

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 19, 1976

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 26 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences. Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 88 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (July 29).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have had the Director and Engineer-in-Chief examine the honourable member's request that consideration be given to problems in the Northern Adelaide Plains associated with the drought. Because of the vast proportion of operators who have managed their operations within their water allocations, it would be difficult to justify any special adjustment for those who have not. However, I shall be pleased to receive any submission made by any individual who considers that his circumstances warrant special consideration. I will have such submissions examined and reported upon by the newly formed Water Resources Council.

MONARTO

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (August 5).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Monarto Development Commission is carrying out two projects under the Monarto (Additional Powers) Act:

1. For the Port Adelaide Centre Joint Committee of the South Australian State Planning Authority: preparation of a redevelopment scheme for the district business zone in the centre of the Port Adelaide council area under section 63A of the Planning and Development Act. Stage 1, involving the preparation of alternative strategies, has

been completed and endorsed by the committee as the basis for ongoing work at a cost of \$27 500. Stage 2, involving the refining of a preferred plan and ongoing management techniques, has been commenced and will be completed in December, 1976. In addition to technical planning work, the commission has advised the joint committee on, and carried out under its direction, a large segment of the associated public participation programme at an estimated cost of \$60 000.

2. For the South Australian Government: a study of part of the Adelaide Hills to be undertaken in two stages. Stage 1 will investigate appropriate policies, and development control mechanisms and management systems, to ensure that the Government's declared policies for the conservation of the Hills are implemented. This stage has commenced. In accordance with governmental instructions, liaison is being established with Hills communities through their councils and citizens associations. In addition, Government agencies responsible for planning development and conservation in the Hills area are being consulted. Stage 2 will investigate specific geographic areas identified as having special problems, and such functional matters as the maintenance of visual amenity along the South-Eastern Freeway corridor, the identification of areas suitable for rural living subdivisions, and the maintenance of viable agricultural activities in the Hills, at an estimated cost of \$170 000 over a period of about 18 months.

The Monarto Development Commission is negotiating with several Government authorities in relation to various proposals.

NORTH-EAST SUBURBS TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (August 3).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The baseline stage of the North-East Area Public Transport Review study is well under way. As part of the communications programme, a file of information will be made available at a wide range of public locations in the study area. A copy of this file containing all documents published by the N.E.A.P.T.R. team will be supplied to the honourable member soon. The study team has moved into an office in the Grenfell Centre and the honourable member and, in fact, all persons are invited to visit the team to obtain any information they consider necessary or to make any suggestions they wish. A copy of the file will be maintained in the Parliamentary Library as soon as it is available, which is expected to be in the near future.

TROUBRIDGE

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The investigations into the replacement for the *Troubridge* are not yet complete. However, I expect the Director-General of Transport will be making an interim report shortly.

TAILEM BEND TO PINNAROO LINE

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The proposed upgrading of the Tailem Bend to Pinnaroo railway line will not bring it to a standard which would allow the operation of intersystem jet freight services or the Overland at a commercially acceptable speed. The Victorian line beyond Pinnaroo would be similarly restrictive.

WILLUNGA HILL ROAD

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The new road deviation between Aldinga Road and Pages Flat Road is expected to be open to traffic in December, 1976. The section from Pages Flat Road to Mount Compass is expected to be open to traffic, as a gravel road, shortly. Sealing of this section is scheduled for early 1977 and completion in mid-1977.

COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether he and the Government will now follow the lead of their colleague the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Wran), and give the Lynch Budget a fair go? After a meeting of the New South Wales Cabinet yesterday, the New South Wales Premier said he was willing to give the Lynch Budget a fair go. He expressed the hope that everyone would join together to get Australia back on its feet. Many times this year, I have appealed to the Government in South Australia to face reality, and to stop making scaremongering statements designed to score political points against the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I am quoting facts. These statements have created confusion and concern in the community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order. The Leader is debating the question; he is not explaining it at all.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable Leader must not debate the question.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Wran has taken a positive step in this regard and made a statement which accepts the need for a national effort to get Australia back on its feet, and he has therefore shown himself to be the most significant Labor Premier in Australia. Will the Premier now stop his constant mudslinging at the Federal Government and get on with the job of governing South Australia?

Mr. Gunn: Instead of whingeing like a stuck pig.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has the floor.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will give this Budget as fair a go as I can. All I can say is that Mr. Wran has pointed out that he disagrees completely with its strategy, and so do I. The Government of South Australia will endeavour to keep down charges to the community and to play its part in endeavouring to lessen inflationary pressures. However, we will not follow the directions of the Federal Government to reduce State services and construction expenditure beyond what we have done.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And so increase unemployment,

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not intend to increase unemployment. We will not follow the directions of the Prime Minister that we do not have an unemployment relief scheme. Our programme is to ensure the maintenance of employment in South Australia and the lessening of inflationary pressures. The Federal Budget does nothing to lessen inflationary pressures and is directly concerned with increasing unemployment.

Dr. Tonkin: That is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader apparently has not read the Treasurer's Budget speech, because he

admits in it that in fact there will be an increase in unemployment as a result.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's in the document.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader does not believe in reading what the facts are; all he does is get up and play politics and then accuse me of doing so.

TOW-TRUCK INDUSTRY

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the special committee of inquiry into the tow-truck industry in South Australia is proceeding and, if it is, when the committee is likely to submit a report to the Minister?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The committee is proceeding with its work. I received a report only yesterday that it was making satisfactory progress. I cannot say at present how long the committee will take, except that it has acknowledged the need for an early report. As soon as that report is received, I will inform the honourable member and the House of the Government's attitude towards that report.

HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider buying Her Majesty's Theatre to preserve it for the performing arts in South Australia? The Premier has announced that he would use the planning power of the City of Adelaide Development Committee to retain Her Majesty's Theatre. It is unrealistic for the Government to try to force a company to keep a theatre open if its operations are unprofitable. The Opposition believes that it is essential that the theatre be retained for cultural purposes. Indeed, we suggest it could possibly be a base for the State Opera of South Australia. Will the Government consider purchasing the theatre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member speaks on behalf of J. C. Williamson Theatres Limited, but I should have thought, given the previous negotiations of this Government with that company, that if it had a proposition to put forward for the purchase of the theatre it would approach the Government.

Dr. Tonkin: No, we are expressing our own concern about its occupancy.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: With the money we get from Fraser, I suppose.

Dr. Tonkin: You're getting more than you got—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that this Government has made provisions for the arts and for the State opera company that far exceed those of Liberal Governments previously in South Australia, or Liberal Governments anywhere else in Australia.

Mr. Becker: That's history.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member apparently does not believe in facing facts in South Australia with regard to this Government's concern for the arts. I applaud the sudden enthusiasm of some members opposite.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can imagine how much appreciation the honourable member has for the arts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am very glad that they have been converted. Having been in a position where members opposite over years have proceeded to attack me

about expenditure on the arts in South Australia, I very much appreciate their change of view. In relation to this theatre, the Government has made clear that it will not allow the theatre to be demolished, or a change of use to occur. If J. C. Williamson Theatres Limited is interested in approaching the Government to ascertain whether the Government is willing to buy the theatre, the Government will welcome such an approach. We have made many approaches to that company, offering Government support to keep the theatre open.

Mr. Becker: And they haven't contacted you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No: it rejected the approaches, which the company had requested. The Government made certain offers, but the offers were not accepted, and the company has not made any recent approaches.

Dr. Tonkin: So you are going to do nothing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not so. I am going to see to it that the theatre is not lost to South Australia. If J. C. Williamson Theatres Limited wishes to approach the Government about the purchase of the theatre, we shall be pleased to talk to the company.

PORT ADELAIDE ROADS

Mr. WHITTEN: Is the Minister of Transport aware of a report in today's *Advertiser* about plans to give Port Adelaide a facelift, and is he aware of the statement that the useful life of Birkenhead bridge is limited? The report on page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser*, when referring to the provision of an adequate public transport link between Port Adelaide and the metropolitan area, states:

A possible long-term traffic solution is building a new bridge north of Commercial Road to replace the Birkenhead bridge, said to be nearing the end of its life. Another idea is to retain Birkenhead bridge with a load limit to exclude heavy traffic and build a new bridge downstream. As a result of that report, I am concerned that people living on the northern side of the Port River may not be able to use this bridge. Therefore has the Minister any information on this matter.

Mr. Gunn: Dear Dorothy—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As with other structures, Birkenhead bridge has a limited life. It was only about two years ago that the bridge was redecked and repaved, and, by maintaining the bridge in this way, its life has been extended for a considerable time. An overall investigation is proceeding on the means of transport communication between Outer Harbor, Osborne, and Birkenhead and the southern suburbs. Several proposals are now being considered, one of which entails the resiting of Birkenhead bridge. The matter is in the investigation stage only, and it is not possible to foresee whether Birkenhead bridge will not serve the needs of the areas to the north of the bridge, as it now does.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the South Australian Government intends to act on the wish of the Federal Government to allocate additional road funds to councils for rural arterial and rural local roads? I have a letter from the District Council of Warooka, in which is enclosed a copy of a letter from the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Peter Nixon) to Senator Harold Young. In part the letter states that \$35 800 000

in additional funds is to be allocated to the States for roads in 1976-77, taking the total allocation to \$433 500 000, of which South Australia's share is \$38 800 000. The letter continues:

Because the Government is aware of the road needs of local government, I have recently written to State Ministers expressing the Commonwealth Government's concern at some of the implications of fund allocations adopted under the current legislation, particularly with regard to the needs of local government and the needs identified in the rural arterial roads network. The Government has decided therefore to ask State Governments to allocate additional funds to these areas to the maximum extent. It is the aim of the Commonwealth that the additional \$35 800 000 should be directed as far as possible to meeting the needs of local government. I propose therefore to direct the bulk of the additional funds to the rural local and rural arterial roads categories.

