospitals have now agreed to provide standard ward accommodation under the terms of the Medibank proposals, and which hospitals are they?

2. How many such beds will thus be available for Medibank patients on July 1, 1975?

3. At which hospitals have doctors entered into any agreement with the hospital board to provide services for pensioner Medibank patients?

4. How many pensioner Medibank beds is it expected will thus effectively be available in these hospitals on July 1, 1975?

5. How many country subsidised hospitals have not agreed to provide standard ward accommodation and which hospitals are they?

6. What change, if any, will there be to the Government subsidies payable to these latter hospitals for the next financial year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

Hospitals that have sought status as recognised hospitals:

1. Forty-six country Government-subsidised hospitals have sought recognised status, as follows: Angaston District Hospital, Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial District Hospital Incorporated, Barmera District Hospital Incorporated, Blyth District Hospital Incorporated, Booleroo Centre District Hospital Incorporated, Bordertown Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Burra Burra Hospital Incorporated, Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital (Wudinna), Clare and District Hospital Incorporated, Cleve District Hospital Incorporated, Crystal Brook District Hospital Incorporated, Elliston Hospital, Great Northern War Memorial Hospital (Hawker), Gumeracha and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Hutchinson Hospital (Gawler), Jamestown Hospital Incorporated, Kangaroo Island General Hospital Incorporated (Kingscote), Karoonda and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Kimba District Hospital Incorporated, Kingston Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Laura and District Hospital Incorporated, Lower Murray District Hospital Incorporated (Tailem Bend), Loxton District Hospital, Maitland Hospital Incorporated, Mannum District Hospital Incorporated, Meningie and Districts Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Millicent and District Hospital Incorporated, Minlaton District Hospital Incorporated, Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Mount Pleasant District Hospital Incorporated, Murat Bay District Hospital Incorporated, Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Onkaparinga District Hospital Incorporated (Woodside), Orreroo and District Hospital Incorporated, Pinnaroo Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Quorn and District Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Renmark District Hospital Incorporated, Riverton District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Snowtown Memorial Hospital Incorporated, South Coast District Hospital Incorporated (Victor Harbour), Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital Incorporated (McLaren Vale), Southern Yorke Peninsula Hospital Incorporated (Yorketown), Strathalbyn and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated, Streaky Bay Public Hospital Incorporated, Tumby Bay Hospital Incorporated, and Waikerie District Hospital Incorporated.

2. The above country Government-subsidised hospitals that have sought recognised status represent 1 597 beds.

3. Negotiations are still continuing in respect of agreements with medical practitioners. However, it should be pointed out that such arrangements are related to hospital service patients and not specifically to pensioners.

4. As previously indicated, there are no specific pensioner beds as, under the Medibank proposals, pensioners will no longer be a separate category of patient.

5. Only one country Government-subsidised hospital has specifically indicated that it does not wish to seek recognised hospital status, that is, Cummins and District Memorial Hospital Incorporated of 20 beds. However, although other hospitals have indicated an intention to seek recognised hospital status, final replies have not been received from nine hospitals.

6. As from July 1, 1975, the existing system of Government subsidies will be replaced by deficit financing of those hospitals that have sought and obtained recognised status. In these circumstances, there will be no provision for the payment of subsidies to hospitals that have not attained recognised status.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many offences relating to the theft of drugs have there been in the past six months?

2. What were the numbers of offences specifically related to pharmacies, doctors' surgeries, clinics, and doctors' cars, respectively?

3. What were the corresponding figures for each of the two six-month periods immediately preceding this period?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The details are as follows: Drug thefts reported:

Six months ended May 31, 1975:

1. Number reported	363
2. (a) From pharmacies	132
Drugs stolen	67
No drugs stolen	65
(b) From doctors surgeries, clinics	116
Drugs stolen	29
No drugs stolen	87
(c) From doctors cars	115
Drugs stolen	96
No drugs stolen	19

Six months ended November 30, 1974:

1. Number reported	192
2. (a) From pharmacies	47
Drugs stolen	35
No drugs stolen	12
(b) From doctors surgeries, clinics	99
Drugs stolen	23
No drugs stolen	76
(c) From doctors cars	46
Drugs stolen	41
No drugs stolen	5

Six months ended May 31, 1974:

1. Number reported	153
2. (a) From pharmacies	27
Drugs stolen	13
No drugs stolen	14
(b) From doctors surgeries, clinics	116
Drugs stolen	33
No drugs stolen	83
(c) From doctors cars	10
Drugs stolen	7
No drugs stolen	3

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many people are currently undergoing treatment for dependence on drugs other than alcohol as outpatients or inpatients, respectively, under the auspices of either the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, or the Mental Health Department?

2. How many people are similarly undergoing treatment for dependence on alcohol?

3. What were the comparable numbers of people treated for drug dependence and alcoholism one year, two years, and five years ago, respectively?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of persons undergoing treatment for dependence on drugs other than alcohol is:

	Mental Health Services	Alcohol and Drug Addict Treatment Board
Out-patients	32	2
In-patients	10	5

2. The number of persons undergoing treatment for addiction to alcohol is:

	Mental Health Services	Alcohol and Drug Addict Treatment Board
Out-patients	41	19
In-patients	64	110

3. Mental health services: The comparable figures are not available for the period 1973-74, but the figures are given for the following years:

	Alcohol addiction	Drug dependence
1969 Out-patients	88	Not separated from other personality disorders at this time.
In-patients	324	
1971-72 Out-patients	52	17
In-patients	455	20
1972-73 Out-patients	46	10
In-patients	409	27

Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board: Comparable numbers of people treated for drug dependence and alcoholism are as follows:

	Alcoholism	Drug dependence
One year ago		
In-patients	659	32
Out-patients	409	145
Two years ago		
In-patients	834	50
Out-patients	253	79
Five years ago		
In-patients	655	25
Out-patients	79	30

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it the intention of the South Australian Government to legalise the use of marihuana in this State and, if so, why?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No.

YOUTH FACILITIES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the serious financial difficulties now threatening the continued operation of Service to Youth Council facilities, and have approaches been made to him for Government assistance?

2. What consideration has been given to any such request and what assistance will the Government offer to maintain the services of this organisation?

3. Will consideration be given to the provision of additional funds for the Service to Youth Council before the introduction of the next budget?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Apart from a report appearing in the press on May, 29, I am not aware of financial difficulties threatening the continued operation of the Service to Youth Council. Neither I nor officers of the Community Welfare Department, have recently been approached by the Service to Youth Council for financial assistance.

2. There has been a significant increase in State Government grants to the Service to Youth Council from \$14 000 in 1972-73 to \$31 400 in the present financial year. Following the rapid growth in State Government support, the Service to Youth Council has been advised that support will be limited to \$30 000 a year for the next three years, with some allowance for inflationary pressures. I understand that consideration is being given by the Commonwealth Government to a special grant of \$17 800 to the Service to Youth Council. This should enable the council to complete the financial year ending June 30, 1975, without a deficit.

3. Not applicable.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What three new industries have been attracted to South Australia following discussions with officers of the development division in the period July 1, 1974, to March 24, 1975?

2. What is the total amount of capital involved?

3. How many job opportunities have been created?

4. What are the future prospects for industrial promotion in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. During the period specified the industries attracted to the State involve the manufacture of fine art and similar products; chemical and mineral products for the building industry; and specialised clothing.

2. The capital investment involved cannot be stated precisely, but initially it is expected to exceed \$500 000.

3. Initial employment in these industries will be about 50 persons, and there are good prospects for growth.

4. The response to recent promotional activity by the Development Division has demonstrated keen interest by manufacturers in other states in establishing manufacturing operations in South Australia, and given a more favourable economic climate, prospects in this area seem to be good.

SCHOOL PROTECTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is external lighting, such as security lights that can be controlled by a master switch to floodlight the outside of schools, installed in any South Australian schools and, if not, is it intended to install this type of lighting?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All new schools have external security lighting provided. This lighting is controlled by a "photo cell". Since their inception some four years ago, all open-space type schools have this lighting installed.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What fire fighting equipment is provided at schools throughout South Australia?

2. How often is the equipment serviced?

3. How regularly do fire drills take place in schools?

4. Has there been an increase in damage caused by fire to property and equipment and, if so, what is the total cost of such damage this financial year compared with the last five years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

Fire-extinguishing equipment is provided by the department on the following basis:

1. Fire-extinguishers:

(1) A 25lb-dry chemical extinguisher for the oil fired heating-plant room.

(2) A 5lb-CO2 extinguisher for each:

- (a) film projection room,
- (b) science room,
- (c) domestic arts room,
- (d) electrical work room,
- (e) metalwork room,
- (f) woodwork machine room,
- (g) switchboard room,

(3) A 2-gall. water CO2 extinguisher for each:

- (a) stairway on each floor above ground level,
- (b) four rooms in schools of timber construction,
- (c) quadruple timber unit,
- (d) triple timber unit,
- (e) dual timber unit,
- (f) three single timber units,
- (g) school of one or two single timber units.

2. Sand-buckets:

For schools of one-storey brick or stone construction:

- (1) with up to four classrooms—one bucket,
- (2) with more than four classrooms—one bucket in each corridor or verandah which serves four or more rooms.

Every school with more than four classrooms should have at least two buckets.

2. In all areas, both metropolitan and country, which are served by the Metropolitan Fire Brigades, the brigade services all fire extinguishers annually. The attention of teachers in all schools has been drawn to the need to maintain fire-extinguishing equipment at schools in a serviceable condition.

3. In the case of solid-construction school buildings, fire drills are to be held at least annually. In the case of wooden school buildings (which are all of one-storey construction) fire drills are to be held once each term.

4. Equipment:

	\$
1971-72	34 700
1972-73	34 100
1973-74	45 800
1974-75	48 147

Figures are not available at short notice on years before the 1971-72 financial year.

Buildings:

	\$
1971-72	56 600
1972-73	119 500
1973-74	223 400
1974-75	80 700

SCHOOL FIRST-AID

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many aides are employed at schools throughout South Australia?

2. Are the school aides qualified first-aid attendants?

3. Are crisis centres established at all major schools in case of emergency?

4. What emergency services are available at schools?

5. What first-aid equipment is supplied to schools?

6. Are first-aid stocks maintained by the Education Department?

7. Has there been an increase in the use of Aspros and similar tablets in schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 1 157 teacher aides employed in departmental schools throughout South Australia.

2. It is not a prerequisite for teacher aides to be qualified first-aid attendants. However, staff members are encouraged

to participate in a basic casualty care course provided by the department at various times.

3. If by crisis centre the honourable member means an organisation through which planned evacuation of a school may be undertaken, the answer is yes. Another meaning of the term "crisis centre" commonly in use is in connection with personal problems of individual students. In most secondary schools, student liaison officers are available for student counselling.

4. No specific emergency services are available at schools. However, students are instructed annually in fire evacuation procedures.

5. First-aid cabinets are supplied by the Education Department to schools for woodwork centres, home science centres, science laboratories, sheet metal classes, and art classes. First-aid equipment for other sections of the school is purchased from school and grant funds.

6. Stocks are maintained in cabinets which are supplied by the Education Department. Stocks in other cabinets purchased by schools are maintained by those schools.

7. As first-aid cabinets in sick rooms are the responsibility of individual schools and are replenished from school funds, it is not possible to determine whether there has been an increase in the use of Aspros and similar tablets in schools.

TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Were the television commercials in which the Premier recently appeared advertising the theatrical performance *Brief Lives* playing at Her Majesty's Theatre, financed in whole or in any part from Government funds and, if so, did he receive from these funds any remuneration in respect of his appearances?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The commercials were paid for by the entrepreneurs, one of which was the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. No payment was made to the Premier, who gave his services as a public service.

PARLIAMENTARY FACILITIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of installing the new amplification and messenger call systems in the House of Assembly?

2. What was the total cost of installing the inter-communication system in the House of Assembly and Legislative Council Chambers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. & 2. The final costs are not yet to hand.

TRUCK INSURANCE

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many truck insurance policies have been taken out with the State Government Insurance Commission in the years 1973-74 and 1974-75, respectively?

2. What policy does the commission adopt towards comprehensive insurance of heavy trucks?

3. Is the commission bound by its charter to undertake this type of insurance?

4. Has there been any instance of the commission's refusing proposals of heavy truck insurance and, if so, how many?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Policies have been issued in each financial year but at short notice the commission is unable to give the statistical information requested.

2. The commission does accept insurance on heavy trucks but acceptance is dependent upon the merit of the proposed risk.

3. No. Section 12 (1) (b) of the State Government Insurance Commission Act, 1970, gives authority to the commission to carry on business according to the practice and procedure considered necessary or desirable.

4. Yes. Insurance has been refused but there are no records kept as the requests have come through the telephone and by word of mouth.

COMPANY INVESTIGATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have the affairs of South Australian Barytes Limited been examined by the investigation section of the office of the Registrar of Companies, and if so, when?

2. If an investigation was made:

(a) has a report been made; and

(b) will such report be tabled and, if not, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. (a) The report has not been completed; it was held up pending the result of court proceedings, the judgment on which was not delivered until June 4, 1975.

(b) No. The inquiries conducted were not in the nature of a formal investigation under Part VIA of the Companies Act, which empowers the Governor to appoint a special inspector. Evidence was not taken on oath. Statements were not taken from present or former directors of the company. For these reasons and for the further reason that there is current litigation concerning the offences of the company, it would be inappropriate to publish the report.

JUVENILES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many juveniles have been brought before juvenile aid panels since July 1, 1974?

2. How many juveniles have been brought before juvenile courts during that same period and what orders were made in respect of them?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. In the period July 1, 1974, to March 31, 1975, 2 195 children appeared before juvenile aid panels.

2. (1) In the period July 1, 1974, to March 31, 1975, 2 063 children appeared before juvenile courts.

(2) Some of the above children appeared on more than one occasion and some appeared as a result of an application to the court. As a result, some 3 420 major orders were made in respect of those 2 063 children. This distribution of those orders are as follows:

Committed for trial or sentence	5
Care and control and ancillary order	212
Care and control	216
Bond with supervision	454
Bond	303
Fine	1 013
Dismissed	1 153
Applications granted	64

TOTAL 3 420

RAILWAY FARES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What were the fares for the return journeys, with sleeper, Adelaide to Melbourne, Adelaide to Sydney, Adelaide to Brisbane, respectively, as at June 30, 1974?

2. Is it proposed to increase the present fares for such journeys and, if so, when and by how much?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Adelaide to Melbourne—\$39.40.
Adelaide to Sydney—\$68.80 (via Melbourne).
Adelaide to Brisbane—\$105.80 (via Melbourne).

2. Intersystem fares are to be increased from July 1, 1975. The increase on the present return fares will be:

- Adelaide to Melbourne—\$12.00.
Adelaide to Sydney—\$48.00 (via Melbourne).
Adelaide to Brisbane—\$74.00 (via Melbourne).

ATTORNEYS' MEETINGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): On what dates, for how long, and in what places, have meetings of the Standing Committee of Attorney-Generals been held since June 1, 1970?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Meetings of the standing committee have been held as follows:

Dates	Duration	Location
July 9 and 10, 1970	2 days	Sydney
October 15 and 16, 1970	2 days	Perth
February 4 and 5, 1971	2 days	Canberra
July 5 and 6, 1971	2 days	Melbourne
October 28 and 29, 1971	2 days	Hobart
April 20 and 21, 1972	2 days	Adelaide
July 13 and 14, 1972	2 days	Brisbane
March 29 and 30, 1973	2 days	Sydney
July 2 and 3, 1973	2 days	Perth
February 19 and 20, 1974	2 days	Wellington
October 11, 1974	1 day	Canberra

ADELAIDE HARRIERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to give financial assistance to rebuild the Adelaide Harriers' club-rooms in the south parklands and, if so, how much and when?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: An application has been received from the Adelaide Harriers Amateur Athletics Club Incorporated for financial assistance towards additions to the club's existing sports building in park No. 20, adjacent to South Terrace. This and other similar applications are being assessed, and it is expected that applicants will be told of the outcome of their applications in August this year.

MUSEUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended to move the South Australian Museum from its present location and if so:

- (a) where is it to be located;
- (b) when will it be moved; and
- (c) why?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes.

(a) and (b) Not yet determined although they are under active consideration.

(c) Because of the overcrowded conditions within the present buildings additional space is a necessity which cannot be obtained on the existing site.

PARINGA FOODS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it proposed to answer my letter of May 14 to the Minister concerning Paringa Foods, at Oakbank?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A reply was posted on Thursday, June 12.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to amend the Succession Duties Act and, if so, when and what amendments are to be proposed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Succession Duties Act is being reviewed and, although Cabinet has not yet considered any draft amendments, it is hoped to introduce a Bill to amend the Act during the next Parliamentary session.

OPPOSITION LEADER'S TRIP

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What was the purpose of the trip overseas by the Leader of the Opposition during the recent Parliamentary recess?

2. How long was he away from South Australia?

3. How much did the trip cost the Government?

4. What was achieved by it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The objectives of the tour were as follows:—

(a) Discussions at the appropriate level with Governments, both central and regional, on Parliamentary systems and Government administration. The Canadian and West German experience in particular was sought.

(b) To examine and discuss at first hand new town and housing developments in major overseas countries.

(c) To ascertain the trade and business potential of South Australian enterprise in overseas markets and to take the opportunity to visit South Australian firms and associates established abroad.

(d) To view the development and achievement of the tourist industry in advanced countries.

(e) To visit overseas companies with long experience of worker participation schemes of management and discuss the ways in which this has been achieved.

2. The duration of the tour was 60 days.

3. The cost, including his press secretary, was \$16 757.

4. The Leader of the Opposition was given an opportunity to broaden his knowledge in relation to matters affecting South Australia. The detailed itinerary was chosen by the Leader. No doubt the benefits were similar to those received by the member for Mitcham when he went overseas.

MINISTERS' OVERSEA VISITS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many Ministers have been overseas during the recent Parliamentary recess and for what purposes, respectively?

2. Where did such Ministers go?

3. How long was each away from the State?

4. How much did each such trip cost and was the full cost met in each case by the Government and, if not, what portion was paid by the Government?

5. What benefits, if any, have accrued to South Australia as a result of these trips?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Five, namely:

Premier: To arrange the setting up of a reciprocal company to complement the company set up in South Australia for the purpose of encouraging trade between Penang and South Australia. He also took the opportunity of fostering the sister city relationship between Adelaide and Georgetown (Penang).

Attorney-General: To represent the State before the Privy Council, discussions in London on legal aid programmes, and visit to Scotland on community welfare programmes.

Minister of Transport: To attend the Australian and New Zealand Local Government Ministers' Conference in Wairakei, New Zealand, from April 3 to April 5, 1975, and took the opportunity of having a short holiday at the same time.

Minister of Agriculture: To ascertain the potential for the export of South Australian agricultural produce and equipment to North African and Middle East countries, to improve the existing trade in carcass meat and live sheep with these countries and to ascertain the extent of assistance required by them in dryland farming techniques.

Minister of Development and Mines: To conduct negotiations with the overseas parents of South Australian subsidiary companies regarding expansion. Visiting United Kingdom and European companies with uranium enrichment capability. Pursuing commercial trade associated with the joint venture project recently arranged with the Libyan Government. The Minister's visit to Japan will be associated mainly with the use of resources in the Cooper Basin and with the automobile industry. To study industrial estates associated with new town developments.

2. Premier: Malaysia.

Attorney General: England and Scotland.

Minister of Transport: New Zealand.

Minister of Agriculture: Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Iraq, Iran, Bahrain and Kuwait.

Minister of Development and Mines: United States of America, Canada, United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Libya, Japan, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia.

3. Premier: 10 days.

Attorney-General: May 9 to June 8.

Minister of Transport: Left Adelaide March 28—returned April 16.

Minister of Agriculture: From April 21 to May 27, 1975.

Minister of Development and Mines: Duration of tour, 55 days.

4. The full costs which are to be met by the Government are not yet known as there are outstanding accounts, and some adjustments remain to be made.

5. The benefits will vary depending on the purposes of the Ministers' visits and the places included in the itineraries.

LAND PURCHASE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How much did the South Australian Land Commission pay for the land comprised in certificate of title register book volume 3757 folio 32?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Land Commission paid \$1 407 156 for the land comprised in certificate of title register book volume 3757, folio 32.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Will the Premier table the agreement made between R.D.C. Constructions Proprietary Limited and the South Australian Land Commission, dated October 24, 1974, concerning the land comprised in certificate of title Register book volume 3757 folio 32 and, if so, when?

2. If not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. It is inappropriate that all conditions of a land purchase be made public, as that would inhibit future negotiations in a competitive field with others. The agreement will be made available confidentially to the member for Mitcham.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce amendments to the Pay-roll Tax Act and, if so, when, and what amendments are proposed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although pay-roll tax has been a State responsibility since 1971, the desirability of maintaining consistent legislation throughout the States has been accepted. On this understanding, the States are currently jointly examining the provisions of the Act relating to the exemption level. The extent and timing of any amendment in regard to that, or any other, provision is not clear at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it proposed to answer my letter of May 9, 1975, to the Premier concerning the payment by St. Ann's College of pay-roll tax?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inquiries within my own department and the Treasury and State Taxes Departments have failed to discover any receipt of the honourable member's letter of May 9. However, several letters have recently been received seeking an exemption from pay-roll tax for St. Ann's College and the Flinders University Hall, and these matters are currently being examined by the Acting Commissioner of Stamps.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the percentage increase in numbers of the Public Service for 1974-75 to date, compared to 1973-74?

2. Is it proposed that there be any increase in the year 1975-76 and, if so, by what percentage and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 36. The percentage increase in staff employed under the Public Service Act, since June 30, 1974, to date, is 4.8 per cent. The increase for the previous financial year 1973-74 was 12.9 per cent.

2. 36. It is expected that there will be an increase in the total number of staff employed under the Public Service Act for the year 1975-76. However, as changes in staff numbers are often determined by Government initiatives, programme priorities and budget constraints, it is not possible at this stage to predict with any certainty the magnitude of the increase.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many persons were employed in Government departments on—

(a) June 30, 1974;

(b) December 31, 1974; and

(c) May 31, 1975,

2. In what departments have the major increases occurred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. Figures on the attached schedule refer to those officers (both temporary and permanent) employed under the Public Service Act. They have been compiled from the best available data at this point of time, and in full recognition of the fact that the update of computer records for the last week of May has not been included in these figures. Hence, given the time available to compile this schedule, it has not been possible to validate the figures and, in any case, actual persons employed at May 31, 1975, will be higher than shown by the last column. I might add that it has cost the department approximately \$350 to provide this information.

The projected growth rate of the services for the 1974-75 financial year was 5.4 per cent. From the attached schedule, the actual growth rate for the 11 months to May 31, 1975, is about 4.8 per cent.

The areas in which major growth has occurred are principally the social services (education, hospitals/health, and community welfare). This was taken into account when arriving at the projected growth rate figure. Growth in the Transport Department can be attributed to decentralisation of the Motor Registration Division.

STAFF STATISTICS ACCORDING TO DEPARTMENT AS AT JUNE 30, 1974; DECEMBER 31, 1974; AND MAY 31, 1975

Department	June 30, 1974	December 31, 1974	May 31, 1975
Agricultural College	3	—	—
Agriculture	584	601	616
Art Gallery	20	18	18
Attorney-General's	195	206	211
Auditor-General's	82	83	86
Botanic Garden	27	27	27
Chemistry	57	57	57
Chief Secretary's	26	24	22
Community Welfare	879	919	958
Correctional Services	447	446	446
Crown Law	70	71	73
Education	1 446	1 498	1 588
Electoral	15	14	14
Engineering & Water Supply .	1 442	1 470	1 493
Environment & Conservation .	248	259	272
Fisheries	56	55	50
Government Printing	219	228	237
Government Reporting	23	23	23
Highways	1 020	1 020	1 021
Hospitals	1 797	1 865	1 928
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	57	58	64
Labour and Industry	231	245	253
Lands	567	582	596
Libraries	238	230	223
Local and District Criminal Courts	252	263	274
Marine and Harbours	266	267	267
Mines	250	253	258
Minister of Agriculture	8	8	8
Minister of Education	5	7	7
Minister of Transport & Local Government	88	—	—
Motor Vehicles	368	—	—
Transport	—	486	498
Minister of Works	13	13	12
Police	81	83	84
Premier's	183	190	197
Produce	41	45	45
Public Actuary	6	7	7
Public Buildings	992	1 016	1 036
Public Health	429	442	462
Public Service Board	236	225	223
Public Trustee	123	120	118
Registrar-General's	219	209	203
State Supply	86	86	86
Superannuation	38	37	37
Supreme Court	92	91	89
Tourism Recreation and Sport	99	107	113
Treasury	38	39	39
Valuation	154	156	157
Woods & Forests	231	236	236
State Taxes	122	118	118

TOTAL 14 169 14 469 14 850

HEALTH REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government accepted any of the recommendations in the Bright report on health services and, if so, which ones?

2. What action, if any, has it taken, or does it propose to take, to implement such recommendations and when will such action be taken?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The answers to both parts of the honourable member's questions are, of necessity, long and detailed. I would draw his attention to *Hansard* of October 8, 1974, (pages 1297-1300), wherein the Minister of Health gave a detailed, chapter by chapter account of action taken with respect to the Bright report recommendations. The question of legislation for implementation of sections of the Bright report is presently under investigation by the steering committee and project team, and it is intended that legislation in this regard will be introduced next session.

THEBARTON COMMUNITY CENTRE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. In view of the fact that the necessary Australian Government funds have not been provided, when is it expected that redesigning of the proposed Thebarton Community Centre will now be completed?

2. When will homeowners who were previously advised that their houses would be acquired and demolished to make way for the centre, be told whether they will still be required to move and when they will have to vacate their houses?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The programme for redesigning the Thebarton Community Centre provides for the completion of the review of the brief with community groups, Public Buildings Department, Education Department and other client groups by November 30, 1975; preliminary documentation by November, 1975, to January, 1976, and final documentation by April, 1976. At present, this programme is being maintained.

2. The houses to be affected by the project are in two categories. There were eight houses in category A. Of these, six have been purchased by negotiation, one is being processed by the Public Trustee, and one remains to be purchased. This purchase is at present being negotiated, but the occupants will be given 12 months notice of intention to acquire. Those in category B will be acquired as and when they become available but will not be the subject of compulsory acquisition. The houses in both categories will be needed for the community centre, and those in category A will be required by the time work commences on site some time after July, 1976.

COUNTRY ABATTOIRS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government to restrict the use of country slaughter yards by butchers?

2. Is the Government considering introducing legislation to alter the existing arrangements where butchers operate their own slaughter houses?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is contemplated that under the proposed meat industry legislation, all abattoirs and slaughter houses will be licensed and will be required to comply with minimum standards of construction and hygiene. In the case of slaughter houses, it is intended that they be given four years to upgrade to the prescribed standard.

2. Not at this stage, provided that butchers build slaughter houses that comply with the standards to be laid down in legislation.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): When is the St. Agnes Primary School, which is currently under construction, expected to be completed and ready for occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Work on the St. Agnes Primary School is proceeding ahead of schedule and is expected to be completed at about the end of July. Present planning is to occupy the school at the beginning of the third term in 1975 and for it to operate as an annexe of the Tea Tree Gully Primary School for the remainder of this year.

HIGHBURY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): Is surplus land still available on the Highbury Primary School site for future pre-school purposes?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A junior primary school building is planned for the Highbury school, and drawings provided for this construction indicate that a site could be made available for a pre-school in close association with the new building.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): What was the cost of cooling the open-space area that has a forced-air ventilating system at Ridgehaven Junior Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$1 300.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Once the Redcliff petro-chemical complex commences production, what is the expected period of production with the present known feedstock supply in the Cooper Basin and, if no further feedstock reserves are discovered, does this mean that the petro-chemical plant will be closed at the end of the period specified?

2. What additional costs is it expected will be involved in the construction of the plant because of its location at Redcliff, which requires specific costing operations for water?

3. Is the plant proposed at Redcliff of accepted world scale?

4. What is the tonnage of the largest ship which will be able to load or unload at Redcliff?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A period of 10 years. However, this does not represent the real situation in view of the confidence of the Mines Department and the Cooper Basin producers in the reserves of the field. An amount of \$15 000 000 will be spent by the producers over the next four years on exploration, and this programme is expected to prove further substantial reserves of gas and hydrocarbon feedstocks.

2. Until a new proposal is delineated against the new start-up date, any valid cost comparisons are not possible.

3. The project would not be viable if it was not of world scale. Any revised proposal by the consortium will be in the world scale range.

4. About 71 120 tonnes deadweight, but smaller ships will be used to ship the products of the complex.

URANIUM

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what recent talks have taken place between the State Government and the Commonwealth Minister of Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) concerning the prospects of a uranium enrichment plant in the north-west of South Australia? Apart from Mr. Connor's reported comments at the Australian Labor Party State convention over the weekend, is there any real prospect of such a project eventuating? In his speech to the A.L.P. convention on Saturday (and it was televised on several television stations), Mr. Connor virtually guaranteed that South Australia would receive a uranium enrichment

plant at Lake Phillipson, 480 kilometres north-west of Adelaide. Among the advantages listed in favour of this site are reported to be 500 000 000 tonnes of brown coal nearby and the proposed new Alice Springs railway, which passes through the area. No comment was made about water, which is, I believe, essential in a production of this nature. Oddly enough, an advantage listed was the strategic location of the area in relation to defence. I say this is odd because, in making this report, Mr. Connor described the Spencer Gulf area as the safest place in South Australia with regard to marine and rocket attack. This statement is rather in conflict with the oft-stated Commonwealth Government contention that Australia faces no real threat from external forces for at least 13 years. Be that as it may, I ask the Premier whether he has any concrete evidence to support the statements made by Mr. Connor at the weekend.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Connor did not specifically state that the proposed uranium enrichment plant would be at Lake Phillipson. What he did was emphasise the advantages of the Lake Phillipson coal deposit in the total of this project. Regarding the Leader's observations on the subject of water, it is clear that he has not studied the technology. If, in fact, the gas centrifuge system of uranium enrichment is used, in that case virtually no water is required by the plant. Only if the gaseous diffusion system is used is there a considerable requirement of water. It would be possible for water to be supplied from the gulf in that event, but it is unlikely on present indications that Australia will proceed to the gaseous diffusion system rather than the gas centrifuge system. The gas centrifuge system of proving has a great many advantages for Australia, and involves far fewer questions of danger of pollution of any kind than does the gaseous diffusion process. At this stage, no firm commitments have been made. There is a continuing study by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government of the development of the technologies. On present timing, there is every possibility of the obtaining of this plant for South Australia in due season. If the gas centrifuge system is used, South Australia has few problems at all in relation to it.