Later in the letter, he states that local government in South Australia would also receive almost \$12 000 000 of untied grant moneys. The Warooka council makes the observation that, in South Australia, provision has not been made by the Highways Department in the allocation of road grants to the council to keep up with rising costs attributed to inflation. The council's allocation for 1976-77, is down on the 1975-76 allocation, and it adds the following note:

District roads grants above exclude tourist roads grants which are contributed on a 50-50 basis—

but that is another story—

It should also be mentioned that the actual allocation for roads grants for the year 1976-77 is considerably less than the application for grants submitted by the council.

The council considers that the Government may not be allocating these funds on a local basis but may be supporting pet projects.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should be delighted if the honourable member would tell me what the pet projects are that he thinks we may be supporting. Although I am sorry that I cannot give him the actual figures now, generally, more grant moneys are being made available to local government this year than were made available last year; that does not necessarily apply on the basis of every individual council. If that situation does not meet with the honourable member's desires, I invite him to tell me from which council he would like me to consider taking money to give to Warooka: I think that the ball is in his court.

I regret sincerely that the honourable member has seen fit to discuss the matter that Mr. Nixon referred to in a letter to Senator Young, and I complained about this matter at the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Regrettably, Mr. Nixon is speaking with two voices because he has reduced the allocation of funds (or, his Government has done this and, as Minister, he must accept the responsibility) to the State, compared to the amount recommended by the Bureau of Roads to the extent in South Australia's case of \$9 000 000 this financial year. I explained to the House some time ago that we had been forced, by the Federal Government's decision, to increase registration and licence fees: first, to make up for the lack of funds provided by the Commonwealth, and secondly, to meet the matching requirements demanded of us by the Commonwealth. It is playing politics when Peter Nixon writes to Harold Young in the way in which he has written in the letter to which the honourable member has referred.

The other aspect that must be considered is that the figures of additional funds, to which the honourable member has referred, principally are those of all of the

States. Likewise, I think he referred to the additional amounts that would be made available as a topping up to take account of inflation, which is still running at 15 per cent, notwithstanding promises the Prime Minister gave Australia last December. South Australia is not getting 15 per cent over what was originally planned, but we have been asked by the Federal Minister to submit a proposition for the allocation of that money in the various categories. Remember, it is not South Australia that makes decisions today as to where the money is to be spent; it is Canberra.

Mr. Boundy: You make the allocation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The decision on where the money is spent is determined by the allocation in the road categories of urban local, urban arterial, rural local, and rural arterial, and the only person who determines that is the Federal Minister. He has God-given power, so that he can transfer from any of those categories into another category to satisfy political whims. That was given him by the Parliament about four months ago. We have made our submission to the Federal Minister: it was made at the Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting verbally by me, and confirmed on the following Monday, and I think the A.T.A.C. meeting was at the beginning of July. As far as I know, we have had no advice that it is not acceptable, so I must assume that it is acceptable. For the Federal Minister to write to Senator Young suggesting that we are not allocating money in the way he wishes is, I am afraid, a reflection on his own attitude and his own action. We have provided him with the information: as far as I am aware, he has accepted it. He has not told us that it is unacceptable.

SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Mr. ABBOTT: Has the Minister of Education any further information on the matter raised in this House yesterday by the member for Kavel about the year 10 science course in schools? The matter was aired at some length yesterday, and as all members (and I, as member for the district) have received copies of the material used in the curriculum, I would be interested to know whether the Minister has considered the matter further. Although I agree with the comments made yesterday by the Minister, being a member of a school council in my district, I would appreciate any further information.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for giving me the chance to expand this matter further. In some ways, one regrets the necessity for airing the matter further. I do not in any way resile from the statement I made yesterday that I believe the school principal has acted very responsibly in this respect. However—

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the principal of the primary school?

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at a time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I might get to the principal of the other primary school before I sit down, Mr. Speaker. I did not take the chance yesterday of explaining to honourable members the nature of each of the documents, nor indeed of giving a run-down on the events that led to their receiving this sheaf of papers. We can divide the document, like Gaul, into three parts. First, there is a covering letter from Mr. A. M. Talbot, who is Principal of Kilkenny Primary School. This letter draws

the attention of the recipient to the material underneath. The second part of the document is a piece of paper printed on both sides: it is a circular to parents, signed by the principal and two senior masters, and lists 20 topics that will be considered as part of the year 10 science course on reproduction. On the back of that piece of paper is a form the parent is invited to fill in. In fact, that exercise has been completed and I have the results that I can give honourable members soon.

Thirdly, the rest of the document consists of a series of questions and diagrams. This is not in the original form in which it was made available to students. I am not suggesting in any way that the content has been altered, but the original form of this document was produced on a Banda spirit duplicator, and written in longhand. I can only assume that the material honourable members have before them now was typed on stencils, or scratched on, in the case of the diagrams, at the Kilkenny Primary School, so that it could be sent to honourable members and other interested persons. If my assumption is correct, I leave it to honourable members to use their judgment as to the propriety of that form of use of departmental resources. The history of this matter is that, earlier in the year, a teacher at the Findon school, who was teaching the year 10 science course, distributed matter to pupils that included the matter sent to honourable members, exclusive of the first two pages but including the 31 questions. Mr. Talbot had a son in this class. Mr. Talbot got hold of this project and approached the Education Department on the matter.

A Principal Education Officer was asked to speak to the school about it, and the result of that discussion was a questionnaire, which forms the second part of the document honourable members have received. That questionnaire was sent to the parents of the 31 children in this year 10 class. The only objector to the material was Mr. Talbot. Therefore, it seemed clear that the course could continue. However, Mr. Talbot approached the principal and in effect gave him two options: one was to withdraw the course altogether, and the other was to have an open public meeting when all of the matters could be laid on the table. As a result of the pressure used at that time, the principal decided not to proceed with this aspect of the course, and all parents were circularised to that effect. Three parents who objected to what had happened then approached the media, and this led to the *This Day Tonight* programme on July 26 and the comment in the *News* on July 27. The principal then determined that a meeting should be held, at which parents of children who could possibly be doing the course (either with or without the children), or the children themselves (with the consent of their parents) could attend.

The meeting was held on August 4, and the whole matter was thoroughly ventilated. Mr. Talbot was present at that meeting and proved to be rather voluble, shall we say, regarding his involvement in the meeting. More than 220 people attended. At the meeting, a revised list of 23 topics, which would operate as a supplement to the course, was distributed to those present. The 23 questions, which were designed to replace the 31 in the document that honourable members have before them, are not in this document. It was not available to Mr. Talbot, because he walked out of the meeting before it had proceeded as far as that. The following four recommendations were carried unanimously by the meeting—

Mr. Evans: By over 200 people?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: More than 220 people. The first recommendation was that the school should proceed with the basic course as proposed; that is, the

year 10 science syllabus on reproduction, something which is not peculiar to this school nor to the year of grace 1976. Secondly, that the 20 topics that featured on the original circular to parents be studied along with the basic course (the 20 topics in the second part of this document). Thirdly, that question 15 on the 23 question list, which honourable members do not have, be modified (that question dealt with artificial insemination). Fourthly, those matters in the 31 questions that had originally been given to the children in the schools were appropriate matters for consideration by year 10 classes, and that they be included in an optional section, which should be studied with the assistance of resource persons. No child should be asked to present research materials on these matters verbally to the class but, on the other hand, if it was their wish to do so they should be encouraged to do so.

Parents have been further circularised giving the details of the basic course, the 20 topics, the 23 questions with the modification to question 15, and specific reference has been made in the circular to those topics included in the 31 questions but not in the 23 questions (homosexuality, lesbianism, rape, circumcision, divorce, prostitution, masturbation, and the concept of engagement). Parents have been asked to give consent to the basic course; the 23 questions; sessions for the additional optional topics involving resource persons; and the use of a set of notes that has been attached to the circular. The school is awaiting the outcome of that further circular. The rhetorical question I ask honourable members is: who indeed has acted responsibly in this matter?

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Premier say what recommendations have been made by the drought committee, which is monitoring the worsening South Australian drought situation? Does the Government intend making available to councils funds for drought relief in addition to the relief already announced? In a letter to the editor of the *Advertiser* on Monday last, the Minister of Agriculture stated:

The Government has decided to add to this scheme by meeting the cost of disposal of stock on site.

I understand that councils will be refunded the cost of disposing of carcasses, for plant use, and for labour. In the letter the Minister also stated:

A drought committee is constantly monitoring the S.A. situation and making recommendations to the Government as the effect of drought worsens and problems develop. In today's *Advertiser* Mr. Chatterton is reported as having said:

The South Australian Government is well aware of the conditions required before being eligible for drought assistance.

The report also stated:

In reply to Senator Young (Liberal, South Australia), Senator Cotton said an argument existed for Federal aid to drought-affected areas but, as yet, neither he nor to his knowledge the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair) had been approached by the South Australian Government.

The report also stated that Mr. Chatterton had said that, meanwhile, adequate State funds were available. I ask the Premier these questions, because I believe the Government has adopted double standards: one minute it accuses the Commonwealth Government of its lack of financial help, and then, when it is possible that funds will be available, it neglects to apply for them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not done his homework. I should have thought, given his length of service in this House, he would know something about the conditions of drought relief available from the Commonwealth. These arrangements are of long standing. When the South Australian Government has spent \$1 500 000 for drought relief, it becomes eligible for Commonwealth Government support. Until that condition has been met, money is not available from the Commonwealth. Funds from the Commonwealth have always been available to us, provided we have met the conditions. We will spend money where it is proved it is necessary under our present schemes. We will meet the cost of councils in this regard for schemes already announced.

I have pointed out previously the assistance given by the Government in relation to the movement of breeding stock, the provision of stock feed and the like, and the provision that farmers may apply for assistance under the primary producers' emergency assistance provisions. We welcome applications from people in the rural areas for such assistance, and when our funds have reached the provision of \$1 500 000 we will get Commonwealth assistance. Commonwealth assistance is granted to other States on a similar basis. A fixed amount has to be met and spent by the State before Commonwealth assistance is available. As soon as we have spent that money, we will call on the Commonwealth Government for assistance, and we will get it.

Mr. Venning: Under the RED scheme you couldn't get it here quickly enough.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The RED scheme was not on a basis that the State had to spend a certain amount before it received Commonwealth assistance. The conditions of the Commonwealth funding are different. At no stage have we said that the Federal Government is not meeting the obligations under the existing scheme in relation to this. I should think that Opposition members would be aware of these conditions, as they have been discussed in this House for many years. As Treasurer, I will provide funds to meet any expenditure shown to be necessary. In relation to the inquiry of the honourable member as to any other recommendations made by the drought committee, I am not aware of any further recommendations, but I will inquire and, if there have been further recommendations, they will be processed and I will tell the honourable member.

NORTH HAVEN HOUSING

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Planning say whether the indenture to the North Haven estate has been altered to permit the erection of housing on the coastal side of Lady Gowrie Drive? I have received inquiries from constituents who have paid large sums for building allotments, only to discover the possibility of additional housing not contained in the indenture being built that will eliminate their sea view. If this information is correct, could the Coast Protection Board investigate the suitability or otherwise of such a project? The present owners understood that no houses would be erected on the coastal side of the road, and believe that the vendors of the land (Australian Mutual Provident Society) has sold them the land on the basis of misrepresentation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not aware of the matter to which the honourable member refers. I will consult the Director of Planning, and no doubt he will ask the Coast Protection Board to check the facts: after

that he will make an appropriate recommendation. When I have further information, I will be pleased to give it to the honourable member.

LAND TAX

Mr. WOTTON: Following announcements made by the Premier in this House and publicly that measures will be introduced to alter the provisions of the Land Tax Act, can he say when it is expected that such legislation will be introduced? Is it expected that this change of legislation will mean that all land tax paid in the current financial year will be at the new rates? Further, will he give an assurance that representatives of all interested bodies, including the Stockowners Association and the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, will be given the opportunity to study amending legislation prior to its being introduced into the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that the land tax legislation will be introduced early in the session. I hope to have discussions concerning the specific proposals with the Stockowners Association and the U.F. & G. I expect that the new rates provided in the legislation will apply to all land tax payable this year.

HOLDEN HILL DROP IN CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare provide me with an up-to-date report concerning the Community Welfare Department's activities and involvement with the former headquarters of the Holden Hill Drop In Centre on North-East Road. This building originally housed that centre. The South Australian Youth Clubs relinquished the lease on the property last year following the closing of that centre. It was proposed that a partnership programme in which volunteer workers partnered tentative young people and an after-hours use of school facilities be developed. My reason for asking this question is that I am anxious to see that the building receives the maximum use possible, in the interests of the community.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will endeavour to obtain the information requested by the honourable member. I cannot say accurately, but I recall seeing a document concerning this building. I believe the honourable member is correct in saying that some proposals were put forward by the youth in the area, I think with some degree of support from officers of the Community Welfare Department. I will certainly bring back a report for the honourable member.

MEADOWS COUNCIL

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether a decision has been made regarding a grant to the Meadows council towards the cost of acquiring Mr. F. P. Smith's property adjacent to Coromandel Primary School? The matter of this property has been tossed around between Government departments, the Education Department in particular, for some years now. Mr. Smith has agreed to sell the property as an open space area to the Meadows council for \$95 000, leaving \$45 000 on terms. The Meadows council has applied for a grant, I believe from the Minister's department, of \$45 000. Mr. Smith has a \$7 052 land tax bill to pay by September 30, and

he hopes that the grant will be made available to the Meadows council so that the council can pay him and he can then pay the State Taxation Office about one-sixth of the grant that has been sought.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I know of no such application, although that is not to say that one may not have been made. I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him know as quickly as possible.

SHACK SITES

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say what is the Government's policy regarding the issuing of leases to district councils for subletting shack sites? The owners of shacks on sites under the control of the Lands Department have been given the opportunity by the Government to have their leases transferred to 10-year miscellaneous leases for non-acceptable areas and to 20-year miscellaneous leases for acceptable areas. The lessees of areas under the control and management of district councils have so far been given only annual leases. Fears have been expressed in these areas about the tenancy of the areas from the councils' point of view. In a circular released by the Minister of Lands in April, it was stated that the Lands Department would negotiate with district councils on the future control of these areas. Today, I received a letter from the District Clerk of the District Council of Franklin Harbor which set out the council's concern and which in part states:

The Lands Department recently advised all councils that, where these areas are under council care and control, these councils be expected to hand back control voluntarily instead of taking control as provided under the Crown Lands Act. It seems that "the gun has now been held at the head of councils" which are in this situation.

Will the Minister obtain a report for me on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague. My understanding of the situation is that the Government decided not to interfere with district councils that have jurisdiction over this type of site other than to encourage them, where possible, to follow the policies laid down by the Government. In other words, there was to be no compulsion. I am not aware of the contents of the letter that the Minister of Lands has written to various councils, but I will check the matter to see whether or not it is at variance with what I have said, and I will let the honourable member know.

PORT PIRIE HARBOR

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Marine say what is the present policy of the Government in relation to reports made by the Public Works Standing Committee and other fact-finding committees concerning the possibility of deepening Port Pirie harbor? I know I may be intruding a little on the Speaker's district—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are.

Mr. VENNING:—but I am concerned about the area because of the situation regarding bulk handling there. At the weekend my Party held a conference at Port Pirie—

Mr. Wotton: A very successful conference, too, wasn't it?

Mr. VENNING: A most successful conference, and I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, that you did not attend. I was hoping that you might have chaired the meeting.

Notwithstanding that situation, the people of Port Pirie asked me time and time again what was likely to happen with regard to deepening the harbor at Port Pirie. The Redcliff project envisaged for the area impinged somewhat on the aspect of deepening Port Pirie harbor. Now that the Redcliff project seems to be a thing of the past, what is the Government's policy with regard to deepening the harbor at Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As Minister of Marine, I cannot recall the Redcliff proposal's having any bearing on the deepening of the channel into Port Pirie. The Public Works Standing Committee met and deliberated on this matter, and recommended against the deepening of the channel on the basis that it was not an economic proposition. For a capital outlay, I think at that time of \$11 000 000, the return that would accrue to Port Pirie as a result would not have gone quarter of the way towards meeting the interest burden. I was not satisfied with that, and I took the step of referring the whole matter to the Bureau of Transport Economics. I did so because I thought that, if I was going to seek assistance further afield (from the Australian Government) to pay for the deepening of this channel, it was necessary for the bureau to examine the project thoroughly as well. That was done, and the report from that bureau indicated that it was not a goer. The situation has not changed. The State Government does not have \$11 000 000 to spend on the deepening of that channel, for reasons I have already stated—the money is not available and the return is not there. The Speaker, as the member for that district, has been in constant touch with me to ascertain whether the Government has had a change of attitude on this matter, which there has not been.

Mr. Coumbe: Didn't you appear at the Port Pirie Town Hall with the Mayor?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did, and I said at that time that we could not proceed with that and other projects. I think that one of the other projects at that time was the filtration of water from the Murray River to towns in the northern part of the State.

Mr. Venning: You found—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has had his chance, so I wish he would be quiet. He is not really interested in the deepening of the Port Pirie channel: his question was designed purely to embarrass you, Mr. Speaker.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister for Planning make available an officer of his department to go to Kangaroo Island to talk with certain groups, including the council, about providing additional Housing Trust accommodation to support an intended industrial development on the island? For some years, investigations have been proceeding on the island to determine whether it is economically feasible to proceed with and establish a meat processing works on the island. At a meeting on August 16, the new Chairman of the investigation committee announced the committee's findings to a large gathering of about 300 interested island people. In brief, he said at that meeting that the real purpose of holding the meeting was to inform the public fully of the committee's finding to date. The Chairman made clear that the committee had decided conclusively that there was a need for this development and that it was desirable to proceed to establish a meat processing works, which would be in the interests of investors and island meat producers

alike. I have been furnished with evidence put forward by the Chairman of that committee. The evidence is accompanied by an expressed interest from well-established meat companies in South Australia that are interested both financially and operationally in the project. I also have a written reply from the Minister of Agriculture confirming that 50 per cent of the island's through-put could enter the metropolitan market. The question was therefore raised how the community could house the additional expert labour force that it would be necessary to bring to the island to operate such a works. On behalf of the interested parties in that community, I am rather anxious to determine from the Minister what is the policy in relation to supplying such housing and whether an officer could be made available to go to the island to explain that policy?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Where there is industrial development in any part of the State, the South Australian Housing Trust would normally assist by providing appropriate accommodation. Having considered the material supplied to me by the honourable member, I am not sure whether or not a firm decision has been made to proceed with the project or, indeed, whether a firm decision has been made that it will proceed or when it is likely to proceed. I am not sure whether it would be necessary for the trust to become involved in a planning sense before a decision is made to go ahead on a firm basis, with the necessary finance committed to the project. However, I will discuss the matter with the trust. A decision could depend on the time involved for a decision to go ahead with the project and its completion date: in other words, on how much time would be available to the trust in which to take action to assist with accommodation that may be necessary. I will raise the matter with the trust to ascertain whether or not it can assist in the way in which the honourable member wishes.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say when it is expected that Brighton Road will be declared a clearway? The Minister would know that, at a recent public meeting held at Brighton, considerable opposition was expressed to the construction of the proposed median strip along the centre of Brighton Road and to the number of planned road closures in the area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have to check the facts on this matter but, from memory, I believe it has been referred to the Brighton council for comment. Whether that comment has been forthcoming, or even whether it has been considered by the board, I do not know. However, I will check to see what is the situation. Perhaps I could write directly to the honourable member if I receive a reply before Parliament resumes but, in any case, I will bring down a reply when the House does resume.