There are no problems with regard to thermal pollution, waste, or water. What is more, it would be within the possibilities of the future development of power in South Australia that this system of uranium enrichment could be used here. At this stage of the proceedings, no final commitment can be made about it. However, I point out that the proposals for the uranium enrichment plant provide for its being finalised by the Industries Development Corporation with money provided by the customers who would obtain the enriched uranium; in other words, it will not be a draw on Australia's capital resources, the customers having their advances repaid out of the sales of enriched uranium. This would mean that we would get the industry wholly owned and controlled in Australia by Australians and that significant employment could be provided on the basis of the resource, and it would be done in circumstances where there was shown to be danger neither to South Australians nor to the world in the development of the resource.

Dr. Eastick: Is Port Pirie still a possibility?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, of course it is; indeed, it is a prime site in the investigations being pursued by this Government with the Australian Government.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether any firm decision has been taken regarding the resiting of the East End

wholesale fruit market to Northfield? Since the publication of the statement that the market would be resited, probably at Northfield, many of my constituents are concerned about where the market will be located. As several rumours circulating place the new market in various areas, to which I shall refer here as point A, B or C, naturally local householders are concerned and wish me to tell them, if possible, just where it is intended to resite the market.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The relocation of the market has been under consideration for some considerable time, but no firm decision has yet been taken by the Government as to its exact location. However, I assure the honourable member that every consideration will be given to the kinds of problem he has outlined in his question and, when the decision is finally made, people will be given a proper opportunity to make representations to the Government about any disadvantage they may suffer as a result of the relocation. I also assure him that every consideration will be given to the points he has raised in his question.

NATIONAL COMPENSATION BILL

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what was the basis of the Government's recent submission to the Senate committee set up to consider the National Compensation Bill based on the Woodhouse report, on which I understand the Government made certain representations? Did the Government, as reported, point out that the loss of premium income to insurance companies and, consequently, reduced investment could seriously affect future State Budgets? If this was the case, will the Premier elaborate on this point? Does the Government believe that the Bill, to which I have referred, could cut across the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act in so far as the 85 per cent cover being offered under the proposed scheme would, in some cases, give workmen less cover than they get under our present Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Those two matters were contained in the total submission, but I would not want to confine my reply to those two matters. Consequently, I will obtain details of the whole submission and make a more complete reply to the Deputy Leader next week.

RAILWAYS (TRANSFER AGREEMENT) BILL

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Premier say what the cost to South Australia will be if the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, 1975, fails to pass into the law of this State?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the honourable member permitted to ask a question on this matter, which was the subject of legislation before the House last week?

The SPEAKER: The question asked by the honourable member for Elizabeth does not appear on the Notice Paper of the House of Assembly at this stage. Had the matter still been on the Notice Paper, I would not have permitted the question. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Liberal Party Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, was quoted in this morning's press as saying that he personally would vote against the Bill. With this prospect hanging over this Bill, it would be very elucidating to the people of South Australia to know how much the State would miss out on if the Opposition saw fit to defeat the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I can tell the honourable member that, in the absence of special arrangements (that is, in the absence of the special arrangement for the railways transfer and for buying the State out of the Grants Commission) the revenue deficit for this year would be about \$15 000 000. Arrangements on those two scores, if approved in legislation, would mean immediately an additional grant of \$10 000 000 and a completion grant of \$10 000 000 payable without further review under Grants Commission procedures. In the normal course, the completion grant would not be paid until 1976-77, after a full review by the commission, and it would be by no means certain that we would get that amount in the completion grant. The receipt of these grants would convert the estimated deficit of about \$15 000 000 into a surplus of \$5 000 000, but, in addition, the other arrangements would allow us to put a considerable sum (number of millions) to reserve. In addition, the State will receive \$6 400 000 of grants assessed by the commission in respect of past years but withheld from payment until actually needed to cover a deficit within the deficit standard set by the commission. Normally, we would have to make a special case to the commission for payment next year.

As to 1975-76, papers sent to the Australian Treasury for the purposes of the Premiers' Conference forecast, on the present basis (without special arrangements), a deficit of \$58 000 000 for 1975-76, on the assumption of an increase of 22½ per cent in wage rates (used by all States to give consistency), and on the assumption that the railway transfer would be approved, but without taking into account the advantages of Medibank. The Treasury and Hospitals Department have been using a figure of \$25 000 000 as the estimate of net advantage to the State from Medibank for 1975-76, and that would have reduced the estimated deficit to about \$33 000 000. However, the non-approval of the railways transfer would mean a big increase in the estimated deficit. The loss of the \$25 000 000 additional grant to be built into the 1974-75 base and escalated in future years would mean a loss of about \$31 000 000 in Financial Assistance Grants in 1975-76, because the \$25 000 000 escalates in that year to \$31 000 000 and would escalate in all future years to markedly more than the prospective deficits on the railways that we then get rid of. It would take the prospective deficit to about \$64 000 000. This adverse effect could be reduced by continuing the petrol franchise tax that might bring in about \$17 000 000 or \$18 000 000 next year, in which case the prospective deficit would be about \$46 000 000 with the petrol tax. Non-approval of the railway transfer arrangements would have two further adverse effects. The loss on the non-metropolitan railways is likely to grow faster than Financial Assistance Grants and, if the State has to continue to meet that loss, the deficits on Revenue Account would be greater than the figures to which I have referred. If the State remains a claimant, we would receive less grants in 1975-76 than now estimated, and would have to wait for two years for completion grants. The effect of refusing the railways transfer arrangements and the buying of South Australia out of the Grants Commission, which depends on that transfer, is that this State is facing an utterly insupportable revenue deficit. The statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that we could give away the petrol tax anyway is therefore shown to be the most arrant and irresponsible nonsense.

Mr. Gunn: Get off your soap box!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, Special Minister for State, and ex-Minister of Education a question.

The SPEAKER: He is still the Minister of Education.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is still the Minister of Education—the Acting Minister of Education.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Anyway, I would like to ask the Hon. Hugh Hudson a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can make frivolous remarks, but it is the practice and procedure of this House that Ministers will be addressed by the title of the portfolio they hold and, in the case of the honourable Minister, the title is Minister of Mines and Energy. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the policy and attitude of the Government to religious education in primary schools? There has been some controversy regarding the proposed curriculum for religious education in primary schools. I recently saw the Minister defending publicly on television the religious education course that has been prepared for introduction soon into some of our primary schools. However, it seems as a result of the weekend conference of the Labor Party that the Minister is not in favour of religious education in primary schools. The Premier is reported in the press as supporting the point of view that there should not be religious education as such in primary schools, and saying, "If the Government is given enough time we will get rid of it." I, and I am sure the public, would like to know what is the true and honest attitude and policy of the Labor Party to religious education in primary schools and whether or not the Minister is in favour of it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter was correctly and fairly fully reported in the *Advertiser*. The article made clear that the decision made by the conference at the weekend, as the result of a motion I moved, was that we should work towards eliminating religious education in primary schools as a separate subject and should therefore work towards establishing it as part of an integrated course in social studies. That was the initial view of the department, and I believe that view was supported by the Religious Education Standing Committee. In the initial stages, when a number of people were concerned about what might be included in such a course, it would not have been possible to give an effective opting-out arrangement for those people if the religious education course was part of an integrated social studies course, or religious education was treated in that way. Consequently, in the initial stages, religious education in about 30 experimental schools where religious education is being taught this year is being treated as a separate subject. The conference decision is that the Government should work towards eliminating that system and work towards integrating it with the normal social studies curriculum. I think that that decision was supported by the vast majority of people at the conference and that it would be supported by the people who were involved in the religious education programme, because that was certainly the way they wished to undertake it in the first place. The only other point I wish to add on this matter is that the original primary curriculum that was produced had attached to it, when it was distributed, a statement that it was an experimental curriculum and subject to revision, and that comments, both critical and otherwise, from people interested in this matter

would be much appreciated. The curriculum is to be revised by the statutory Primary Curriculum Advisory Board. That process will take place this year so that the new curriculum will be prepared for next year. To a significant extent, the way in which these courses become established will depend on the attitude of people within the schools and within the community generally. I have little doubt that, once the courses have been revised and the fuss and worries about the matter have died down, religious education in primary schools will be studied as part of social studies and there will be little problem or worry attached to it.

SCHOOL AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy as Minister of Education, say whether he knows of any instances of schools in South Australia not making use of the audio-visual equipment available to the schools? The Leader of the Opposition, in a recent speech, stated quite categorically that waste was occurring in education expenditure, and he cited instances that apparently he knew of where the equipment was not wanted and, therefore, had not been used in certain schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was not in the House last week for the debate on the Supplementary Estimates, so I am not sure what took place then, but I saw the Leader on television over the weekend when he was giving examples of alleged waste of expenditure. I should like to assure the House and the public generally that, if any instance of misuse of equipment or of a situation where equipment is lying idle and not being used is brought to the notice of the Education Department, appropriate action will be taken.

Dr. Eastick: There are plenty of examples—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will come to the Leader in a moment, so he may care to wait. It may well be that the difficulty that arises with some audio-visual equipment not being used properly relates to the school administration itself and that the school administration needs assistance in the way it approaches the question of the use of the audio-visual equipment that it has available to it. However, I ask the Leader, if he has any specific instances, to come out in the open and indicate the details. If he does not want to give instances in public, I should be quite pleased for him to do it in a letter to me, and I assure the Leader that those individual cases would then be investigated. However, I think it is an extremely dangerous practice to talk about all these alleged instances without at the same time being willing to notify either the Minister of Education or the Director-General of Education of the details of each specific case so that we are given the opportunity to rectify the matter, either by rearranging the use of equipment or by advising the school on appropriate changes in its administrative procedures. If the Leader and, perhaps, other Opposition members carry on with the argument in the way in which they have been carrying on without taking the additional step of giving us the necessary information, those members run the risk of being identified in the public eye as being part of the education back-lash that tends to go on at present. I do not want the Opposition to be identified as part of the back-lash! I think that would be most unfortunate, particularly in this State. I know that the colleague of Opposition members, the shadow Minister for Education in the Commonwealth Parliament (Senator Guilfoyle), has identified the Commonwealth Liberal Party as wanting cuts in education expenditure, and I should

hope that the Opposition here would have a more forward-looking policy than its Commonwealth colleagues, but if the Opposition here continues to carry on in the way it has carried on, without having a responsible attitude to specific instances of which it is aware, one can only draw the conclusion that, really, when it comes to priorities in expenditure, the Opposition is against education. If that is so, I should also like to know from the Opposition whether it would propose to cut expenditure on education not only in Government schools but also in independent schools. I should like to know, if there is to be any campaign in this area, how far it is to extend—whether it is to extend only to Government schools or is to go across the board and include independent schools as well.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier say when it is expected that the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government will reach agreement in regard to additional funds for Monarto for 1975-76? I noted from the press (I believe towards the end of April or early in May) that the Government was disappointed that the Commonwealth Minister had been to this State and an agreement had not been reached. I hope that the Premier, when replying about when an agreement may be reached, will tell the House why an agreement was not reached at that time, whether the Commonwealth Government is still considering plans (whether as originally planned or as modified), and whether it is expected that an agreement will be reached before June 30 or early in the next financial year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Arrangements currently are being made for a further Ministerial council meeting to be held on this matter soon. The Commonwealth Government cannot state clearly the amount that can be committed for the next financial year until it has completed its Budget arrangement, because the amount to be provided for Monarto is part of the total amount in relation to the Department of Urban and Regional Development which involves the contribution of moneys to other regional centres as well. I have been told the amount that the Department of Urban and Regional Development has submitted to the Commonwealth Treasury and I know the basis on which the department is making submissions in relation to Monarto, but naturally enough that, like all other major matters of expenditure by the Commonwealth Government, must depend on the overall amount of the Budget and the overall amount to be paid, in the total of priorities, towards regional development, so at this stage we do not know the final decision of the Commonwealth Government on this matter. However, the Commonwealth Minister has been in touch with my office only today to arrange a further Ministerial council meeting.

Mr. BOUNDY: My question is supplementary to that asked by the member for Murray. Will the Premier undertake to halt further expenditure on the new city of Monarto, as a means of avoiding the imposition of further State taxes? All members are aware that, this week, the Premier will attend the Premiers' Conference. This afternoon's *News* refers to a possible cut in allocation from the requested \$800 000 000 to \$200 000 000. Expenditure on Monarto need not have a high priority, in view of the present projection of population. In addition, more time is necessary in which further to evaluate effluent disposal problems, the possibility of flash flooding, and the suitability of the ornamental lake proposed for this city. Although it is recognised that Monarto is mainly

funded by the Commonwealth Government, there is a sizeable involvement from this State's finances.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, there is not a sizeable involvement of this State's funds in Monarto: the Commonwealth's funding for Monarto is the overwhelming part of the Monarto development. In consequence, the decision which the honourable member has asked me to make would have little impact on the State Revenue Budget. In these circumstances, the honourable member is asking me for a remedy for State financial pressure that is entirely inappropriate. The Government is constantly examining Monarto and all other projects in South Australia as against the financial capability of the State, the amount of funds committed to it (not only by the State but by other authorities), and the general priorities within the Budget. In these circumstances, naturally enough the planning of Monarto and of all other projects will be taken into account in the planning of our future needs, but we are certainly not willing to halt expenditure on Monarto since we believed (indeed, every member who had an opportunity to vote in the House indicated that he believed) that it was proper for us to proceed with a sub-metropolitan regional city to ensure that we were in the position to see to it that Adelaide did not deteriorate to the wretched condition to which Melbourne and Sydney had deteriorated under Liberal Governments.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS TRAFFIC

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Transport say whether consideration has been given to any changes in the pilot study in relation to the closing of streets in the Unley City Council area in respect of which the trial period of six months has almost expired? The area concerned is also in the District of Bragg and the District of Mitcham, but in the District of Unley there have been more closures, and I may say that they have been favourably received by electors. I eagerly await reports of accident rates during the study period.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is taking the matter a little further than it was taken earlier today, and I know that the member for Bragg is extremely interested in this matter, because he had a Question on Notice. I know that the honourable member will be interested in the further information which the member for Unley has sought and which the member for Bragg did not seek. Last week the representatives of that area again had a discussion with me, suggesting that at the end of the six-month trial period, which is in August, there should be a further trial period of six months, with Wattle Street being closed on the western leg. I have agreed to their proposition. In addition, they have asked that the traffic lights proposed for Unley Road at the Wattle Street junction should not be installed whilst the test is being conducted. Their view is that traffic signals tend to indicate in the minds of motorists that the road in question is a major road when, in fact, this will be a no-through road. As I thought that was a fairly reasonable request, I agreed to it. The third matter they raised was their wish to be involved with the findings of the test so that they could express a view before the final decisions were made. They were told that this was a matter between the Highways Department and council concerned. In fact, the Highways Department virtually acts as agent for the council. Our role is to provide the council with the information collected, the analysis of it, and any views that may arise from it. We would not feel free to make that information available to anyone other than the council.

However, we were willing to inform the council that it should feel free to make the information available to these people, because in this case (in the same way as in other cases) we wanted to get as much as public involvement and opinion as possible.

WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister of Education, state a commencing date for work on the upgrading of the senior section of Waikerie Primary School? The work on upgrading the infants block is presently proceeding. In a reply that I received from the Minister of Education on November 28, 1974, it was stated that a comprehensive plan had been prepared for the upgrading of the upper primary section of the school. The plan included provision for an administration unit, an activity hall, a Commonwealth standard library unit, and 11 teaching spaces. My concern at present is to know just when the planned alterations will be made. Undoubtedly the Minister is well aware of the interest and concern of the school council and teaching staff of Waikerie Primary School in relation to this matter. I shall be pleased if the Minister can supply me with information relating to the upgrading of the major part of this school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will make inquiries and bring down a reply.