DEVALUATION

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether he had the full support of his Cabinet when he recommended on Tuesday in this House that the Australian dollar should be devalued?

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow that question. To the best of my knowledge, the Minister did not make such a recommendation.

Mr. Gunn: That's a matter for debate, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow the question, because, in my opinion, the Minister did not state that it was his opinion.

Mr. Gunn: He did.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I did not; I said "if".

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I ask you how you decide that a person cannot ask such a question and how you decide that the Minister did not make that statement on that day. A member might have interpreted the Minister's statement in that way, and surely, if he did, he has the right to ask that the matter be clarified. You, Sir, might have interpreted the statement differently from the way in which another member might have interpreted it. Remember, there was much debate at that time. I therefore believe that the honourable member has the right to have the matter clarified.

The SPEAKER: In the first place, it is not within the Minister's portfolio. Secondly, it is within my ambit to make these decisions. The honourable member for Light.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Sir. If the Minister stands in this place and makes statements like he did on this occasion, obviously he is making such statements—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be seated. I have ruled that the Minister is not authorised to make such statements.

Mr. Gunn: Well, he did.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! Furthermore, I believe that he did not make such a statement. The honourable member for Light.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MONARTO

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Government's action in promoting the use of the Monarto Development Commission for Darwin reconstruction purposes was an emotional ploy introduced to ensure the passage of the enabling Bill? When that measure was before the House, it was indicated clearly to the Minister that Darwin people did not wish to use the facilities available from the Monarto Development Commission. In fact, a telegram to that effect was made available to him. From the reply to a question asked by a member earlier this week and also a written answer to a question without notice earlier this afternoon, it is quite clear that the only projects that the commission has been given to undertake relate to the Adelaide Hills and Port Adelaide. It is with this knowledge that I ask the Minister whether the House was duped into making a decision that was not based on reality at the time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have thought better of the member for Light. A genuine approach was made by the Darwin Reconstruction Commission both to the General Manager of the commission and to me.

Dr. Eastick: Did it go up in smoke?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The basis of the amendment that was introduced to the legislation was the result of that approach and also in relation to matters that had been raised by the State Planning Authority so far as the Monarto Development Commission was concerned. They were the two matters under consideration at that time. I am not the master of the Darwin Reconstruction Commission's business. No doubt the member for Light,

together with other Opposition members, did his best to ensure that sufficient pressure occurred in Darwin to stop any work coming to the Monarto Development Commission in relation to this matter.

Dr. Eastick: They didn't want it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member says that they did not want it and that it was not a genuine approach by the Darwin commission. He knows all of this. I have said previously in the House—

Mr. Dean Brown: That shows that we can't trust what you say in the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport is incredible on this matter. I have said previously in the House that I had a genuine approach from the General Manager at the time (Mr. Powell) of the Darwin commission. The honourable member can believe me or not believe me. I have stated previously that that was the position at the time.

Dr. Eastick: Will you table the documents?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, if Mr. Powell would provide a statutory declaration for me, and if that will satisfy the snide remarks that the member for Light and the member for Davenport would otherwise make; perhaps that would keep the member for Davenport quiet and he might make an apology in public.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's not man enough to do that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If we are reduced in the House to Opposition members imputing the foulest of motives to Ministers as soon as they get any kind of opportunity, the standard of public debate generally will really be degraded. I suggest to the member for Light that his standard of public debate is normally very much higher than the kind of imputation he made this afternoon.

SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether age pensioners can avail themselves of school dental clinics already established in country areas; if they can, whether dentures will be available through the clinics; and whether the Government will advertise locally during which hours of the school day and during which school holidays the facilities may be used?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is certainly an important matter that the honourable member has raised, and I will bring it to my colleague's attention as soon as possible. I can understand the interest the honourable member shows for pensioners in Mount Gambier, and I am sure that my colleague will provide the information he seeks.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution relating to the Constitution Convention.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee and notified the selection of its representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CURRENCY

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A close check of the *Hansard* record will demonstrate clearly that I did not advocate a devaluation of the Australian currency.

Mr. Wells: They know that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I pointed out in the debate on a number of occasions (and if the member for Eyre had the decency or honesty to read *Hansard*—

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister has gone far beyond the bounds of a personal explanation. He is reflecting on my character. What he has said was unparliamentary, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to be more careful in his statements when he castigates Opposition members.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked for an unqualified withdrawal of the implication.

The SPEAKER: Of what words?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister questioned my honesty.

The SPEAKER: What are the words the honourable member wishes to be withdrawn?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister, in his explanation, which was far beyond a personal explanation, questioned my honesty by saying "if the member for Eyre was honest". That is unparliamentary, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: That is not unparliamentary. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member would care to check the *Hansard* records of that debate he would find that I pointed out that a change in the Australian exchange rate could have a significant effect on the shipbuilding industry and that the chief reason why the industry was in trouble was that there had been, in relation to the average of other countries over the past three years, a revaluation of the currency of about 20 per cent and that, similarly, a devaluation of the currency of about 20 per cent would have a significant effect on the position of the industry. Members then challenged me whether I was advocating a devaluation of the currency and, in that debate, I said, first, that it was not appropriate for a State Minister to speculate on that matter, and secondly, that I did not—

Mr. Dean Brown: Despite the fact that you had already advocated it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I had not advocated it. I said that, if that change occurred—

Mr. Dean Brown: You had already called out—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know how many times one must put things on record in order to ensure that the member for Davenport and the member for Eyre will not misrepresent one's position. I make clear that I would not advocate a devaluation at present, for the simple additional reason, which was not discussed

in that debate because it was not relevant, that a devaluation of the Australian currency would raise the internal price level and add to inflationary pressures. It would be for that reason particularly, even if one wanted to assist the industry at present in that way, that it would be out of court. Therefore, to offset the effects of the revaluation of the currency, as one could not devalue (if one was to develop the argument further), one would be able to support the industry only by an increase in subsidy.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 18. Page 739.)

First schedule.

Highways, \$1 470 000; Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$5 840 000—passed.

Woods and Forests, \$7 550 000.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to acquire more land for forestry purposes this year and what acreage is available for planting within the State at present?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): It has been and will continue to be the policy of the department to acquire further land where possible and when funds are available. One of the problems is the availability of suitable land for growing pines. As the department intends to continue to expand its plantings wherever possible, the reply to the first part of the question is "Yes"; how much, depends on what funds are available. I do not have with me the breakdown of funds made available for the purpose, but I shall check whether a specific amount has been allocated.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): What progress has been made in regard to the provision of the Modulock factory in the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no specific information to give the Leader, but I shall obtain it from my colleague and let him have it.

Mr. EVANS: Is the department conducting experiments with trees other than radiata pine as a form of timber? Are we moving towards a hardwood for long-term use? I understand that hardwood often will survive in a low-rainfall climate, when radiata pine will not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Recent tremendous improvements have been made in curing and milling radiata pine to make it more suitable for many purposes. The demand is heavy and for some time overtime has been worked in the mills, but I do not think commitments have yet been met fully. We must consider using other types of timber in the building industry, because we still import much timber. I do not know of any specific action the department is taking in developing stands of hardwood timber, but I shall check and let the honourable member know.

Mr. RODDA: In the South-East, smaller mills have closed and logging licences have been transferred to the larger mills. What is the policy covering the letting of a licence to a new mill, or the granting of a new licence? The Comaum forest has come to maturity, and an efficient mill and work force are available in Naracoorte. The mill has been undertaking contract cutting for a box mill. What would be the Government's attitude, if it wished to have a licence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot speak for the Minister of Forests, but from my own experience I think there would be little possibility of a new licence being

issued. I know of the pressures placed on the department over the years by holders of existing licences who have wanted them extended. At times, I have had titanic battles with the department in trying to get extensions to existing licences: therefore, I believe that new ones would not be available. The department is anxious to extend its plantings, but is restricted by the availability of suitable land. I shall draw the Minister's attention to the question, and probably he will correct me if I am wrong; certainly, he could expand on what I have said.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The department is continuing to acquire land in the Gumeracha and Kersbrook area, basically, I think, for the protection of the reservoirs. As the land being acquired is highly productive, especially around Kersbrook, I am not sure of the emphasis the department places on it. Does the Minister consider that there will be an economic return to the Government from forestry when these forests are filled? Is the emphasis on water protection, on making money out of growing timber, or both? Perhaps the Government is buying more land than is needed merely for water protection.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give a categorical reply. Timber is planted primarily to protect the watersheds, in the case of reservoirs, but it has been argued whether this is a suitable way of achieving the purpose. I do not know whether it is intended to mill the timber, but I do not think it would be economic. It has been the Government's policy to provide a 0.8 kilometre buffer zone around reservoirs, and that is the reason for the argument about the planting of timber, and the protection of the reservoir and the watershed. I am not sure of the economics of the matter, but I will have it checked for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What studies have been done on the effect on run-off, as pines and timber could have a significant effect on the catchment in the areas? I am interested in both quantity and quality. Also, a major fire through that country would create a holocaust.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure some studies would have been undertaken. I am sure that at some stage it would have been carried out, because I do not think the argument would have been entered into without some thought and study. I will see what information I can get from my own department as well as from the Woods and Forests Department on the matters raised.

Mr. BLACKER: Has the Government considered trying to encourage farm wood lots? I know that is not in keeping with past policy, but there are many areas throughout the State where farm wood lots of reasonable size could be established. Only a few hectares of wood on a farm could meet the requirements for fencing and posts in an area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This has certainly been considered in the past. One of the problems has been that only three crops are taken from the growing of timber (*pinus radiata* in particular). This caused a problem with succession and death duties as well as with income tax. The State Government recognised the problem. We wanted to encourage farmers to plant trees, and we made moves to relieve the burden of State death duty. We approached the Australian Government at that time to make some provision for income tax relief in the same way, but we were not successful. Therefore, it is not always an attractive proposition from the economic point of view. The Woods and Forests Department offered to make available to farmers specialised services and to provide saplings to plant in these areas, but I am not sure whether that offer still stands. This matter has

been looked at over the years, but without success. I wish it could be successful not only from the point of view of utilising the timber but also from the point of view of the general environmental benefit created by having small forests throughout the State.

Mr. EVANS: There is no doubt that pines use too much water within a catchment area and lessen the run-off because of the density of rotting pine needles and the amount of water they use because they are evergreen. Also, natural vegetation can also be harmful. From my own experience as a member of an association concerned with this I know that the department spent a large sum clearing natural vegetation from the Mount Bold catchment area. Will the Minister ask the Woods and Forests Department whether it has considered growing poplar trees, which are grown in New South Wales for paper pulp? As they are deciduous trees, they do not cause pollution of the water by discolouration, and they use less water during their growth period. I believe there may be a need to move towards growing poplar trees in water catchment areas so that we could produce paper pulp instead of timber.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.
Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$9 550 000.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say whether the item "Harbor Works, Port Adelaide, inner harbor, rehabilitation of berths, \$1 095 000" refers to the Birkenhead side of Port Adelaide? Does this item, which is specifically important to the cement producing industries of South Australia, relate to the project reported on by the Public Works Committee? How far is this sum likely to go and what time table has the department in mind? This industry is a winner for South Australia, and I believe the project should be pushed ahead with all expedition.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is correct in saying that the money that has been spent on the inner harbor development is for that purpose. I cannot remember exactly the time set down for its completion, but I believe that the sum allocated is sufficient to complete the whole job. The cement industry is valuable to South Australia, and this is why the alterations are being made. Other works are going on further up river that will involve minor expenditure this year leading to greater expenditure next year, and that involves the upgrading of certain wharves. However, I am not an expert about the location of the wharves involved. The honourable member will know that recent major items of expenditure have been on the container berth, which is due to be completed late this year.

The upgrading of the Port Lincoln wharf is proceeding. Problems arose during the construction and we took precautions to keep people away from the area. However, our consultants have shown that it is not a serious problem and that it can be rectified. It will be rectified, and that facility should be operating towards the end of this year. I do not think any other major harbor works are being undertaken at the moment.

Dr. EASTICK: If this facility is to be used completely and if its operation is to be efficient, it will need to be used regularly. What action has been taken to ensure that most of the problems relating to ships taking on cargo in South Australia can be overcome? I know from reading the paper this afternoon that Executive Council increased wharf costs this morning in a number of instances by 50 per cent. I know of the inter-related difficulties which apply to people with primary produce not being able to fill container ships at the point of manufacture

because there are no Department of Primary Industry inspectors immediately available. Problems arise when railway trucks are used to bring material from the country, because it has to be offloaded and placed in the wharf shed before it can be placed on pallets for loading on to a ship. This causes an additional handling cost which can be, in some instances, \$35 to \$40 per hour.

The member for Frome about three years ago raised the question of the cost of production of hay, particularly lucerne hay. This hay, from the Morgan area, cost about \$1.20 a bale delivered to the wharf and the cost to lift the bale over the side of a ship and into the hold was an additional \$1.30. This problem will affect the likely returns from the facility being built. I believe the Minister has commissioned a working party of responsible authorities to try to make certain that, when the improved facilities become available, the flow of goods on to the ships will give a distinct advantage in the cost factors associated with shipping out from Australia, or shipping from South Australia to other ports in Australia. It is on that general basis that I seek information from the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is always difficult to look ahead and say that a facility such as this will be an economic success in the short term. It is a bit like a chicken and egg situation. I am confident, because of the information given to me before it was decided to proceed, that the facility had to be built. Trends in shipping change, certainly from year to year, and that has an important bearing on how this facility will be used in the future. If it had been there two years ago it would have been utilised very heavily indeed. We have not had the same problems on the waterfront in South Australia as have occurred in Sydney and Melbourne, and we would have been able to capitalise on that situation. Regarding costs, we are entirely competitive with other major ports in Australia. The honourable member mentioned a 50 per cent increase in charges, but that is the first increase for three years, and the cost is still competitive with other States.

I am not prepared to say anything about the handling of cargo. I will see whether I can get an expert in that area to comment on what the honourable member has said. We have taken steps, through the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department, to contact shipping interests in certain parts of the world (Japan, the Scandinavian countries, Europe and Britain) so that they will be fully aware of the facility that will be available and of the attractive features of Outer Harbor. One of those features is the ready availability of many hundreds of hectares of land, a fact that other port authorities are very envious of. Negotiations on how the terminal will be operated are almost complete. On September 15 this year, or soon after, I expect to be able to say who the operators and what the terms and conditions of the control of the terminal will be. The new crane will be operated by the terminal operator, but maintenance and servicing of the crane and the allocation of it (because it is a common user berth) will be controlled by the department. It was thought that a problem would arise between the Australian Government Workers Association and the Waterside Workers Federation about who would operate the crane, but that has been resolved. There was a problem about the differential rate charged between Gilman and Outer Harbor for the transportation by rail of containers, but that, too, has been resolved.

Little else stands in the way of preventing the successful conclusion of the negotiations to which I have referred. From recent inquiries we have had (and if the honourable

member knows about the shipping industry he will realise how difficult it is to be sure what they are talking about, because it is a can of worms, really), the use of the facility looks promising in the short term.

Dr. Eastick: Beyond South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am talking about shipping that comes up the gulf. One of the difficulties we have had in South Australia has been in relation to the direct use of the facility by shipping coming up the gulf. The honourable member was talking about the wider use of the facility. He would know that at Outer Harbor there is room for another two sites of the same size, and we have a back-up area available to us. I took that up with the Commonwealth Government, because I believed South Australia was the most suitable site of any port in Australia to develop this concept. That was borne out by an investigation carried out by the Commonwealth Government. That investigation showed that it was the only port on the mainland of Australia where the concept could conceivably be economic. That investigation did not say that it would be a great economic success; it simply said it would more than break even. That is a hope we can live with in the future. I am quietly confident that the facility will be successful. It is certainly something we had to have. I have done all I can to urge the new Director of Marine and Harbors, John Griffiths, to promote not only that facility but also the other facilities we have as a commercial enterprise, because that is really what it is.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I remember the Minister's answering a question (I think two years ago) wherein it was suggested that there was a hope that passenger tours to the islands from South Australia would be commenced. To my knowledge, that has not eventuated. Is there any chance that this fairly expensive facility will be used profitably? Apparently some doubt still exists about the long-term use of the container facility.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the facility was built, fairly stringent cuts were made in its design. South Australia needed a new passenger terminal because the other terminal was an absolute disgrace in relation to customs, health and other passenger facilities. Ships did and still do come to South Australia. The situation could change rapidly with Pacific Island trips becoming popular again.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not from Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It has happened before; it could happen again. If it does happen, South Australia must have the necessary facilities, even if only three or four ships visit the State. If these facilities were not available, members opposite would say, "You are not trying to attract the sort of trade and activity that we can attract to this State." I set up a committee to investigate other uses for this structure. The lower part of the building is a cargo shed, and is used fairly often. It has been decided that the upper level could be used successfully for various reasons by Taperoo High School. It is the sort of facility the school needs.