MOUNT OSMOND TRAIL

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Before the Minister for the Environment makes his final recommendation concerning the future of the partially completed walkway on Mount Osmond, will he obtain a report, through the Minister of Mines and Energy, from the Mines Department concerning the effect of the construction work on soil and rock stability in the area? In addition, does he have the initial report from the Environment Department, and, if he does, what are the recommendations in that report? Last Sunday evening, with the local councillor, I attended a meeting of residents. It became obvious from that meeting that many of the residents were now more concerned about the rock and soil stability in the area than perhaps about the effect of the pathway on the beauty of the area, although they were also concerned about that. A geological engineer gave a very informal report to some of the residents last Friday afternoon that indicated that the construction work would have an effect on the stability of the soil and rocks. Furthermore, the residents still remember the fairly large landslide which occurred last year just around the side of the mountain at Mount Osmond and which blocked off the road to that area. I found that in the area generally there was great confidence in the council and its previous environmental projects. The residents hope that finally the work will turn out to be to the betterment of the area.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have had some discussion with the environmental officers who looked at this project late last week. I make clear that originally there was some misunderstanding about whether or not approval had been given by the Environment Department or the State Planning Authority for the construction of this walking trail. It has been shown that approval had not been granted. In addition, it has been established that, in fact, the hills face zone regulations do not require approval from either the Environment Department or the State Planning Authority for the construction of a walking trail of this type. It may well be that we will have to examine this aspect of the matter. An examination of this

project has shown that the council was anxious to provide a walking trail for people of all ages. Rather than attempt to mark out a trail that people of all age groups would not have been able to traverse, the council decided to level the trail to an extent that would allow it to be used by all people. I have been informed that the council was granted about \$50 000 under the Regional Employment Development scheme for this purpose. Only a small part of the \$50 000 has been involved in work requiring the use of equipment; I understand that at least four-fifths of that sum will be spent on labour to provide a complete coverage of the exposed area by mulch that the council has been collecting for some time for this purpose. Therefore, the scar will be covered by mulch, enabling growth to take over on the level part. Moreover, a substantial number of trees will be planted; I understand some are being planted at present. The situation does not seem to be as bad as was first thought. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that we were not given an opportunity to comment on the project in the early stages, because I am confident that the construction of a trail of this type would not have been approved generally by the department and that other recommendations would have been made to the council in this case. I shall be happy to discuss with the Mines Department the question of the likelihood of this work creating an unstable situation in the area. I will certainly discuss the matter with my colleague to see whether there is any basis for fear along those lines, and I will let the honourable member know the outcome.

FISHERIES REGULATIONS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Fisheries, say whether the Government intends to amend the regulations under the Fisheries Act, 1971, relating to the allocation of lobster pots to authorised vessels to conform to the regulations of the Australian Government? Secondly, will those boat owners who have lost pots through the transfer of ownership have those pots reinstated? Under the regulations now being used, the entitlement to pot allocation is based on 10 pots for the vessel plus three pots a metre; any part of a metre is disregarded. Under the Australian Government regulations, the allocation is based on 10 pots a vessel plus one pot for each .305 metres; this is equivalent to the basis of one pot to a foot as it existed in South Australia prior to metrication. In some cases, this difference can amount to six pots. We have the situation where a fisherman can use more pots in Australian waters than he can use in South Australian State waters, but he has difficulty in travelling from his home port to Australian waters without contravening the State regulations. Will the Minister ask his colleague to examine this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with the Minister of Fisheries and obtain a report for the honourable member.

WARRADALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister of Education, ask that action be taken to have a temporary wooden building, which is situated at the Warradale Primary School and which is now not in use, converted into a library or general purpose room? I have been approached by a member of the school council who has asked for my assistance and, on inquiring at the school, I found that there were several empty buildings. The present library, which is too small, is situated in the administration block, and the staff room is

too small. The necessary work could be carried out by the Public Buildings Department, and it would consist only of removing about four partitions. The upgrading of this room could be done gradually.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into this matter. Many people seem to be interested in this room, and some of them are after it, including more than one Mathwin. I should explain, however, that the use of the surplus rooms must be considered in relation to the needs of other schools as well. Whether it will be possible to do as the honourable member has suggested I cannot say off the cuff, so I will need to have the matter investigated. I will bring down a reply for the honourable member later.

STATE FINANCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Premier still confident that the States will receive a fair deal at the forthcoming Premiers' Conference and, if so, on what does he base that confidence? The Premier was asked several questions about this matter last week. Last Tuesday, the Premier said:

In fact, it—

that is the proposal put by the States to the Commonwealth—

is based on the proposal which came from the South Australian Treasury, which was largely the case put to the Commonwealth Government.

On the following day, the Premier was asked about the Prime Minister's ability to enforce certain Party conference decisions and, in the course of his reply, he said:

The decisions of the Terrigal conference make clear that in no circumstances—

the railways notwithstanding, apparently—

are the States to be destroyed but that they are to be provided with the amount of revenue necessary to continue their normal activities of government, and that they are not in any circumstances to be deprived of such revenue as would force them into savage or difficult revenue measures adversely affecting the working people of the States.

On the following day, he said that he had had no communication from the Prime Minister turning down the case. He said that in the House on Thursday afternoon, although apparently some of the other Premiers had heard something. In this morning's *Advertiser*, it appears—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member intend to give any more examples in a brief explanation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have almost come to an end. This morning's *Advertiser* states:

The State Government proposals for the next five years would cost the taxpayer more than \$10 300 000 000 if agreed to. The Federal Cabinet was told this at a special meeting yesterday. Ministers agreed with the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) that the economy could not afford the State Governments' proposals.

Then, we heard this afternoon the prepared statement which the Premier gave in reply to a question by the member for Elizabeth, from which it seemed that the emphasis had changed from that of last week, from the excellence of the States' case as prepared by the South Australian Treasury, to the requirement by the Commonwealth that we hand over our non-metropolitan railways or go broke. It is for these reasons (because there seems to have been a substantial change of emphasis in the replies given by the honourable gentleman in this place over the past week) that I ask him whether he is still confident that the States will get a fair deal at the conference this week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that the States will get a fair deal at the conference. That view from the Premiers of the Liberal Government States, the honourable member has not bothered to cite, but they themselves have said it today.

Mr. Nankivell: We are more concerned about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member wants to change the subject—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —when anything useless to him is said in this House. The position now is exactly what it was last week. The honourable member, in relation to the railways deal, was echoing things said by the Liberal Party—that group of people he normally spends most of his time saying unpleasant things about. They said that, in saying that the railways deal would have to go through if I was to remove the petrol tax, it was just blackmail, and I did not need to have the petrol tax anyway. It is not blackmail at all. The figures I gave to the House today were available last week. It would be impossible for this State to remove the petrol tax if we did not have the extremely good financial deal that had been given to the States as a result of the railways transfer agreements. That was the position last week, and it is the position this week.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries whether support will be given to an approach by the fishing industry for long-term financial assistance, as I understand this approach is being made by the industry to the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture? It needs no words of mine to underline to the Government the difficult situation facing the fishing industry at present with high costs, the poor season that has prevailed in the managed fisheries surrounding the coast; the problems that face tuna fishermen, and the general down-turn in the economy. Obviously, these people, important as they are to the community, are entitled to some form of long-term assistance similar to that given to other primary industries, and I ask the Minister to confer with his colleague on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague, but I must say that the point has been raised with me by fishermen from my district. I have similar views to those held by the honourable member, and believe that, if a liquidity problem exists in an industry through no fault of the members of that industry, we should not treat one section of primary industry differently from the treatment given to other sections. Recently, efforts have been made by the Australian and State Governments throughout the country to assist the beef industry in its present crisis, and I see little difference (if any) between this industry and the fishing industry, which, because of a bad season and other factors, including markets, has not been able to do as well as it has done in previous seasons. I shall ask my colleague whether he has not already spoken to the Australian Minister. I know of and I am aware of the moves to which the honourable member referred being made by the industry itself. It is proper that the industry should approach the Australian Government in the first instance about this matter, because any assistance should not be confined to one State but should be made on a national basis.

FILM MAKING

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what assistance the State Government and the South Australian Film Corporation can offer commercial film makers in this State? I understand that arrangements are now being made for a full-length film entitled *Last Bus from Banjo Creek* to be

made in South Australia. The film will have a budget of about \$1 000 000 and will star Rod Taylor, and I believe that Peter Ustinov or John Mills are to be approached to take the supporting role. The female lead is being offered to Olivia Newton-John or to Glenda Jackson. From this information it seems that the producers will be making a first-class film. I understand that the South Australian climate offers much for film makers, as the sun shines for 311 days in each year, and that our scenery is of great advantage for film making. The Film Corporation has a studio 21 m x 21 m x 9 m with a wooden floor, but I understand that that is considered not quite suitable for such a major film, and that a sound-proof studio 30 m x 30 m x 12 m on about two to four hectares would be more appropriate. Because of the Government's success, to some degree, with the Film Corporation and the chance to make South Australia the film-making centre of Australia, and because no large studio is available in Australia, can the Premier say what the Government can offer, and whether his Government is keen to establish South Australia as a major film-making centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the assistance offered to commercial film makers, the Film Corporation has been involved in joint venturing with film makers in several films, and I have previously given those details. It has sometimes developed facilities on its own, and sometimes it has prompted by the giving of contracts the establishment of commercial undertakings which provide facilities for film makers in South Australia. As a result, two feature films, and a total of 63 films have been completed by the corporation in 2½ years. The people already engaged in the film industry in South Australia have had many contracts offered to them and, where their technical capacity can meet the required world standard that we require them to reach, they have obtained contracts from the Film Corporation. I have heard something of the film to which the honourable member has referred, but I have not received a report from the Film Corporation indicating that any conclusion has been reached by it on this matter. As I understand the honourable member's explanation, he is suggesting that what should now happen is that the Film Corporation should invest in a large sound studio. At this stage the corporation does not intend to invest in a large sound studio; in fact, all our technical advice is against doing any such thing. Many shots were made on location and we have been able to encompass the interior shots within the limited studio facilities we have taken over from the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The cost of a large sound studio is considerable, and in most film industries is no longer considered an advisable early investment, because a large sound studio remains dark for a considerable time and a large capital sum is tied up. What we have succeeded in doing in the corporation is to proceed economically and effectively without vast expenditure. What we are interested in doing immediately is to encourage the establishment, not by the Film Corporation but by commercial ventures, of film laboratories here. These laboratories would be more important to us for establishing South Australia as the centre for an Australian film industry than would be the establishment of a large sound studio. At present film laboratory facilities are available only in Sydney and Hong Kong in this total region, and there have been discussions by the Film Corporation (at my instance) with film makers in neighbouring countries about establishing here all the necessary film laboratories. At this stage all I can say is that I have received no submission from the Film Corporation about establishing a large sound

studio, which would cost a large sum. So far the corporation's facilities have been quite sufficient for those films to be undertaken in South Australia about which we have had anything like effective approaches from film makers.

MODBURY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a report on when work is to be undertaken at the intersection of Montague and Kelly Roads, Modbury? Both roads are under the care and control of the Tea Tree Gully council. Future plans involve the duplication of Montague Road, including the installation of a roundabout at its intersection with Kelly Road, and the council was to undertake the design and construction work, using Highways Department funds. Last year I was informed that the upgrading of this intersection was not considered to be of the highest priority; however, I inform the Minister that accidents are occurring constantly at this intersection, so I ask that, if practicable, consideration be given to the roundabout's being installed now rather than waiting until Montague Road is duplicated.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member.

PORT BROUGHTON AREA SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy expect any down-turn or delay in priorities of the building programme of schools in this State because of the recent changeover of Ministerial responsibility? At the weekend I was invited, with his Cabinet colleague, to inspect Port Broughton Area School. About three or four weeks ago another double unit was placed on the playing area at that school. One problem associated with the school is that, when the committee tries to have some of the facilities upgraded, such as changerooms, showers or toilets, it is told, "You are getting a new school." Two years ago I led a deputation to the then Minister of Education. It was then expected that a new school would be erected three years after that deputation. In the meantime, I understand that the situation has deteriorated for various reasons, and it seems that it will be some time before a new school can be expected in the area.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to the honourable member's question is "No". The amount of work that has gone on in the school-building programme in this State since 1970 is the result of the priority given to education by Cabinet as a whole. That priority would stand no matter who the Minister of Education happened to be. This is one of the contrasts between the current Government and the previous Government. The previous Government would not support the needs of education, but the current Government does. We realise that the Port Broughton school needs rebuilding, but there is such a backlog of work throughout the State that has been left after so many years of mismanagement by previous Governments that it cannot all be done in a short space of time. I do not recollect having said to the honourable member or to anyone else when I received the deputation that a new school at Port Broughton would be available in three years. If the honourable member is saying that that was said or promised, that is simply not the case. Certainly, the position at Port Broughton is such that replacement school facilities are needed—no-one would deny that. However, it is simply a matter of trying within the limits of the funds available at any time to develop a building programme that meets in order of priority the needs for replacement schools throughout the length and breadth of the State. Whether anyone likes that or not,

it is not possible to replace in a short space of time all the schools that need to be replaced. I will draw the department's attention to the honourable member's question to see whether any further information is available about the Port Broughton situation and, if there is, I will give it to him.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) laid on the table, by command, an agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of South Australia in relation to the provision of hospital services (1975).

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended so as to enable the motion for the adjournment of the House, when moved, to be put forthwith without debate.

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. McRAE

Mr. LANGLEY moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Playford (Mr. McRae) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

COMMUNITY CENTRES

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this House resolve that the providing of community centres by the Government of this State shall be a public purpose within the meaning of the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act, 1914-1972; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

South Australia is about to pioneer a significant social recreational and educational institution (the community centre high school) following a grant of \$3 196 000 from the Australian Government for the establishment of such facilities at Angle Park. The Government had planned initially for the development of two such centres, one for Angle Park and the other for Thebarton. At this stage the Australian Government has not yet given approval for Thebarton as a separate project. However, the State has decided to proceed with those parts of the Thebarton project that are State financed. In the case of Thebarton, this means that the Education Department will proceed with the building of the necessary facilities for a co-educational secondary school and, in addition, will provide such components as a combined school and community library, a child-care and pre-school centre, additional further education facilities and, through co-operation with the Thebarton council, joint development and use of the playing fields.

Consideration is being given to the inclusion of a Community Welfare Department centre and a health centre. Of course, additional recreational components can be included if and when funds are provided by the Australian Government. Although Angle Park can proceed as a total project, Thebarton will have to be carried out in stages. At both Angle Park and Thebarton, planning for the proposed centres is now in progress, and it is hoped that building can commence prior to the end of the first half of 1976. The concept is unique within Australia since the secondary school will be an integral part, but not necessarily a dominant feature, of the complex that will serve the needs and interests of the wider community as well as those of the school students.

Highly regarded consultant architects have developed sketch plans for the two centres and, at Thebarton in particular, they have exercised considerable skill in utilising a relatively restricted site. It will, however, be necessary in both cases to acquire some additional property to ensure adequate building space and proper access. The Government is advised by the Crown Solicitor that the Minister of Education has no authority under the Education Act that enables him to provide, in schools, additional facilities for community centres, although the same Act allows for public use of the buildings or facilities of Government schools. Furthermore, because no power is conferred by any Statute to provide community centres, the Crown Solicitor has advised that it would be improper to acquire land for the establishment of community centres under the provisions of the Education Act. That Act simply authorises the Minister to establish and maintain Government schools as may be necessary for the provision of primary and secondary education for children.

This motion is necessary to provide the proper authority for the acquisition of property for the establishment of community centres. Section 4 (III) of the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act enables the Government to acquire land for certain public purposes which are not covered by particular Statutes. That section provides:

The Governor may by proclamation declare to be a public purpose any purpose which both Houses of Parliament, during the same or different sessions of any Parliament, resolve shall be a public purpose within the meaning of this Act.

While it is possible that, in the case of Thebarton, the provision of a fully co-educational and comprehensive secondary school would require much the same property acquisition as the proposed community centre high school, it is probably a sensible step (and it is therefore possible in the case of Thebarton that we can say that the acquisitions are necessary in order to make the Thebarton school fully comprehensive and co-educational) to invoke the provisions set out in section 4 (III) so that the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act can be implemented in regard to community centres.

As would be clear to members, it will be necessary for both Houses of Parliament to carry the motion that I have moved, so confirming that the undertaking for which the land is required is a public purpose within the meaning of the Act. The public and the communities served by the centres will have access to the grounds, buildings and facilities for recreation, social and educational activities, as well as for the use of a wide range of community and health services. In these circumstances, it is beyond question that the establishment of both the Thebarton and Angle Park Community Centre High Schools is a "public purpose". I therefore seek the approval of members for the motion before the House, as I am sure that all members will recognise the importance of this new venture in the development of community and educational services in South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BEEF INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 11. Page 3299.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I will speak briefly to this measure, and I point out that I am not leading the debate on behalf of the Opposition. The Opposition supports the measure but not precisely in the form in which it has been presented. It is quite apparent

that there are deficiencies in the measure as it has been presented to the House originally and those deficiencies adversely affect many people who are in difficult circumstances as a result of the down-turn in beef prices. Because of the restrictive nature of the Bill, many persons who really require that sort of assistance would be precluded from getting it.

It is recognised that, whilst there is general agreement by the Commonwealth Government on the nature of assistance that will be given to disadvantaged groups of people in the community (and at present beef producers are in such a disadvantaged group), the actual determination of the method that will apply for the overall distribution of the funds is to be as stipulated by administrative act, and this follows an exchange of letters between the Prime Minister and the State concerned.

Last week, when we were dealing with the complex matter of the transfer of country railways, it was possible for Opposition members to have access to a letter that had passed between the Prime Minister and the Premier. Indeed, from checking that document it became apparent that several decisions had been taken but that further negotiation was to take place in other areas. It was on that basis that we registered much opposition to the proposal that was before us.

On this occasion, we have not been able to know the content of the letter of intention or of the documents that have passed between the two officers, so I make the point that, in respect of this Bill, the Opposition is not in a position similar to the position it was in last week. There has been no in-depth study of the true intentions of the Commonwealth Government and we do not know the principles on which the State has accepted the scheme. I register, at this time, a protest on behalf of the Opposition. If we are to address ourselves to such measures as this and if it is convenient or possible, an opportunity to study the document (or even a doctored document, if I may use that term without offence to members opposite or their Commonwealth colleagues), setting out the aims of the approach to the subject, would be beneficial. I should hope that that procedure becomes an order of action in future, because in those circumstances we could address ourselves more definitely to legislation before the House and, I believe, fulfil our obligations and duty to the electors. That is all I want to say at present. I understand one of my colleagues will discuss the matter further.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the honourable member for Victoria, I seek information on whether he is the principal speaker for the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: He is, Sir.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The Bill highlights the economic recession throughout Australia. Of course, the primary industries are feeling that recession, and this measure has been introduced to provide financial assistance to certain specialist beef producers in the State and for other purposes. In explaining the Bill, the Minister drew the attention of the House to the present depressed state of the beef market and the hardship being experienced by those who depend on the beef industry for a livelihood. He stated that the Australian Government and the State Government had reached agreement to establish an emergency assistance scheme. In this regard, one of the big areas of concern that I and my colleagues who have examined the Bill have had is the definition of a specialist beef producer. We will come to grips with that problem later, but I thank the Minister of Works for the consideration that he has given to our concern about this part of

the Bill. It was difficult to see how we would be able to assist all the people who needed assistance under the measure.

The beef cattle industry in South Australia is a major one, and beef cattle numbers have increased considerably in recent years. At present, we have about 1 400 000 head of cattle in the State. This Bill, considered statistically, will assist a maximum of about 450 beef producers who will come within the ambit of the definition of specialist beef producer. Of course, this does not mean that on the fringe other producers must be forgotten; they will receive assistance similar to that being given under this scheme.

It would be wrong of me to canvass the matter beyond that, other than to say that that grey area exists. I suggest to the Minister of Works that the rural industries assistance can be stepped up to cover what I call the grey area and all those people in the industry, which as I have said involves 1 400 000 head of cattle, who will need assistance beyond what is involved in the Bill. The specialist beef producer was perhaps buoyed up by the wonderful cattle prices received some two or three years ago, aided by the keen support of the American market for hamburger beef. Indeed, we have seen many hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in the cattle industry in improving breeds and in using up the hybrid vigour of the exotic breeds. It is fair to say that, throughout South Australia, this special branch of primary production is geared up to produce quickly high quality beef.

As necessary as it is for us to have this type of legislation, I hope that the time will soon come when it is unnecessary and we will see buoyancy in primary production, a buoyancy that will flow through to the general community, with prosperity again coming to this country. Although we need this legislation now, we would like to see prevailing the type of conditions to which I have referred. However, unless we have legislation of this type, the assets and other conditions that now apply will not be there when the good days return. I thank the Minister for the trouble he has taken in meeting our requests and bringing forward legislation to provide the type of assistance required by these people. Clause 4 (3) provides:

Financial assistance under this Act may not be granted—

- (a) to a person or body other than a specialist beef producer; and
- (b) unless the Minister is satisfied that the applicant for such assistance—
 - (iv) can provide reasonable security for the repayment with interest of the amount applied for by way of assistance.

I hope that the Bill will be administered tolerantly. Many people who will require assistance and who have purchased land recently will have made financial arrangements whereby the vendor will be holding a first mortgage, a bank will hold a second mortgage, and a stock firm will hold security over the stock. Some tolerance will therefore be necessary in applying the provision of the Bill to which I have referred.

I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that the officers who administer this legislation will need to show great understanding in giving effect to this provision. If some tolerance is not shown, people may find this provision difficult to get over. The \$3 000 000 to be provided under this scheme will be provided on an equal basis by the Commonwealth and State Governments, with each providing \$1 500 000. The interest rate charged will be 4 per cent a year, with the maximum loan to any one producer not to exceed \$10 000. Importantly, there will be

a holiday of 12 months on the repayment of interest, so that interest payments will commence on the first day of the second year. Clause 6 provides an exemption from stamp duties and other fees. These provisions are a step forward with regard to assistance provided to beef producers and other producers in recent times. The assistance of \$50 000 000 provided by the Commonwealth Development Bank was made available to industry at an interest rate of about 11 per cent, so that, with the 4 per cent interest rate on the loans under this Bill, it is little wonder that they are eagerly sought.

I was present at the field day when the Minister announced this assistance to beef producers. Many beef producers were present. However, most of them will have difficulty in qualifying as specialist beef producers. The fervour with which the Minister's announcement was greeted underlined the need of the industry. The people who need this assistance showed their need in the reception they gave to this announcement. In view of the discussion I have had with the Minister and what he has said about the need to pass this legislation, I have little more to say. I could say many things about the beef industry, but they might be outside the provisions of this Bill. I support the Bill, and will have something more to say in the Committee stage.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): In supporting the Bill, I have two comments to make. First, I consider the amount to be advanced to be too small, having regard to today's costs. When I was at Marree last weekend, I spoke to many beef producers, and what I have just said was their general comment. Although they all agreed that these loans would be a help, they pointed out that a greater loan would have been much more useful to them, with a sum of \$30 000 being especially helpful. According to the schedule of the Bill, the Commonwealth Minister has the right to vary the amount of the loan, so I sincerely hope that he will exercise his prerogative in this matter and increase the amount of the loan.

Secondly, I believe that the help is coming in the wrong direction. Most of my remarks will apply to the Far North of the State, the area that I represent. People in this area have no other source of income except from the sale of beef. Unlike the position of people living in what can be called the inside country who can diversify their means of obtaining income, these people are solely at the mercy of the beef market. It will be of considerable benefit to people who qualify as specialist beef producers to obtain a \$10 000 loan at 4 per cent interest. This will represent a saving of \$900 a year in interest, as I understand the current bank rate is 13 per cent. Therefore, over seven years these people will save \$6 300. I point out that this is only a loan from the Government and not a grant, so the whole scheme will represent little cost to the Government.

Regarding the qualification of a specialist beef producer, I point out that cattle stations in the North are very large, in many cases involving partnerships of several people. The Minister may be able to correct me on this, but my understanding of the Bill is that, if one of the members of a partnership does not qualify as a specialist beef producer, that property will not qualify for a loan. I agree with what the member for Victoria said about only 400 people qualifying as specialist beef producers. I consider that most producers with properties inside the dog fence, where many sheep are run, would have a higher income from wool and sheep than from beef. So that will immediately disqualify them as specialist beef producers, particularly as the price of wool was so high two or three years ago.

At present, we have the ironical situation of having thousands of fat cattle in the North of the State but, because of the high cost of freight and marketing, the owners are reluctant to send these cattle south. At present, they are concentrating mainly on yearlings and lightweight steers, which bring a premium, but they are reluctant to send their bullocks and cows south because of the high freight costs. The prices they are obtaining does not pay them to send that stock south. The people concerned have been advised by the Lands Department that they must reduce their numbers. As members know, all pastoral leases have a limited stock-carrying capacity, which is determined by the pastoral lease, and the producers have been advised to bring their numbers back to the allocated numbers. Owing to the good seasons we have had, there has been a tendency to build up numbers, but the numbers must now be reduced. The high cost of getting stock to market and the prices being obtained for them leave little for the owners in return.

I will quote a few instances of various prices that have been received by owners in the North for stock sold recently. If members refer to last week's *Stock Journal* they will read of a case of 96 steers sent from Tennant Creek in the Northern Territory, which does not come under this Government's jurisdiction; but the Bill covers the Commonwealth Government as well as the State, and members will realise that these figures are relevant to the situation. The 96 steers averaged \$56 at the metropolitan abattoirs. Road transport from Tennant Creek to Alice Springs amounted to \$18 a head and freight from Alice Springs to Adelaide was \$28, making a total of \$46, plus commission. Therefore, the Northern Territory producers would have received a net profit of \$8 or \$9 a head.

I will quote another instance, namely, that of cattle being sent from about 190 kilometres west of Alice Springs; 900 head had to be disposed of because of a shortage of water, and the cost of carting the 900 head to the abattoirs was \$35 a head, and they averaged \$38 a head. So, after paying commission, only about \$2 a head profit was made on these cattle. Around Oodnadatta at present freight costs amount to 27 per cent of the price obtained for bullocks and steers, and to this must be added the cost of road haulage from the station of \$1 a mile. In the country at the end of the Birdsville track I am told it does not pay producers to send yearlings or weaners, because they lose too much condition. Big steers or bullocks are usually sent, and it takes only 18 bullocks to fill a transport, so that 300 miles (480 km) at \$1 a mile amounts to \$17 a head to Marree, and as it is \$15 from Marree it costs \$32 a head to get the stock from Birdsville to the Adelaide abattoirs.

On one large station in the North last week there were many donkeys, and the owner rounded them up and brought them to Adelaide, where they cleared \$1.50 a head. This illustrates the costs involved in the industry in the North. The same person told me that two years ago the price of one steer covered one week's wages for a station hand, whereas today it takes the price of three steers. This station years ago employed up to 50 station hands. That is what it is costing the industry in the North at present. Last week an owner sent cattle down from the Cooper area; his 10 steers averaged \$48 a head and his 11 cows averaged \$40 a head. The costs were \$8 road freight and \$16 rail freight from Marree, totalling \$24. They were beautiful cows, but he cleared only \$16 for them. These cattle were purchased early last year as stores for \$120 a head. Floods also cost the same owner the loss of 1 000 branded cattle last year. The cost of feeding an

animal at Marree is 38c each feed, so stock kept in the yard for a day costs 76c a head.

Cattle is presently coming from South-West Queensland, but what does it cost to get them to the abattoirs? Last week the price of \$20 was being received for chopper cows, and these people just will not send stock down at that rate. I had an instance last week of a man from Quorn who came in and said that the stock firm had told him to destroy his sheep on the property, because he would get less than \$1 for them here at the abattoir, and it would cost him more than that to get them down! We have reached the stage where the cost structure is so high that it is uneconomic at present to send stock to the abattoirs, even though that stock is excellent meat for manufacturing. As these people cannot afford to send their stock to market, there will be a loss to the State as a whole. In return, these people have to pay high freight charges on goods returned back to the station, such as fencing material and general working goods. Therefore they are paying extra not only for the high cost of freight on the stock but also on the goods taken back to the station in return. The inside country has advantages in this respect because people there are not paying such high freight costs, although I believe producers on Kangaroo Island are paying \$12.50 freight a head of cattle. This is an illustration of how freight charges and costs are crippling primary production at present. For instance, to send a steer from Alice Springs to Adelaide through the South Australian Meat Corporation costs \$70 a head—more than what the animal is worth on the station itself. The question has been asked by people who are unaware of the difficulties in the industry: what did these producers do with their money when they received high prices a few years ago?

Mr. Chapman: Gave it to the Government in taxation.

Mr. ALLEN: That is easily answered: they paid enormous amounts in taxation and, also, many of them spent money on improving their water supplies.

Mr. Chapman: Since 1973, there are no deductions for that, either.

Mr. ALLEN: No. At present, it costs about \$30 000 to put down an artesian bore, and then there is the high cost of fencing and of the freight on the fencing materials used. Many owners have attempted to upgrade their herds by buying good bulls, and these costs have taken up any surplus that had accumulated over the last few years. Although the Bill will help the industry it does not go far enough. There should be some freight concessions or something along those lines so that these people could send their thousands of fat cattle to market. It will be catastrophic if the season continues as it is now and if these cattle lose condition. At present prices cattle cannot be sent to market but will have to remain and possibly perish on the station, and this will mean a loss to the country as a whole. An article in the *Chronicle* of May 16 by Mr. Grant Heaslip highlights the present position in the cattle industry and some short extracts from the article are of considerable interest. The report states:

Mr. Heaslip said the average cost of \$37 to send an animal to either Adelaide or Katherine in the north of the Northern Territory was crippling station-owners.

It also states:

There were good supplies of dry feed, but large numbers of stock would be left to die should the early summer rains not come.

The report also states:

Current net returns to Centralian cattlemen averaged only \$33 for fat stock.

I support the Bill, and sincerely hope that the Government will see its way clear in future to give further assistance to this important industry.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Like the member for Frome, I am concerned about the method that the Government intends to adopt in its plan to assist the beef industry. I am concerned, because the rural industry has not forgotten the fiasco that resulted from a proposal some years ago to assist woolgrowers. The emergency financial assistance plan for woolgrowers broke down miserably, although the motives of the Government of the day might have been sincere. This Bill has a clause similar to that which then applied to financial assistance for woolgrowers. In order to qualify as a specialist beef producer one must submit returns for the three years ended June 30, 1974. I am not satisfied that this Bill precludes an applicant from qualifying in relation to that period although he is not participating in this industry to any significant degree at this time. In other words, he could have been phasing himself out of the industry from June, 1974, and during this financial year has been totally phased out but, in terms of the Bill, would qualify for assistance.