Mr. Goldsworthy: As a hall?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Conventions have been held in the building, as have cabarets and other functions, too. However, I want a more permanent use for the facility. That is why its use by Taperoo High School is being considered. The school is keen to use it. In that regard there are transport and other problems, but I hope they will be ironed out soon and that the facility will be used fully during school terms. If a ship arrives while the children are using the facility, the ship could still be handled adequately. The only costs involved if the

school used the facility would be cleaning and lighting costs. It is too good a facility to leave vacant for the best part of the year.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It cost \$4 000 000, didn't it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, \$1 300 000. If we were to build the facility today it would cost \$6 000 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: The decision to build the container berth was obviously made as the result of an inquiry, an investigation and projected figures in relation to the estimated tonnage that it was hoped would go through the terminal. Does the Minister have figures in relation to South Australian goods which go by rail in containers to be shipped out of Port Melbourne but which could be shipped from the Port Adelaide facility?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member were to look at the Public Works Standing Committee report on this matter he would see the predictions that the committee made. I do not believe those predictions have altered much, if at all. Because I do not know what tonnages are shipped out of Port Melbourne, I will get that information for the honourable member. I do know that hundreds of containers a month are taken by train from this State to Port Melbourne.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say what were the terms of the contract given to the company that will handle the new container terminal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The contract has not been completed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: A press report announced that a contract would be given to a certain company.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is negotiating a contract with Terminals Proprietary Limited, but the contract has not been completed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The announcement was made a fortnight ago that the contract would be given to that company. It seems to me that the problem regarding Port Adelaide as a container terminal is that certain tonnages need to go through the port before the terminal becomes viable. South Australia now falls short of the required tonnage. Some South Australian manufacturers are sending containerised goods to Port Melbourne because of the absolute certainty of ships being available there, whereas goods can wait in Adelaide for up to three months.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is off the track in saying that, because ships from Melbourne and Sydney are no more certain than they are from Adelaide. We hope that that situation will change and that there will be a certainty of shipping dates in South Australia when the terminal is completed. One of the reasons for negotiating with that company rather than the Government or Australian National Lines handling it was that the company has such a variety of interests in shipping that it would be ludicrous for the Government to attempt to run the terminal itself. It is not good business to have a large terminal available if ships do not use it. We believe the company has the variety of interests in shipping necessary to attract the sort of trade we need at Port Adelaide. True, over the past few years, the tonnages coming into Port Adelaide have decreased, but until three years ago the operation of the Marine and Harbors Department was a break-even operation, and even made a profit. However, because of the added cost of fishing havens and other projects, in relation to which no fees are collected, the department went from a break-even operation to a deficit situation. Next year the department expects to break even in its operations, as a result of increased charges. I expect to know soon after September 15 who will operate the terminal. Terminals Proprietary Limited

has boards at branches all over the world that must meet to consider these contracts. That is what is causing a delay. Letters of intent have been exchanged, but the contract has not been finally sealed. I cannot therefore tell the honourable member what are the terms and conditions of the contract.

Mr. WARDLE: Does the allocation for land and property acquisition relate to the purchase of property along the Murray River? About two years ago a scheme was evolved whereby vessels plying on the Murray River could deposit effluent at certain sites. Has the land for this purpose been acquired and, if it has not, will part of this allocation be used for this purpose.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not have details about which property will be acquired, but I will get the information as soon as possible for the honourable member.

Mr. BLACKER: I was interested in the Minister's comments about the bulk loading facility at Port Lincoln. I note that \$535 000 has been made available, but I take it that all existing equipment on hand for the second gantry is not included in that sum. Has provision been made for the additional funds required to carry out the necessary structural modifications?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There has been no delay because of a lack of funds to any alteration to the structural defect that has been found; that will be rectified. As I am not certain what the \$535 000 is for (although I hope that it is the final payment), I will let the honourable member know.

Dr. EASTICK: Having checked through the papers, I am now able to correctly state that the figure I was really looking for was between \$13 and \$15 per person an hour, which was an additional charge. Has the Minister considered ensuring that all existing organisations involved in stevedoring, etc., at the ports will be able to engage in any future activities associated with the container organisation, or is it intended that a new organisation will grow, with the phasing out of certain existing organisations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The negotiations in which I am involved deal with the lease of the area and its development to a suitable standard by those who will occupy and operate it, the costs they will be required to pay the department, etc. I have not been involved in discussions with Terminals Proprietary Limited regarding how it will physically operate and whether it would mean any down-turn of other organisations involved in this type of activity. I think that the company would not build up its own system, but would be served by existing systems. If the honourable member thinks that there would have to be a large initial outlay, no doubt the company, like the Government, would wish to see how the venture proceeds.

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister ascertain whether fishing vessels over 13 metres are paying wharfage fees? I understand that all vessels over 13 m pay a wharfage fee or annual licence, and that the charge varies from port to port. I know that vessels based on Port Lincoln pay an annual fee, whereas those up the coast pay so much a tonne an hour at the wharf.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Where a facility is built from fishing haven funds, no wharfage charge is made for its use by fishermen. However, a slipping charge is made but that does nothing like meet the cost of operating the facility. However, I will obtain an accurate report, because I do not want to give people the impression that they should not be paying, if they are required to pay.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister say whether provision is made for a vessel to remove debris, dead animals, tree trunks, snags, etc., from the Murray River? If no provision has been made, has the Minister considered this issue and, if he has, what are his opinions? Has the Minister considered servicing vessels on the Murray River rather than creating so many effluent disposal points? Some people believe that this would be a more economic and thorough way of coping with the problem, and those who ply the river regularly know that much effluent is still being poured into the Murray.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The work boat owned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the River Murray Commission is required to remove stumps and similar articles. The installing of effluent stations along the Murray River at which pleasure craft may dispose of their effluent is well under way. It would hardly be a practical solution to have a boat servicing those points. I will study the matter, but I cannot see how one boat could possibly service the length of the Murray River.

Mr. VENNING: Is the \$102 000 allocated for the construction of the Solomontown causeway the final payment? When the building of the causeway was first considered the cost was to have been about \$450 000, whereas the final figure could be between \$600 000 and \$700 000, which would be about 7 per cent of the cost of deepening the Port Pirie harbor. Is the \$102 000 required to complete the bridge over the water to nowhere, or what will be the total cost of it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member demonstrates a remarkable lack of foresight. It is intended to develop an area that will now be connected by the causeway for recreation, for yachting, and so on, and there is also the possibility of a small industry establishing on the site. Some further dredging of the turning basin will be regarded, and that will involve reclaiming more land. It could be a future site for industrial development in Port Pirie: the potential is there. The causeway was not built to go nowhere, but it was built because the people of Port Pirie, through their council, wanted it.

Mr. Gunn: The Mayor at that time said it was a bridge to nowhere.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Whatever he said, that is not so. If members opposite wait, they might one day regret their present comment.

Mr. Venning: Wouldn't it be better to put the money into deepening the harbor?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: How much would we deepen it, and what would we use it for?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Are funds to be made available to provide fuel and water for fishermen on the Beachport jetty, and has money been allocated to construct a heavy-duty ramp at Carpenters Rocks to enable fishermen to bring up bigger vessels?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot say offhand, but I shall inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. GUNN: About six months ago I had some correspondence with the Minister regarding constituents at Thevenard who had asked about the possibility of improving the slipway. It was reported to me that the department had agreed to install a new slipway to alleviate the problems of fishermen having to take their boats to Streaky Bay to put them on the slip for survey purposes. As I cannot see any indication that work will commence on this project shortly, has the Minister any information on this, or could he let me have it later?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Recently, the Director discussed with me the priorities of minor works. From memory, the work at Thevenard will be commenced this financial year, but I will check the matter and let the honourable member know.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$72 870 000.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister say whether provision is being made for the preliminary work on providing a water supply at Carpenters Rocks?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I do not have the details of the work, I shall get them for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister further information regarding the Little Para dam? I am interested in the estimated cost, the time of completion, and details of the construction.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply to a question asked by the honourable member was on my desk yesterday, but I sent it back for further details. I will post it to him in the recess, if he so wishes.

Mr. ARNOLD: What stage has been reached in the development of the Dartmouth reservoir, and when will it become effective in providing water for South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member would confer with the member for Torrens, he would find that the information was contained in the replies to two Questions on Notice given to the member for Torrens on Tuesday last.

Mr. RUSACK: The estimated cost of the water supply for Paskeville, Kadina, and Wallaroo 12 or 18 months ago was about \$5 000 000. How far will the \$571 000 allocated take the scheme, and what is the schedule?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain details for the honourable member.

Mr. ALLEN: Last year, \$6 000 000 was provided for the replacement of the Morgan-Whyalla main, and this year a sum of \$2 473 000 is allocated. The matter was regarded as urgent, and I understand most employees on the project were working one hour a day overtime, although young unemployed people in the district could not gain employment on the project. Has the Minister a reason for this situation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I have not. It is a management problem, and I do not make decisions that involve an hours overtime in a day, but I shall find out.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: An amount of \$1 026 000 is provided for depots and offices. As I understand that something is planned for Nuriotpa, can the Minister give any details?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain details for the honourable member.

Mrs. BYRNE: The areas of Highbury and Modbury are referred to in the proposals for the construction of new sewers. Can the Minister give details of the exact location of the new sewerage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain details for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the Dartmouth reservoir. The Treasurer's statement contains the rather curious comment that the Commonwealth had advised that it would not provide financial assistance beyond the previously approved total amount of \$8 800 000 for this State. Under the terms of the River Murray Waters (Dartmouth Reservoir) Act, 1971, South Australia would receive \$8 800 000 by way of financial assistance with repayments

commencing 10 years after receipt of the first payment from the Commonwealth. What inference can be drawn from the rather curious phraseology of the Minister?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It should have been explained more clearly, but the Commonwealth will not contribute anything towards the escalated costs. It will meet only that cost to which it originally agreed, and therefore the three States will be required to bear that added burden of escalation.