A similar situation applied to the assistance for woolgrowers. In 1970-71 and 1971-72, 21 000 woolgrowers in Australia enjoyed assistance amounting to \$21 500 000, which was about two-thirds of the \$30 000 000 available. Among those applicants were growers who had qualified but who had sold out of sheep and in no circumstances should have received a hand-out from the Government or the authority. I believe the Minister should be careful when amending this legislation to avoid the possibility of any members of the beef industry qualifying in relation to the period when they are not participating in the industry today. I understand that action is being taken to tidy up clause 3, but will that solve the problem? If we are to tidy up the definition of "specialist beef producer" without amending the definition of "company", we will not allay the fears held by Opposition members. I understand that, by the definition of "company", responsibility is placed on each member of the company and that each company member is required to accept liability for any debt but is also entitled to accept the benefits directed to that company. Therefore, I believe that each company representative must qualify within the terms of this Bill. It may be in the interests of the Minister to consider the intended amendment to tidy up this definition.

The member for Frome referred to important aspects of this industry. Whilst we have no alternative to accepting any form of assistance to the industry, which has its back to the wall, perhaps the Government may be better advised to direct the assistance towards unloading the surplus stock in Australia and therefore encouraging beef producers to dispose of their aged and surplus stock. In several areas of this State it would be beyond the resources of growers to dispose of their stock and receive any sort of reasonable return. The present rate for chopper cows at the abattoir is about \$20: the freight charge from Kingscote to Gepps Cross is \$12.50 a head, the cost between the farm and wharf would be another \$3.50 a head and, in addition, yard fees and selling charges would erode the \$20 received, leaving the farmer without any net return. I know of some growers who received an account, rather than any proceeds, when they tried to sell their aged stock.

The member for Frome referred to areas a great distance from the metropolitan centre, some places being along the South Australian border. My examples are

closer to home, and I believe they will reinforce the case for helping growers to unload their stock for a reasonable return rather than lending them money in order to stay in business cluttered up with surplus cattle and sheep. I bring to the attention of the House the seriousness of the freight situation in South Australia and point out how disastrous it could be to rural producers generally and beef producers in particular. Whether or not producers qualify as specialist beef producers, some of them in this practice have more than got their back to the wall, because as they sell the further downhill they go. A grower from Macgillivray on Kangaroo Island who set out to dispose of some of his aged sheep in order to keep his younger stock intact and in order to keep his beef herd together (bearing in mind that there was little or no return from his beef) took the only logical step and attempted to get out his surplus aged sheep. On April 22, 1975, he sent to the abattoirs 276 cast-for-age ewes. The freight invoice breakdown from his farm to Kingscote (the berthing terminal of the m.v. *Troubridge*) shows that he incurred a cost of \$55.20, or 20c a head on this stock. The freight costs from Kingscote to Gepps Cross via the *Troubridge* were an additional \$1.64 a head, amounting to \$452.64. The total freight cost was therefore \$507.84. After these figures were deducted from the net amount recovered from the abattoirs, the producer suffered a loss of \$367.89, or \$1.33 a head. I appreciate that that example relates to sheep and that we are considering a Bill relating to beef.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was just about to draw the honourable member's attention to that fact.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I realise that, but many growers who will not qualify under this Bill have some sheep and some cattle, having gone through the process of diversification. They have already adopted recommendations from the Agriculture Department and switched from total sheep into sheep and some cattle. Producers therefore have acted not only under encouragement but also under direction of the department and its advisers to do so. There are literally hundreds of growers who will not, in my opinion, enjoy any assistance under this measure, yet they are in dire financial straits in keeping their respective farms going. That is why I have referred to the desperate attempts that are being made by growers who have not only cattle but sheep and cattle as well.

In those circumstances I believe that it is only fair that I bring to the attention of the House the matters to which I have referred. I do not intend to pursue a course on behalf of sheep producers, but will come back to those who are involved in the beef industry. As I have said, it is essential that we do not introduce in South Australia or in Australia, by supporting this Bill, any form of assistance to any industry that is going to end up like the emergency financial scheme that was directed to the wool-growers in 1971. I call on Governments generally to continue to assist the beef industry, but to do so by directly assisting the growers and encouraging them to dispose of their surplus stock at a reasonable return rather than by lending growers additional finance that will not help them to unload their surpluses.

It is an embarrassment that one faces in South Australia wherein one depends on seasonal conditions in the main and depends at certain stages of the year on unloading stock. If we are faced with a situation at this time of year, long after the top of the season has passed, and with prices as they apply at the abattoirs today, goodness knows what will happen in spring when hundreds of thousands of

cattle will pour into the markets because people will have to unload them at the end of next season. I have every sympathy with the collective group to which we are referring in this measure. I believe the Bill is designed to assist, but it assists only a few, and it should be widened and directed more especially at freight assistance rather than at interest assistance on further borrowed funds.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Naturally I support the Bill. I am concerned about the whole situation regarding the beef industry. I listened to my colleagues on this side giving their thoughts about the Bill and the problems that exist in the beef industry. The member for Frome said he would have liked to see a bigger sum available for this purpose. I agree, but I go further and say that the \$3 000 000 will not all be spent on the scheme. The whole measure is so narrowly constructed that a producer must be refused assistance from all other financial institutions before he can participate in this scheme; a producer must also have a viable business before he can be considered. Regarding beef marketing, I have yet to find anyone who can give a ray of hope for a marked improvement in the sale of beef in Australia for some time to come.

Mr. Chapman: Mr. Casey couldn't when he returned from the Middle East.

Mr. VENNING: True. The previous Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Casey) went to the Middle East to try to search out new markets for our beef, but we heard little about the results of the visit on his return. The only thing we found out was that his portfolio was changed, and I do not know whether that helps the situation or not. I remember the debate last week regarding the transfer of railways and how that would assist us. I believe a rebate should be given on freight to transport stock down from the North. A few moments ago my colleague referred to a problem regarding the North, but he did not refer to the possibility that, when cattle reach Adelaide, there may be a strike—what happens to the stock then? The producer loses all the time. Primary producers cannot collect social service payments unless they walk off their properties. That is an impossible situation for a producer when he is up against it financially. When a primary producer is up against it he is really up against it. I believe the Act should be amended to allow primary producers, like other people who are in difficulties, to collect social services without having to walk off their farming properties.

The money to be allocated to beef producers has to be repaid. Certainly the interest rate that will be charged will be of great assistance to producers: it will be of a benefit indeed when one considers present lending rates of 10 or 11 per cent. In fact, the interest rate is probably the main provision of this Bill that will help producers. I happen to have had something to do with the committee that dealt with this matter through rural reconstruction. I know how limited is the number who will be helped and how narrow the guidelines are. I repeat that I believe that \$3 000 000 will be the amount involved and that nothing more will be spent to assist beef producers in this State. The beef industry in South Australia certainly has a real problem. Beef numbers have never been higher and at present much of South Australia, like many other parts of Australia, is experiencing extremely dry conditions. In Queensland cattle are being turned out on to the road to go where they wish. Of course we support the Bill, to assist a limited number of beef producers, and the amendments on file will assist to carry out the provisions of the Bill. There were problems about the matter, such as the case of a farmer's wife, who had been a nurse or school-teacher, going out to earn money because of financial

difficulties. This action would put her in a difficult situation regarding benefit from the legislation. I hope that the authorities that deal with the beef industry in this State will be as generous as possible in assisting those people who are in difficulty.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is unfortunate that the House has had to consider a measure such as this. We live in a world in which millions of people are starving, and it is unfortunate that we must prop up a few specialist producers in an industry. I know that the problem in this State is not as great as the problem that the producers or the Government face in Queensland, but action must be taken if we are not to have a disaster.

I am aware that only about 8 per cent of Australia's total beef production is from South Australia but, if this year's season is poor, I do not know what will happen to many thousands of head of cattle if the prices at the abattoirs do not improve drastically in the next few weeks. As the member for Frome and the member for Alexandra have rightly pointed out, it is uneconomical for many producers to take cattle to the abattoirs, and there are no local markets. I do not know what will happen to these cattle; obviously, many cattle have been mated, and there was to be another drop of calves this winter.

I wonder whether it will be possible for producers to allow cattle to remain on their properties. In some cases, producers will have to destroy them. The first action that the Government ought to take to assist the industry is to give relief from annual indirect taxation charges such as council rates, land tax, and other fixed charges. Those charges are increasing rapidly because of inflation, and in turn that inflation is entirely due to the actions of the present Commonwealth Government and completely beyond the influence of the producers. Unfortunately, during the past financial year, many producers have had to meet a tremendously increased income tax burden, which has left them short of working capital.

If a more realistic approach had been adopted and sensible concessions had remained so that producers were not faced with such a high taxation bill, they could be in a difficult position at present. Other actions should be taken to encourage producers to reduce the number of stock on their property and enable them to receive a realistic return when they do this. At least, action can be taken so that, when producers are forced to send their stock to the abattoir, they get a reasonable return. The present position is totally inadequate and, if the situation is not rectified quickly, we could face a disaster in the beef industry.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I support the measure, of course. Primary industry generally and the beef industry in particular are, in large measure, boom or bust enterprises. They are subject to the vagaries of the season and the local market, and have to couple with this the variables of our Government policy. Although the variables of our local market are bad enough, added to them are the variables in the beef industry that exist through the actions of the Governments of the countries to which we export our produce. As previous speakers have said, inflation and cost increases have had a serious effect on the effectiveness of the beef industry in this State. Indeed, the effect has been felt across the nation.

Few people in my district would obtain the assistance offered in this Bill, because hardly any of them would qualify under the definition of a specialist beef producer. We all know that the beef industry has its own difficulties, and the accounting period for all primary production, particularly for the beef industry, can be of no less than

five years duration. Forward planning for this period is necessary to build up and establish the industry.

The problem that exists in the industry at present has been brought about by the boom or bust situation that we have had. In boom times primary producers have established themselves in the industry, and at present they are selling their produce on an extremely depleted market. The present problems of the beef industry are being worsened by the serious dry period that we are suffering, and if this extends into a full-scale drought the position of thousands of head of cattle moving to an over-supplied market is too terrible to contemplate.

Particularly in the South-East, where the member for Victoria lives, producers have so many cattle on their properties now that they must kick the tail of the last one to shut the gate, and the market may not be able to handle the cattle that move to the abattoirs. In that case, producers will be forced to return them to their properties. I trust that the Minister will be aware of the anomalies that existed earlier when assistance was extended to the wool industry. Serious doubts existed then that the assistance always went to those who needed it most. I fear that the assistance provided for in this Bill may be too little too late, but I support the measure, because it assists the beleaguered beef industry.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

To strike out the definition of "specialist beef producer" and insert the following new definition:

"specialist beef producer" means a person, firm or partnership declared by the Minister pursuant to section 3a of this Act to be a specialist beef producer for the purposes of this Act.

As several members have pointed out, the definition in the Bill was far too restrictive. Last week, the member for Victoria having put a case to me about the matter, I contacted the Minister of Lands and his officers and, in turn, they contacted Canberra. Members will appreciate that we can make no substantial departure from the terms laid down at the last Agricultural Council meeting unless we receive the blessing of the Australian Minister for Agriculture. He was pleased to agree to the extension of this definition because it was pointed out to him that many producers in the industry might have purchased a beef-producing property only one or two years ago and might be precluded under the original definition, yet they might be in no less difficulty than was any other beef producer.

The members for Alexandra and Goyder expressed doubts about this scheme, having regard to assistance previously granted to the wool industry, but this scheme is entirely different from that scheme, as it is not based on loss of income. The previous scheme was based on a loss of income from wool. This scheme is not designed to prop up marginal beef producers. It is designed to help beef producers with liquidity problems. Such producers will be provided with liquidity to enable them to operate as they would be able to operate normally if markets were there to enable them to do so. The idea is to provide finance in circumstances where producers are unable to get it anywhere else. It is not a scheme to assist people to recover. This money is not a gift; we never said that it would be. The loan will be provided at a low rate of interest that a producer can possibly manage to repay.

In addition, loans will be made in circumstances in which normal lending institutions have closed up and in which

the beef producing properties concerned would be viable if conditions were normal. Therefore, the fears expressed by a couple of members opposite about assistance provided by the Australian Government in relation to wool are not well founded. I will now deal with the case of the Minister and the committee advising him allowing a producer to earn some additional income. There may be the case of a person who owns a property and who in normal circumstances would qualify as a specialist beef producer. However, he may have had to go out to work, and to send members of his family out to work, in order to survive. In those circumstances, he should not be prevented from receiving assistance under this scheme. In other words, we are attempting by this amendment to widen the provision that was included in the original Bill, so that we can help as many people as possible under this scheme.

The member for Rocky River said that possibly the Bill provided too little too late. When this matter was first raised, I was Acting Minister of Agriculture and I sought advice from the Acting Director (Mr. Peter Trumble) about the needs of this State under this scheme. The reply to my query indicated that we would need an overall sum from the Australian Government and the State Government of slightly more than \$2 000 000. I said to the Acting Director at the time (and this can be checked with him), "All right, we will make it \$3 000 000, if we can get it." I should like the honourable member to know that we went for a little more than we thought we needed. Fortunately, we were able to get the Commonwealth to agree to \$1 500 000 and, with \$1 500 000 from us, that made a total of \$3 000 000. Under the amendment, the Minister and the committee that advises him will have more flexibility, and more people will probably be able to benefit from this scheme.

Mr. RODDA: I thank the Minister for the representations he made to the Minister of Lands and for the subsequent approach to the Australian Government to enable the introduction of this amendment, which we discussed last week. We hope that more people will now be eligible for the loan. However, the provision relating to the exhaustion of all sources of available finance will make the decision difficult. I understand that a special committee will advise the Minister and that the legislation will be administered by the rural industry assistance branch. How will the legislation be administered, and what will be the role of the special committee set up to assist the Minister?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Rural Reconstruction Branch of the Lands Department will be responsible for administering the legislation. Only recently the Minister decided that a revised application form would be issued. I think that the normal application for rural reconstruction (which is a 20-page document) was previously being used. This frightens people, before they see that they need fill out only a part of it. We now have a new form based on the Western Australian form, and I think it involves just two pages. It is fairly straight forward and simple. This will not cause the headaches that have been caused to some people, including some of my own constituents, in trying to prepare applications for the scheme. I am not sure how the committee will be made up, but it is the committee that advises the Minister in this area (the normal rural reconstruction committee) and will not be a special committee. This committee has access to all the knowledge and advice of officers of the department, many of whom are very experienced in this area. I make perfectly clear that the Government intends to service as many people as it

possibly can, without getting into the situation in which the committee or Minister lets through some people who should not get the loan. I suppose that is almost inevitable in some cases, but I hope that, if it happens in a few cases, ridicule will not be heaped on what is a genuine attempt in this area.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This is a most important amendment. It is a good thing that the Government has heeded the advice of the member for Victoria. The amendment improves the Bill, as the clause was too exclusive. I congratulate the Minister on moving the amendment and the member for Victoria on initiating it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 3a—"Specialist beef producers."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. (1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section the Minister may upon application in a form approved by him, declare a person, firm or partnership to be a specialist beef producer for the purposes of this Act.

(2) In making a declaration under subsection (1) of this section the Minister shall have regard to—

- (a) the proportion of the applicant's total annual income that is derived from the production of cattle for slaughter;
- (b) the period during which the applicant has been engaged in the business of the production of cattle for slaughter;

and

- (c) any other matters that the Minister considers relevant.

The Minister will have regard to these matters, and the new clause will allow him to have the flexibility to disregard some of the more stringent conditions.

Mr. VENNING: Do I understand that it will require a Ministerial decision on some of these aspects before assistance will be given?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, because it is not possible to legislate for every circumstance or eventuality. The committee will advise the Minister, and it is not often that a Minister disregards the advice of a committee appointed to assist him. I assure the honourable member that the Minister and the committee will ensure that they do not create any unusual anomalies in carrying out their work.

New clause inserted.

Clause 4—"Grant of assistance."

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say whether the new clause we have just inserted will cover any difficulty arising under subclause (3) (b) (iv)?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister must satisfy himself that the applicant for assistance can provide reasonable security for the repayment, with interest, of the amount applied for by way of assistance, on the assumption that there will be a recovery in the industry in a reasonable time. However, it may happen that the industry will not recover (we all hope that it will), so that there may need to be an extension of the scheme to provide an even greater scope. Based on the assumption that the industry will recover in a reasonable time, the Minister would want to assure himself on that score. I do not imagine that any person who could be termed a specialist beef producer under the scheme would be unable to provide reasonable security, and the Government is responsible to see to it that it protects its own interest.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

New clause 7—"Validation of payments."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

7. Where before the commencement of this Act, at any time on and from the seventeenth day of June, 1975, a loan has been made to a person, firm, or partnership, and the Minister certifies that that loan could have been made to that person, firm or partnership, pursuant to this Act had this Act been in operation at the time at which that loan was made, then this Act shall apply and have effect in all respects as if—

- (a) it was in operation at the time at which the loan was made;
- (b) the person, firm or partnership to whom the loan was made was a specialist beef producer;
- and
- (c) the loan was made under and in accordance with this Act.

The new clause provides that payments can be made now, even though the legislation has not been passed, in anticipation of its being passed. I think that the first payments were due to be made today; the Minister has expressed the desire that it would be better for the payments to be made rather than wait for the Bill to be proclaimed. This new clause is necessary to enable that to be done.

Mr. VENNING: Let us assume that a cattle producer were in trouble and would normally qualify for assistance. Do I understand that he must have been advised by the committee that he is acceptable to it as an applicant for assistance, or must have gone to the bank and said, "I am able to get money under the scheme"? Exactly what does the new clause provide?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Lands Department has already received applications for assistance. The validation clause simply means that, if the applicant had been approved, even under the old Bill, which is more restricted than the one now before us, instead of waiting for this legislation to be passed, we are able to make payments as from now if we wish. We can pay in anticipation of the Bill's becoming law.

New clause inserted.

Schedule.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say whether, in view of what has been said by the member for Frome, the Government will look favourably at these people should they get into difficulty?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$10 000 was arrived at after considerable debate in Agricultural Council, which I attended on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture. The member for Frome would be aware of the many big beef producers in Queensland and in other States, and I went along with them and agreed that there be an upper limit of \$10 000, bearing in mind that it was carry-on finance to solve liquidity problems and to carry out the normal operations on the property in order to maintain it so that the owner would not be lost to the industry in this difficult period. It could happen that the normal lending institution would lend money to the person if it knew that he would receive money from the scheme. There could be a combination of the two that may amount to, say, \$20 000. Should a drought occur other measures would have to be taken to assist producers. The sum of \$10 000 was accepted after much discussion, so that the amount available could be spread over more people than if we had accepted no upper limit for this grant.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1975)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISES (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 11. Page 3296.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This is not a simple measure, notwithstanding the fact that it was presented in that way. I refer more specifically to the part of the Bill that seeks to insert retrospectivity in respect of penal clauses, but, first, I say that the document that accompanied the presentation of this Bill was one of misrepresentation. It sought to tie together two events that, by no stretch of the imagination, could be tied together. The Treasurer introduced the original Bill on November 19, 1974, and in his second reading explanation stated:

Whilst that is the invidious situation that faces the State—referring to massive deficits and the like—

the Government is nevertheless concerned at the clear inflationary effect of this Bill, and is deeply conscious of the anomalous position into which it is being forced, in that it must introduce legislation of this nature at a time when all available evidence suggests that some relief from indirect taxation is one of the more important methods of stimulating the economy.

Obviously, the Government was being forced into the position by the Commonwealth Government's refusal to assist the States and distribute funds raised from the States back to the States. The Treasurer's statement continued:

In this regard, I would make quite clear that, even at this late stage, my Government would not proceed with this Bill, and also a Bill to be introduced later this session to license retail tobacco sales, if Australian Government assistance were made available to the extent contemplated by these taxing measures.

There is nothing about tying together this legislation with a railways Bill, or the sell-out of the railways; there was merely to be a distribution of funds from the Commonwealth to the States that would obviate the need to introduce those forms of taxation. Subsequently, the Commonwealth Government made funds available to the States, but the Treasurer failed to meet the responsibility as outlined in his statement to the House on November 19 last year and release people from the effects of the petrol tax. He sought to indicate how important it was that the money be spent in various ways so that he would not be permitted to fulfil his guaranteed promise to the people of the State. The document presented to the House when introducing this Bill was one of misrepresentation and, for all to hear, I repeat the first part, as follows:

Its principal object is to provide for the repeal of the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act, 1974, to honour an undertaking of the Government to the effect that, should certain financial benefits flow to the State consequent upon the passage of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, 1975, the substantial licence fees imposed on sellers of petrol would be removed.

That is a situation which the Treasurer fabricated much later than the original introduction of the measure in November, 1974, and which he has fanned in recent weeks in an attempt to get him, his Government, and his Commonwealth colleagues off the hook. Clearly, there is no tie between this measure and the railways Bill, and there never has been.

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage I point out to the House that we are dealing with a Bill before the House, and I must say that the honourable Leader has not infringed at this stage, and I want that clearly understood. However,

we do deal not with second reading speeches but with Bills. Whilst the Leader has referred to a certain matter, he has not infringed at this stage, but I will not allow a debate on another matter when we are referring to this Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not intend to infringe in any way, but I draw to the attention of the House the parallel drawn by the Treasurer in respect of this legislation with other legislation that has been of public concern. It is a totally dishonest manner in which the Treasurer has presented the two sets of circumstances to the people of this State and to this House. It is part of the play-acting we have come to expect of him in an attempt to divert the public gaze from the true facts of the Government's financial mismanagement and willingness to sell out the facilities and services of this State. We have the consequence of having passed a Bill that is very questionable in respect of certain facilities which are owned by people, but which are on premises to be transferred, if the Treasurer has his way. I refer to the wharves and bulk handling—

The SPEAKER: Order! Back to the Bill.

Mr. Jennings: The true facts!

Dr. EASTICK: I should like the truth to come out. I do not believe the truth has been told regarding many of these matters. Many comments have been made that information is available and that reports will be made available to members of the Opposition. Indeed, a report on the overall financial commitments of this State, including a submission to the Commonwealth in relation to our dire financial position, was offered to me across the floor of the House last Tuesday afternoon, but that document has not yet been delivered, notwithstanding that I asked the Premier's Department for that document because it would afford me and other members a better appreciation of the exact financial position of this State. I will spell out the situation if the member for Ross Smith wants the truth concerning the requests I made, the time the requests were made, and the failure to deliver the goods. However, that is not the purpose of this Bill, which is another example of the on-again off-again, buddy-buddy relationship between this Government and the Government in Canberra. Earlier this afternoon (indeed, on occasions over the weekend) we were told that South Australia would benefit by the sum of \$28 000 000 by handing our hospital system over to Medibank.

The Minister of Health in another place, as a result of questioning this afternoon, clearly indicated that South Australia will be advantaged to the extent of \$28 000 000 by joining the Medibank scheme. Not a cent of that sum of \$28 000 000 has been referred to by the Premier in a run-down of the financial requirements of this State. If there is suddenly \$28 000 000 floating about, where is it to be directed? From Government Ministers we hear that this sum will be available for the general activities of the State. The petrol tax is not necessarily a tax that would proceed beyond September this year, notwithstanding the passing of this Bill.

Fortunately members in another place were able to take a responsible attitude and to provide for scrutiny of this matter. We would have to recognise that this Bill seeks to relieve the public of further financial, inflationary contributions to the State as from June 24 and that unless action along these lines is taken further moneys will be extracted from the people and will go straight into the pockets of the resellers or those associated with the industry. The situation that now exists certainly was not intended by the Government: some resellers are collecting more money than is required to meet their licence

fee, and they are making those additional funds available to the consumer by cutting the price of petrol. However, a reseller with a smaller sale of petrol than previously still has to raise the funds necessary to pay for his licence. If this Bill is not passed, the situation after June will be chaotic, all resellers recouping the additional funds that were not to be a charge against them. Then the other difficulty of unfair competition would arise, with some companies closing down and not providing a service to the community in future. However, that is an entirely different matter.

The aspect of this measure I want to highlight is that the Government is introducing through amendment to section clause 11 a measure that will allow money to be extracted from people who have failed in various ways to fulfil their commitment under the general terms of the Act. I have previously told the Government that the Opposition does not accept retrospective legislation, and this Bill does not alter my view on that. It is clear that, under clause 11, not all the people who obtained funds from the consumer would be called on to make those funds available to the Government. There would be a selective extraction of funds from people who had been detected by the Government system, while many people who raised the funds in precisely the same manner would get off scotfree. Apart from the Government's obtaining these funds, they are funds that should be directed to those who paid the amount in the first instance, believing that they were doing what was required of them. It becomes an impossible situation, resulting from poor legislation that advantages some people and disadvantages others. That aspect, tied to retrospectivity, makes the action that the Government seeks to undertake through clause 4 totally unacceptable.

If there is a way of including a provision that will stop exploitation of the public, the Opposition will completely support it. If, at the same time, a measure can be included in the Bill which stops money being raised from the consumer as from June 24, without disturbing the period extending to September when the Government receives all the licence returns, the Opposition will support it. However, I do not believe that the Bill as presented is totally adequate or that the House should support it *carte blanche*. One cannot disagree with the general aspects of Part IV in relation to amendments to the tobacco franchise legislation. There never has been quite the same commitment in respect of tobacco franchise as there has been in respect of petrol, and I appreciate that the provisions of this Bill in respect of the tobacco franchise legislation allow certain tribunal activities and other aspects of collection to proceed. The tobacco franchise legislation, in its own right, is not self-standing: it is necessary to go back to the original provisions under the measure dealing with the petrol franchise. I repeat that I support the general aspects of the Bill, but I believe that it has been misrepresented in the way that it has been proposed to us, and I am totally opposed to clause 4, which seeks to make fish of one and flesh of the other.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support my Leader's remarks. A serious proposition has been put before the House. False reasons have been given for the introduction of the measure, because it has been tied to another obnoxious piece of legislation that we have discussed recently.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have mentioned to the House (and I will repeat it to the honourable member for Eyre) that we are dealing with one Bill: there are not two Bills involved in this. That will be the type of debate that will take place, and remarks on some other legislation are out of order in dealing with this Bill.

Mr. GUNN: The Bill that we are discussing should never have been put before the House. It is another indication of the stop-go financial policies of this Government. Discussion of legislation of this kind highlights the need for a full public inquiry into the State Government taxation field. If this Government wanted to serve the people of this State in a productive and positive way, it would appoint a full inquiry, with the powers of a Royal Commission, and allow the people to make representations on areas of State Government action. Then the report could be tabled here so that members could consider it realistically. We should not be in the ridiculous situation of having legislation operate for six months and then of having the Treasurer, with a threat, placing a repeal Bill before the House. If the Treasurer is successful with this legislation and if the present Commonwealth Government remains in office, legislation similar to this will be put before the House again before long, because the same shallow excuses and arguments will be advanced to justify it. Those excuses are that the State Government has found itself in a difficult financial position. However, that has happened because there has not been proper planning, and because proper guidance has not been given to Government departments. The Government has continued its policy of thinking of a scheme and then deciding how to finance it. It has this great media-monitoring machine, this Dr. Goebbels machine, to brainwash the people with its proposals, and later it thinks about how to raise the funds.

I strongly support the Leader's statement about clause 4. I have in my district constituents who face many difficulties in relation to this legislation because their taxes have been based on an estimate of past sales and their current sales have not met the figures. They have had to pay substantial amounts to the Commissioner. They consider that this is most unjust, and I hope that the Government will consider its financial situation realistically in the few months that it has left to consider it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Briefly, the need for clause 4 arises from the very retrospective nature of the licensing system and, if we are to bring a licensing system to an end, it is necessary for us to make transitional provisions that will allow it to come to an end. As the licensing system was originally devised, the penalty was to deprive a man of his licence. If his licence was defaulted, he could not continue in business, and that was a very real penalty. However, if we remove that penalty but still have a period in which the Act is obliged to operate, we must have some alternative.

Dr. Eastick: It goes beyond that, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it does not do anything of the kind. Otherwise, the Leader would be leaving the Act without any proper provisions under which to administer it, and that would not be proper. Regarding the other matter to which the Leader has adverted, in February this year we had a small amount of money provided to us by the Commonwealth Government. It certainly was not enough prospectively to ensure that next year's financial returns would even approach a situation where we could be looking at a kind of deficit that could have withstood even the most stringent circumstances for the State. In those circumstances, and given the alterations in necessary public spending, which I detailed at that time (it was not some new thing undertaken by the Government: it arose from escalation of wages and escalation of actual costs of equipment provided to Government under plans put before this Parliament in appropriation legislation), it was certainly not possible to remove this measure. At

the time honourable members asked me whether I was going to get anything from the Commonwealth Government that would allow me to remove it. I said we were negotiating and that I hoped I would have a measure under which we would get some money to remove it. I said hope was not lost and I was still continuing to negotiate. Now, when I have successfully completed the negotiations and I can say that we have got money whereby we can remove this tax, all I hear from the Opposition are moans.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Sale of petroleum products by unlicensed persons prohibited."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The argument I advanced in the second reading debate has not been destroyed by the Treasurer's reply to that debate. New subsection (1a) of section 11 does not limit how far back in the life of the legislation the provision will go. This legislation was proclaimed only on December 5 last. It is possible to initiate actions against persons for offences under the original legislation, and no limitation of time is set in this provision. Therefore, I cannot support this clause.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This measure only provides that the court may order payment of the licence fee that would have been paid if the licensee had paid his licence fee; that is all it does.

Dr. EASTICK: New subsection (1a) (a) supports what the Treasurer has said. However, another provision states that a further sum not exceeding \$1 000 can be fixed by the court.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: For failure to pay.

Dr. EASTICK: I grant that this provision was contained originally. In fact, it is intended to delete the reference to \$1 000. What the Treasurer has not said is that there is a default penalty in the original provision of \$200. That has been completely removed, and we suddenly have the situation in which a person can be called on to pay \$800 more than as provided originally. I do not dispute that we should be able to collect the licence fee in cases where the licence has been utilised for the gain of the person concerned. However, the circumstances outlined in this case are not identical to those that applied previously. There will be two classes of people: those who have been prosecuted previously and those who will be prosecuted subsequently. Different circumstances will apply in those cases. It is in the overall sense of retrospectivity that the Opposition cannot accept this provision.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hopgood, McKee, and McRae.
Noes—Messrs. Arnold, McAnaney, and Nankivell.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 12), schedule and title passed.
Bill reported without amendment.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEX DISCRIMINATION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 11. Page 3300.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I agree with the two main principles of the Bill, namely, giving effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee on the Sex Discrimination Bill by removing discrimination on the ground only of sex. Members will recall that the committee was set up as a result of a private member's Bill introduced by the member for Bragg, and complementary legislation is now on the Notice Paper in relation to the Government's intention on this matter. The second object of the Bill is to provide indexation on a quarterly basis, as foreshadowed by the recent decision in the national wage case, whereby, whilst it is not yet definite, it is likely that indexation of that nature could be on a quarterly basis. Therefore, it is necessary to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to alter the minimum period from six months to three months to coincide with the quarterly adjustments. The Opposition completely supports the principles put forward.