Mr. BOUNDY: The Public Works Committee has reported favourably on installing an additional 22.73 megalitre storage tank at Arthurton. I understood that an early start would be made constructing the tank, but no provision has been made for this tank and for the further extension of mains to upgrade the supply to lower Yorke Peninsula. Can the Minister say when this work will be done? Also what is involved in the sum of \$91 000 made available for a tank at Mount Rat?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain details for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Some time ago the Minister announced sewerage schemes for towns within watershed areas. Under the heading of "Miscellaneous, local government" is shown an estimated payment of \$1 450 000. Will all sewerage installations for towns within watershed areas come from that allocation? It is indicated as an effluent scheme, but in some circumstances effluent schemes are not effective and sewerage schemes are necessary. What criterion is used to determine which system is installed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Public Health Department decides whether or not a common effluent drainage scheme is suitable and it is responsible also for the design at the request of councils. If the department is satisfied that a common effluent scheme will not suffice, it is not planned or designed and the plan is returned to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The scheme would then have to be for a deep drainage or sewerage system. Where common effluent disposal schemes are installed, the Minister of Local Government provides for funds from his source for that purpose.

Mr. BLACKER: What is involved in the \$49 000 allocated for treatment works at Port Lincoln, and what work will be done on the Uley South basin?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain details for the honourable member.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am pleased that \$9 400 000 has been provided for work to continue on the construction of water treatment and filtration plants in the metropolitan area. Does this refer to the completion of the Hope Valley treatment works and to the continuation of work on the treatment plant at Ansteys Hill?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted, too, that funds are available. These funds come from the Commonwealth Government by way of a 30 per cent grant and a 70 per cent long-term loan. I earnestly express the hope that the same thing will happen next year. I hope we will get more, because it is extremely important to the people of Adelaide. We did not get large sums for the backlog of sewerage work because we were able to obtain money for water treatment, which the Government considered to be absolutely necessary. The first of the water treatment plants at Hope Valley, which will be operational by the end of this year, will service about 60 000 families. Work on the treatment works at Ansteys Hill has already commenced. I expect to invite members to visit the Hope Valley treatment plant when it is

commissioned. Whilst it sounds a large sum (about \$18 000 000 will be the final cost), I hope once members see it they will appreciate just where the money has been spent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You would have no objection to our having a look?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will make sure you have a look. I have no objection to any member visiting Hope Valley or Ansteys Hill, and I look forward to providing them with a conducted tour, also.

Dr. EASTICK: Provision has been made for the replacement of the Morgan-Whyalla main, because of a breakdown in the concrete in the original main. Has the project continued according to the original plan, and has any other part of the main been shown to be deficient? Is the project likely to be larger than was first expected? Also, can the Minister say whether the allocation made for sewerage at Gawler is expected to complete that project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get information on the last point. As far as I am aware, we are on schedule with the replacement of that section of the Morgan-Whyalla main; that section was put in as a trial section. Obviously it was not successful. As far as I know there have been no great difficulties with the matter, but I will check and let the honourable member know.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister obtain for me details of the programme in relation to water filtration, the suburbs that will be serviced as the plants come into operation, etc.? Also, for what is the \$65 000 to be spent on the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with the original report on the water filtration of metropolitan Adelaide. I thought a copy had been issued to all members. It is a very detailed and well drawn report. It also shows what priorities have been given to various treatment works.

Dr. Tonkin: Is it on schedule?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The only problem I have is obtaining from the Commonwealth an indication of what will happen next year so that I can go on with further planning. This relates to the Little Para water treatment plant, which will be used in conjunction with the dam itself. That is a worry at the moment because we are so far ahead that we do not know whether we should proceed to the next stage or not. That should be resolved shortly. I think about \$4 000 000 has been spent on the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works over the past three years to double its capacity so that it will be sufficient for the area it serves until well past the turn of the century. It is a very efficient treatment works. I think the sum allocated would be to round off the work that has been proceeding for some time.

Mr. WOTTON: Could the Minister later give me more detail regarding the Mount Barker water supply? There is an urgent need for water in that area, particularly in Hartley and Woodchester, and it is hoped that some of the water from the new scheme may go to that area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Mount Barker water scheme is well known to me. Mount Barker competed with Callington for unemployment funds at one stage, and Callington won. That will show the honourable member that we are aware of the problem there. With regard to Hartley and Woodchester and the report the honourable member inquired about the other day, I have an interim report from the committee which was established to examine the socio-economic factors of this proposal, but I have not had time to read it. I do not know what

conclusions have been drawn, but when I have read the report I will give the honourable member a progress report. I can give no further information at this stage about the Hartley and Woodchester situation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to the \$200 000 set down for expenditure on the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme, Karoonda stage 1. I thought the \$200 000 would be the total commitment by the State Government on this project.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know why "stage 1" is mentioned. I understand that the \$460 000 received from the Commonwealth Government, added to the State contribution, is sufficient to complete the scheme. Whether the document refers to stage 1 in the sense of being work required outside the boundary, I do not know. Half the town is outside the scheme. Whether that half is called stage 1 and the other stage 2, I do not know. I am thankful that we have been able to get this money, and I know the honourable member is, too.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister say whether the \$92 000 provided for Murray Bridge as a water supply project is for one scheme or for several small connections and extensions of lines?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot say, but I will find out for the honourable member and let him know.

Mr. RUSSACK: On page 8 of the document reference is made to certain country centres that are being sewered. Is it Government policy to continue sewerage country towns throughout the State? If a town installs a common effluent scheme, will this inhibit consideration of priority for that town, or will such a scheme be complementary to the installation of a full sewerage scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government does not intend to sewer all country towns: I think the last major works have been carried out. Where a town or area is large enough, a sewerage scheme will be considered. As the honourable member probably knows, Port Augusta started off with a common effluent disposal scheme which was not sufficient, and we are now sewerage that town. I think that demonstrates that there is flexibility in the policy and that we do not just take a hard line of saying that we will do no more. As a general intention, we are saying that the major work necessary in the country has almost been completed. Common effluent schemes are quite efficient, and they have been cheaper in most cases. They are always handled by local government.

Mr. ALLISON: Is there any provision for settlement of the Mount Gambier sewerage outfall, or has that been left completely?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire for the honourable member and let him know.

Mr. EVANS: Does the allocation of \$108 000 for a reticulated water supply to a national park refer to Belair National Park?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get that information for the honourable member. I believe it does relate to the Belair National Park.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister obtain a report for me showing which depots and offices are included in the sum of \$1 026 000 under "Country Waterworks"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do that.

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister obtain a report for me about the location of work being carried out now on the reconstruction of the trunk sewer system in the north-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$111 400 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the \$12 640 000 provided for Flinders Medical Centre relate to its completion, or does it relate to only another stage of that development?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I think it represents the sum for work projected this financial year. However, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say what work will be carried out in upgrading Magill Home this financial year? I understood that the Government guaranteed to spend \$100 000 last year and this year on upgrading that home. The sum spent last year was substantially less than that, and the sum of \$25 000 will not make up the residue promised in about May last year. Work has been commenced on adding the toilet blocks in the accommodation area, and some of the accommodation area was to be improved, too. Magill Home is an old building that is run down. Despite the infirmity of some of the old people living there, they are still required, sometimes in the middle of the night, to walk from the accommodation block to outside toilets.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What the honourable member has said is not, I believe, in accordance with the facts. I understand that prefabricated toilets are attached to the accommodation blocks to which he refers. One was attached and in commission about two months ago, when I visited the home. The other was on site and in the process of being joined to the existing ward, which I agree needs to be upgraded.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you check the promises made by the Treasurer 12 months ago?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. To the best of my knowledge, no change has been made to the plan. I was present at a staff meeting held at the home. The Treasurer and the Minister of Works were also present.

Mr. Dean Brown: When?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: About six months ago.

Mr. Dean Brown: It was perhaps unfortunate that the local member was not invited.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! One question at a time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Invitations to the meeting were issued by workers on the site. If they did not see fit to send an invitation to the honourable member, I assume that that was a matter for them. He cannot take the Government to task on the matter. He asked whether the \$25 000, if spent, would be in accord with Government promises. I suggest that it is, but I will get information on that matter.

Dr. TONKIN: Is it true that the frozen food factory mentioned is the facility to prepare meals in advance for general hospital distribution; if it is, has it involved the development of technology that is new not only to South Australia but also to Australia? I understand that that is the case and that this plant will lead the way for similar plants serving hospitals in other States. Hospital staffs do a remarkably good job in preparing the quantity of food that must be prepared.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I am sure the member for Playford would certify that.

Dr. TONKIN: Probably he would. My concern is whether a South Australian engineering firm has been employed to develop this facility or whether a contract has been awarded to an interstate firm. It is important, at this stage when South Australia's industrial development is so poor, that this sort of contract should stay in South Australia. If this new technology could be developed in South Australia, the Government should give every encouragement it can to use a South Australian firm

because, if the facility is a success (and I have no doubt that it will be), that firm could be used in other States for the provision of similar facilities. If the Government has awarded the contract to a company from another State, I can only decry that decision and say that it was short-sighted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If I were to use the techniques and tactics adopted by the Opposition, I would impute to the Leader nothing other than what he said. The Leader said "if". If I can provide information that is useful to him on this matter, it will be done more by virtue of my service on the Public Works Standing Committee than in my capacity as Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health. I understand that the frozen food factory project was handled excellently. A project group went overseas to investigate some of the techniques that might be used. I recall visiting a pilot set-up operating at Glenside. As I have no personal knowledge of the suggestion that a contract has been or is being let, I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education supply me with details about the \$170 000 to be spent on Lobethal Primary School? Also, can he obtain for me a report on Nuriootpa Primary School and on the progress being made on work on Nuriootpa High School? I would also like details of work on the Police Divisional Headquarters at Nuriootpa.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): The final programme details are not yet available regarding the Lobethal Primary School project; probably, the upgrading and additions will begin towards the end of this calendar year, but I will obtain more specific information for the honourable member.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They are interested in whether work will be done on the resource room.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As I do not have that specific information, I will obtain it for the honourable member.

Mr. Goldsworthy: When will the Nuriootpa Primary and High Schools be ready for occupation, and what is the current state of progress?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The primary school will be available in September. I will obtain information for the honourable member regarding the high school.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain a report for me on the extent of the upgrading proposals for the Glenside Hospital, and whether the work includes additional occupational therapy centres and outpatient facilities, whether the present outpatient facilities are satisfactory, and whether in the general alterations and additions consideration has been given to installing a swimming pool for therapeutic purposes, so that patients would not have to use a nearby swimming pool?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I commend the honourable member for his genuine interest in this matter. As I do not have the information immediately to hand, I will obtain a report for him, especially on the concept of a swimming pool for therapeutic purposes.

Mr. EVANS: Although I accept that there must have been a cost survey of the benefits or otherwise of having a Government-owned frozen food factory, can the Minister obtain for me details of the expected savings from venturing into such a project, the number of personnel to be employed therein, the approximate number of meals to be processed each month or each year and the effect on staff engaged in hospital kitchens throughout the State?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am sure the honourable member appreciates that this matter was the subject of a lengthy investigation by the Public Works Committee, and a report would have been submitted some time ago. Offhand, I do not recall whether the report contained the kind of analyses for which he has called, but I will obtain a report for him.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say what is the future of Windana? I thought it had been closed down, except for an intake of about 20 young people from McNally or Brookway Park some time ago. What type of additions will be made with the allocation of \$230 000 and what will happen to the high-security areas there now that are not being used?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved: That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I understand that the amount shown against Windana additions is in relation to work associated not with geriatric accommodation, but with psychogeriatric accommodation. The distinction is fine, but there is one. I will not refer to the kind of security area the honourable member says exists at Windana; probably this is not the time for that. I shall try to get information for the honourable member regarding his other queries.

Mr. VENNING: Not one school in the Rocky River District has been referred to. About five years ago the previous Minister of Education promised that a new school would be built at Port Broughton within three years. What has happened to the new area school for Port Broughton, the Victor Harbor of the north?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In determining priorities, the Education Department, wherever possible, tries to ignore electoral boundaries. I have visited this school, and I appreciate the difficulties, but they are no worse than those at other schools, including some which have been included. We will continue to examine closely the situation at Port Broughton. Although we would like to do something, the Loan money is not available this year to enable us to make a definite commitment.

Mr. ARNOLD: On page 9 of the document, many schools are listed; for instance, the Waikerie Primary School. Appendix I of the Treasurer's statement shows only a small number of the schools actually listed that will receive funds. Can the Minister explain the difference?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Pages 19, 20, and 21 of the Treasurer's statement list schools that are charges against the major buildings line. There are other ways in which money can be put towards a project. One is in relation to general planning, which may be for that school but which does not appear in this document as a specific allocation to that school. Another may be in relation to a charge against the auxiliary accommodation line, and I believe that \$3 000 000 on that line has not been earmarked specifically. Also, various minor works projects are not spelt out in the Treasurer's statement. I can get the information for the honourable member in relation to the school he has quoted. The Treasurer's statement is in relation to major works, as opposed to items that are a charge against, say, auxiliary accommodation.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Education give me any information on the present situation regarding proposals for the Norton Summit school, to which no reference appears on the lines?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member raised this matter with me; I have not yet received the information, but I will get it to him soon. The work for

Norton Summit would not normally appear as major works because, in part, it is upgrading, which would be a minor works programme, and also in part land acquisition.

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister obtain a report on precisely what work is to be undertaken in additions to the Modbury Hospital, for which \$458 000 is to be allocated?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall be pleased to do that.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare outline the security upgrading programme at the McNally training centre, giving some indication of whether the upgrading of security so far has been adequate, whether the programme as originally reported some time ago is to be carried out in full, or whether any additional matters should be considered?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The programme announced some months ago did not detail the measures that would be taken, and I do not intend to do so now. Some measures involved the relocation of living quarters: that work is well under way. Also, concentration of numbers has been reduced to a large degree. Additional fencing has been provided to allow for exercising and for freedom, within certain bounds, of the young people. Other measures are best not commented on, although they have been undertaken. About three-quarters of the programme would have been completed by today.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the attention the Kingscote Area School Council has received from the Minister of Education, and also correspondence from the Minister indicating a possible programme for the replacement of that school. Will the Minister explain under which line the cost of preliminary planning and calling of tenders will be financed in relation to the school, the work on which we understand will commence later this financial year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that no charge will be made against this financial year, although the tender target is for the latter part of this financial year. There is sufficient flexibility in the programme, if the tender has to be let as such a time that there has to be a charge this financial year, for it to happen. No specific allocation is made within the programme, but we intend to let the tender before the end of the financial year. Architects will be visiting the school next month, and I think this would be a good chance for the principal, the school council, and the honourable member, if he can, to discuss this matter to try to refine our programme.

Mr. Chapman: There is no chance of a delay beyond that commitment?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I would certainly hope not.

Mr. BOUNDY: I express appreciation to the Minister for the excellent work done at the Yorketown Area School. Is part of the \$161 000 allotted in the general "Major additions" section to pay for the completion of the work? I remind the Minister that the only work outstanding at the Yorketown Area School relates to a groundsman, and I know this problem exists generally throughout the State. In all fairness I want to say thank you for what is a lovely facility at Yorketown.

The Two Wells school is on the design list, but I must press for the earliest possible consideration of the plight of that school because it is definitely of a poor standard and needs replacing. Minlaton Primary School has been in a similar situation for a long time: plans have been made for a new school, but they have been rebuffed. The administration offices and staff rooms need to be replaced: the staff room is located in the laundry of the original residence at the school. It was inadequate when there were nine members on the staff, but there

are now 17 staff members. It would seem sensible to provide a Demac building for that purpose, and when the new school is built the Demac building could be moved to the new site.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think I was fortunate that I used the coast road when visiting Yorketown, because I think the honourable member might have had a road block for me near Minlaton. I am familiar with the situation at the Two Wells school, which lacks facilities. At this stage we may be able to go to tender in about July next year. I will try to maintain that programme, if I possibly can. I agree with all the honourable member has said about Two Wells. I will have my officers examine the position at Minlaton. I thank the honourable member for his appreciative remarks about Yorketown, and hope everyone enjoyed the half holiday.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say what major additions are intended at Loxton High School, and what additions are to be made to Edmund Wright House?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I will ask the Minister of Works to provide the honourable member with the details.

Dr. EASTICK: Can a Minister say whether it was a last-minute decision to place the various departments in the Grenfell Centre, thus requiring an expenditure of \$720 000 on alterations to accommodate them? Because some other project was turned down, was there no immediate relief for these departments in a Government building? How long will they occupy this centre in order to allow this money to be amortised against the use? Is there any recovery from the owners of Grenfell Centre, if these departments move out after a short time? Does the tenure permit other Government departments to move in and replace these various departments, if they move out? Will it be necessary to spend a similar amount to readjust the premises for some new departments? It is necessary that the Committee be aware of all the ramifications of this expenditure, because it seems that \$720 000 will become the property of some other person and no longer be of any value to the State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to the honourable member's questions in reverse order are: "No", "Yes", "Yes", "No", "No", "No", and "No". The Minister of Works will give a detailed report on the Grenfell Centre when he has it, and I will certainly refer these questions to him.

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the line, "Primary and Secondary Schools \$40 500 000". As the member for a developing area, this subject interests me greatly. I appreciate the progress that is being made in this regard, and I know that it will continue to be made. I notice in Appendix I, under the heading "Primary and Junior Primary Schools" that new schools have been completed at Fairview Park Primary, Stage I, \$801 000, Demac construction; Holden Hill North Primary, \$985 000, Samcon construction; and St. Agnes Primary, \$1 102 000, brick construction. These schools were necessary, and since their completion and occupation I have visited them. During the same period, a special school built at Modbury South costing \$1 044 000, of brick construction, is certainly an asset to the local and surrounding districts.

Under the heading "Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1976", there appears Highbury Junior Primary, \$671 000, brick construction; Modbury South Junior Primary, \$671 000, brick construction; and Modbury West Junior Primary, \$631 000, brick construction. Being an expanding area, there is need for such additional junior primary

schools. Under the same heading is shown Modbury Heights High School, costing \$5 045 000, in brick construction. Then, under the heading "Major Works to be Commenced during 1976-77", a new school is to be built at Redwood Park at a cost of \$1 300 000, of brick construction. This is also an area in which a new school is needed. I am pleased the department has had the wisdom to do this work, which will commence this year. However, can the Minister say what work will be constructed with the \$700 000 allocated for Modbury High School, an older school, at which students are at present disadvantaged, compared to those attending some other metropolitan schools?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is a modified type A building, and I refer the honourable member to the Taperoo High School or Woodville High School for an idea of

what type A building is like. The work has been approved by the Public Works Committee, and construction should commence early in 1977.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 7, at 2 p.m.