The Bill also seeks to delete all references to the living wage, and I will quote from the Minister's second reading explanation where he talked about the conditions of employment of the sexes and said:

Accordingly, it endeavours to ensure that as far as possible there can be no discrimination in conditions of employment as between the sexes, to the extent that those conditions of employment are determined by the Industrial Court or Commission in this State.

This matter could be subject to some argument, because of later provisions the Minister has put before us. The Minister said that the Bill was the result of an International Labor Office decision to be ratified, in which it was suggested that the practice of determining different living wages for males and females should be changed. The Minister continued:

It would have been possible to achieve one of the objects of the measure by repealing only the references to the female living wage.

I agree that that could have been done. The Minister continued by saying that representations were then made, and the Government decided to abandon the living wage concept. The question of determining wages for females in various occupations was the subject of an important decision and hearing last year before the Industrial Court. Cases were brought up in which there were no male counterparts for certain occupations, in which only females were engaged. The member for Playford (Mr. McRae) was counsel in the case. It was an important case, and it laid down certain guidelines. In fact, it was a test case. The Minister went on to say that the concept of equal pay would not be implemented overnight but would be gradually brought in according to the powers the Industrial Commission might have.

I say with all due respect to the Minister that the way in which he (although it may have been his predecessor in this case) has gone about this matter appears to be a clumsy way of achieving the desired results in the three subjects to which I have referred, namely, removing sex discrimination, introducing indexation, and removing the living wage. I will now discuss those topics in the order of the proposed amendments before us. The first is the change in the provision dealing with the living wage, namely, clause 2. The view has been held for some time that the opportunity for the court to control South Australia's living wage has operated to the advantage of South Australia in helping to achieve a result that would give us a differential whereby we could produce goods to our advantage as regards other States, so that we could

compete with other States by producing goods here, transporting them to the other States, and selling them on the open market. The view is held that this amendment removes that opportunity, and this view has been held for some time.

The Bill now seeks to take away all reference to the living wage. The Minister has said that the Government had considered deleting all reference to the female living wage; however, the Government will now delete all references, wherever they occur in the Act, to the living wage generally. Although it occurs in one part in an amendment the Minister has foreshadowed, the definition will go. I believe that the Government has posed several problems for itself, and certainly for the court. In the first provision we are dealing with, namely, clause 2, the Minister himself quotes the question of total wage. He referred to the time when all awards could be varied to describe rates as total wages; that is what we are considering now. The Minister said that most awards now provide a total wage rate, although about one-half of them also include the margin above the living wage. That is correct, but there is no mention of minimum wage, which, for Adelaide, is \$79.60 for males and \$71.60 for females. The Minister said:

However, there is a small number of awards and industrial agreements that, at present, only provide for margins above the living wage for the time being in force. It is necessary, therefore, for the time being for the purpose of those awards and agreements to preserve a figure equal to the present living wage.

I assume that is why the figure appears in an amendment to the Bill. I suggest to the Minister that, where he talks in clause 2 about changing the heading of a section from "living wage" to "alteration of awards", he should really, if he is being completely realistic in this matter, use the term "total wage" or "alteration in total wage", because we are talking not about the alteration in the award but of the concept of "total wage", which has been the term used in the Commonwealth jurisdiction for a long time. I suggest that "total wage" would be a better term to use. Clause 3 amends the Bill in three ways. At present, the definition of "industrial matter" includes any matter, situation or thing affecting or relating to, amongst other things, the sex of an employee. The Bill purports to remove the word "sex" from the definition, and we agree with that concept. "Industrial matter" is the most important of all the definitions. As it is a wide definition, it could include not only the sex of the employee concerned but also (and I believe it does) special references to whether people of either sex shall be disqualified for employment and removal. I believe that this removal of the specific about which I have talked may leave the general proposition arguable in the court. I am fearful that we may have unnecessary litigation. I favour removing any question of sex discrimination, but all is not plain sailing for this Bill. I am not sure whether the traps that can occur have been realised, and they may apply to the detriment of employees. If we adopt this proposed definition, it would seem that we remove from industrial matters any question relating solely to the sex of the individual, for example, rest periods or seating. I am suggesting problems and trying to help, because the Minister will be aware that the metal industry award provides for matters that may be detrimental to females, although under present conditions they are quite rightly provided for. Clause 3 amends section 6, and paragraph (b) is similar to paragraph (a), because the adoption of a variation could be interpreted as removing these aspects from the question of industrial matters.

The State's wine and spirit award was rather contentious, and part of it referred to the question of disqualification of male employees from employment in the industry.

We are referring to sex in this Bill but in an industrial way, and it applies to both boys and girls. In the award I have mentioned there is a restriction on males under a certain age from being employed in the industry. The whole question of employment of a proportion of juniors to tradesmen or adults could be in jeopardy, although it could be caught under a subsequent section of the Act not to be amended. The dry cleaners award is another that provides that no female under the age of 18 years may be employed on a steam press. Also, the metal industries award provides that specific work can be declared unfit for females, and prohibits the employment of non-apprentice junior employees on certain machines. I agree with these provisions, but I am trying to show that dealing with this type of legislation is not as easy as it may seem. Some problems may lead to litigation and require decisions by the courts.

Clause 3 (c) refers to the abolition of the living wage, because that definition is now superfluous. The words "total wage" or "alteration of total wage" could well be substituted for what the Minister is suggesting. I turn now to clause 6, which seeks to delete section 35. I see no problems in altering the first two subsections. Under section 35 (3) the Full Commission has had power to fix the different living wage rates to be paid in various parts of South Australia. As the Minister will recall, the rates at Whyalla and Iron Knob have usually been fixed at 50c a week higher than the rate for the rest of the State. It could be argued that section 36 might cover this point. We are now taking away the court's ability to make variations for different areas of the State.

If section 35 (3) is removed, the specific power to continue ordering differential rates for Iron Knob and Whyalla will disappear. I have already said that section 36 may catch this variation, and this is important to the honourable member representing the North of the State. Section 35 (4) is obviously a consequential provision, and sections 35 (5) and 37 (1) (b) have, to date, prohibited the Full Commission from declaring a new living wage unless a period of six months has elapsed. I agree completely with this because, if we are to have indexation in the Commonwealth of Australia, it should apply also in South Australia: this should be complementary. We agree that this precedent should be followed. It will, of course, follow any national determination.

The Bill repeals section 35 and inserts in its place a new section that seeks to incorporate the current living wage (that is, \$48.20 a week for adult males and \$38.60 a week for adult females) fixed on about April 30 last. I take it that the Minister has included this provision to enable it to be used as a base. No minimum wage has been determined, and the Minister has not included in this provision the variation of 50c relating to Iron Knob and Whyalla. We are, therefore, not quite on all fours in this respect.

I refer now to the difference in relation to the minimum wage, as no-one receives the living wage. The minimum wage, as I understand the order of April 30, is \$79.60 for adult males and \$71.60 for adult females. I wonder why (and I should like the Minister to elaborate on this aspect later) the Minister has adopted the living wage, which he is seeking to expunge from the Act, and yet does not use the term "minimum wage" which is laid down and on which most people work. The minimum wage aspect is important, as some people operate on it. I believe that the Minister's proposal to amend section 35 would not nullify the recent living wage decision, and the inclusion in section 35 of the amount will be confusing unless it is

removed or amended when next the Minister gets around to what he calls an alteration of awards (what I suggest should be an alteration of the total wage). The Minister seeks to amend section 36 of the principal Act by striking out from subsection (1) the passage:

(which variation may include provision for a minimum wage in excess of the living wage).

Here again, we have the phrase "minimum wage". The Bill seeks to remove existing specific references to the powers of the Full Commission to declare a State minimum wage. It could well be in future that, if we follow the national wage case, we could have a State minimum wage that is also determined by a national wage case (I hope I have put that clearly for the Minister), even though it may be thought that section 36, as amended, retains this power to which I referred earlier without the words sought to be deleted. I should have thought that the specific reference to the powers to include also the State minimum wage would be desirable.

I turn now to the repeal of sections 37, 38 and 39, which in the past have dealt specifically with the mechanics to be gone through in relation to the promulgation of a living wage decision by the Full Commission. It appears to be the intention of the Government that no proclamation in future will be made. The Minister has referred to that in his second reading explanation, and I accept it. I presume the Full Commission will make an order relating to this alteration of a wage affecting all State awards. However, it seems as though one safeguard in relation to the existing section 37 will disappear from the Act. The Minister may be aware that, by the provisions of that section, he, as Minister of Labour and Industry, must satisfy himself and sign a certificate that he is satisfied that a new alteration of wages does not create unjustifiable differences between comparable wage rates fixed under Commonwealth and State awards respectively.

I believe that to have been a very valuable safeguard. I know that I had to sign such certificates when I was Minister. The President of the Commission also must agree. That provision and also subsections (4) and (5) are being removed from section 37. This, I believe, would concede power to the Full Commission to alter an award at any time, because I believe the wording is imprecise. I do not suggest that that would happen; I would hope it would happen only at least as a quarterly adjustment, but the Minister should be aware that all statutory powers in this regard are being taken away. There is no limitation, and I believe that some limitation should be retained. Perhaps we should consider it by linking such a consideration by the State Full Commission to the national wage movements, whether quarterly or whatever else they may be. This is a most important aspect. The Minister seeks also to delete section 38, which contains the powers to vary all State awards following a declaration of a new living wage. I presume that, by the amendment the Minister is seeking and by excluding these requirements, this will be left to the discretion of the Full Commission.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's correct.

Mr. CUMBE: If that is the case, in my view there would be no requirement about the manner in which annual salaries would be increased as a result of future alterations to awards and no requirement that employees under 21 years of age should get a percentage of the increase in the adult award rate, so there is no general requirement about how the resulting new rates would be compiled. I have referred to these matters because I think that the Minister has gone about it in a rather clumsy way and I am frightened that litigation that could be avoided could occur. The removal of section 38 (1) would result in the

Full Commission's having to rule on these matters individually each time an alteration to awards occurred. In the Bill there is no legislative requirement that any uniformity should occur from one alteration in awards to another. In effect, the Full Commission would have to make its own rules. I am aware of the position in the Commonwealth court in that regard, but I put it forward so that the Minister can consider it.

Section 69 is consequential. I suggest that, instead of the alteration of wages, the Minister should look at the question of total wages and should introduce amendments to make it easier to operate. After all, the Minister has to administer the Act in future and he will find when he has a little more experience that it is important to have these matters clarified by the Legislature so that the courts will not be flooded with litigation. Members opposite will know, from experience, how these matters can be argued at considerable length. I have before me an important industrial case that the member for Playford fully argued last year. Section 78, which deals with equal pay, is extremely important. The Opposition has said that it favours the removal of discrimination. Because the Minister may not have been here when I have spoken previously on this subject, I reiterate that I have repeatedly supported the concept of equal pay for the sexes and its phasing in gradually so there is not too much of a jump. The present position is that all applications for equal pay for females, even those that are subject to consent by the parties, must be dealt with by the Full Commission. The repeal of section 78 will enable a single Commissioner or even the Chairman of a Conciliation Committee to deal with applications for equal pay, giving rise to the distinct possibility that individual Commissioners could reach differing decisions. In fact, a single Commissioner could consider a consent agreement. We must have the concept of a Full Commission retaining the power to consider these matters so that we get uniformity in the decisions made. A second prerequisite, which establishes whether adult females perform work of the same or like nature of equal value, is set out in the Act, but that will disappear. A famous case has been handed down on this section, and I referred to that case last year. It has been used as a test case, where there is no equivalent male classification. By the deletion of the provision to which I have referred, can the Commissioner no longer consider that test case, which has been the guiding principle on many of those issues that have been raised since it was decided? The case has been cited extensively for use as a guideline in this regard. The decision is dated October 3, 1974, and is reported in print No. 43 of that year.

If section 78 is removed entirely, it could well be argued and presumed that individual Commissioners and Chairmen could even disregard this test case by claiming that the principles in section 78 no longer existed and, therefore, they were no longer obliged to keep that case in mind. I repeat that, whereas all these matters were referred to the Full Bench of the Commission, they could now go to a single Commissioner (they operate under different awards) or even to the Chairman of the conciliation committee, and differing decisions may be brought down. There are certain decisions on this matter in the Commonwealth jurisdiction.

I point this out as a real possibility, because at present some State awards have an equal margin for adult males and adult females. Generally, when we have been talking about equal pay, there has been a differential between the rates, because of the living wage. The total has been either up or down and this has been increased by the differential that I have mentioned. This has caused

difficulties in some approaches made to the court. If we are to abandon the living wage, we should adopt a total wage concept, as is done in the Commonwealth jurisdiction.

I have said that we agree with the main concept that the Minister has put forward, but I have deliberately submitted for his consideration some problems that may arise and I suggest that he seek the adjournment of the debate to consider those points. They may be valid or they may not be, and the Minister may agree with them or he may not, but I have put them forward constructively, because they are important. What I want to do (and I think the Minister has grasped the point) is avoid unnecessary and expensive litigation that could be avoided if the legislation was clear on this aspect. The Minister, on reflection, may want to move amendments to the Bill himself. I am suggesting this not because the Minister is new to the portfolio but because I believe that the matters I have brought forward are important to the whole work force of South Australia. On that basis, I support the second reading.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support this Bill at this stage. I consider it a most important measure, because of the objectives stated by the Minister in his second reading explanation. My colleague the member for Torrens has dealt, in his usual thorough and detailed way, with this industrial measure. I am pleased to see that there is specific reference to the findings of the Select Committee of this House on the Sex Discrimination Bill. We are acknowledging the need for changes in that sphere. When that Select Committee was meeting, it became clear that there were two ways of tackling the difficulties that arose in industry. It became apparent that there was a piecemeal approach that I believe some witnesses said was necessary. It was a piecemeal approach inasmuch as various items of legislation were to be amended or had been amended in small ways and, after all this process had been gone through, we would see the objects of the original Bill brought into effect. There was no question that this approach has been successful to a point, but I am concerned to ensure that there is nothing that we miss.

The points raised by the member for Torrens, particularly the deletion of section 78 of the principal Act, deserve close consideration. If the effect of this legislation is to make women's position less clear and to take away from them rights that they now have in the industrial field, it must be looked at very closely. The member for Torrens has pointed out several aspects where this could be so. We are all concerned to ensure that there is no discrimination in employment, whether it be against women or men: we want a fair go for everyone. This matter must therefore be looked at carefully. When introducing another measure, the Premier said:

I wish to pay a tribute to the member for Bragg. When he first introduced the measure to the House, the Government considered that legislation was not necessary but that the matter could be coped with by administrative measures and piecemeal changes.

To a point, I agree. However, I repeat that I will be happy with the passage of this legislation only if it does not disadvantage women in the work force and women in the community generally. I will be happy if this legislation passes only if another measure before this House is passed, because the two go hand in hand: there is no conflict. A general measure to tie up all loose ends is thoroughly desirable. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 18, at 2 p.m.