

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 21, 1976

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

## PREMIER'S BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER: On behalf of all members of the House, officers at the table, and the staff of Parliament House, I think it is only proper that I should wish our Premier a happy birthday. It is interesting to note that he has possibly spent almost half of his 50 years in this House and, although he has had many onerous tasks to perform, he still seems to be exuberating youth. I am sure that he has many, many years of service left in this House and that all would wish that he continue in the best of health with many more years of health and success such as he has already enjoyed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): By leave of the House and on behalf of Government members, I support your remarks, Sir, and amend them slightly if I may, because I am not so certain about the Premier's youth. However, I certainly want the Premier to continue in good health and to be Premier of this State for many, many years to come. Congratulations Donnie—a great 50 years!

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): By leave of the House, I would say the sentiments we have just heard are normally heard on valedictory occasions. Perhaps that might be going too far, but the Opposition, of course, joins with you, Sir, in wishing the Premier a happy birthday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am very sensible of the kindness of honourable members and their expressions on my birthday. I hope that I will retain a certain number of functions of youth, even after 50 years.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: As Jack Jennings said, "You were born young."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope I have stayed young, and I hope that I have retained what I believe is the essential quality of youth, that is, that one questions one's assumptions constantly. I am very sensible of the kindness of all members of the House, of you, Mr. Speaker, of the members of the Opposition, as well as the members of my own Party on my fiftieth anniversary. It is unusual in the course of political life that pleasant things are said about a member whilst he is still in office: it normally takes a death for that to occur. I can assure members that, with all their kindness, I am still alive and hope to remain so for some time.

## QUESTIONS

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

## GLENELG TRAM CROSSING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Will boom gates be installed at the Glenelg tramline crossing at Sixth Avenue, Dunbar Terrace and Maxwell

Terrace, Glenelg East and, if so, when and what is the estimated cost?

2. If gates are not to be installed at this crossing, why not?

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

1. No.

2. Because of the low volume of traffic, it is considered that there is no need for boom gates at present.

## COT DEATHS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many cot deaths were recorded in South Australia during 1975-76?

2. Is any research being carried out in South Australia concerning the cause of this particular death syndrome and, if so, where and what form is this research taking?

3. Is the South Australian Government assisting any such research in this State and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Thirty-four: 19 metropolitan; 15 outer metropolitan.

2. Yes. The South Australian Government has been supporting research into the sudden infant death syndrome since 1970. This involves collaboration between investigators at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, Waite Agricultural Institute, C.S.I.R.O. Division of Mathematics and Statistics, and Princess Margaret Hospital, Western Australia. A report on this investigation has been almost finalised and will shortly be published.

3. Yes, \$15 000.

## PRODUCERS COMMITTEE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Has the Government set up a primary producers committee to consult with the State Planning Authority and, if so:

(a) what are the terms of reference of this committee;

(b) when will it commence its inquiry;

(c) who is the Chairman;

(d) have the members of the committee been appointed and, if so, who are they;

and

(e) if members have not been appointed, how will they be appointed and when?

2. If this committee has not been set up is it the intention of the Government to have such a committee and when?

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

1. The State Planning Authority is establishing a primary producers committee.

(a) The terms of reference of the committee are:

(1) To advise the authority on the implications for, or likely effects on, primary producers of:

(i) Policies and proposals under consideration for inclusion in development plans;

(ii) Proposed planning regulations initiated by the authority affecting areas predominantly in primary production;

(iii) Such proposed planning regulations initiated by councils affecting areas predominantly in primary

- production as may be referred to the committee by the authority.
- (2) To advise the authority on ways and means of achieving the objectives of development plans in so far as they affect areas predominantly in primary production whilst minimising interference with such production.
- (3) To make recommendations to the authority on any variations or additions to the proposals of current authorised development plans that affect primary production.
- (4) To report on such matters affecting rural areas as may be referred to it by the authority.
- (b) The committee will hold its first meeting when the membership has been finalised.
- (c) Mr. D. Wilsdon, who is a farmer from Spalding and a member of the State Planning Authority.
- (d), (e) The committee membership will be as follows:  
 Chairman: Mr. D. Wilsdon (Member of the S.P.A.).  
 Member: To be selected from three people nominated by United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Inc.  
 Member: To be selected from three people nominated by Wine Grapegrowers Council of S.A. Inc.  
 Member: To be selected from three people nominated by the Stockowners' Association.  
 Member: To be selected from three people nominated by the S.A. Fruitgrowers & Market Gardeners Association.

Member: To be selected from three people nominated jointly by the S.A. Dairymen's Association and the South-East Dairymen's Association.

Member: Agriculture Department.

Member: Principal Planning Officer (Rural) State Planning Office.

Nominations have only recently been received from the various bodies and are at present being considered. It is expected that the members will be appointed at the next meeting of the State Planning Authority on October 12, 1976.

2. See 1.

### HOUSING TRUST

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of homes, units or flats, identified according to usual administrative category, did the Housing Trust possess as at June 30, 1970, in each of the following towns: Gawler (including Evanston), Kapunda, Saddleworth, Freeling, Wasleys, Greenoch, Lyndoch and Williamstown?

2. What increases have there been in each financial year since June 30, 1970?

3. What building programme is envisaged by the trust for the 1976-77 financial year?

4. What is the current waiting list of applicants applying to each of the designated towns and building categories?

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

#### 1. TOTAL TRUST HOUSING STOCK IN THE ABOVEMENTIONED TOWNS AT JUNE 30, 1970.

Town	Single units	Dwelling Types		Rental grant houses	Total dwellings	Rental stock
		Timber frame single units	Double units (semi-detached)			
Gawler . . . . .	61	8	214	12	295	226
Kapunda . . . . .	6	12	8	3	29	21
Saddleworth . . . . .	—	13	—	—	13	1
Freeling . . . . .	1	6	—	—	7	2
Wasleys . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greenoch . . . . .	9	—	—	1	10	1
Lyndoch . . . . .	—	2	—	—	2	—
Williamstown . . . . .	—	6	—	—	6	—

#### 2. INCREASES IN STOCK SINCE JUNE 30, 1970.

	Single units	Dwelling Types				Total	Cum. total	Rental stock
		Timber frame single units	Double units (semi-detached)	Timber frame transportable units	Cottage flats			
Gawler—								
1970-71 . . . . .	—	3	10	—	—	13	308	241
1971-72 . . . . .	—	6	22	—	17	45	353	276
1972-73 . . . . .	—	5	6	—	—	11	364	289
1973-74 . . . . .	—	3	28	—	—	31	395	318
1974-75 . . . . .	21	3	6	3	—	33	428	327
1975-76 . . . . .	24	5	44*	—	—	73	501	378
(* includes 24 single storey maisonettes)								
Kapunda—								
1972-73 . . . . .	—	1	—	—	—	1	30	21
1974-75 . . . . .	—	—	—	4	—	4	34	23
1975-76 . . . . .	—	1	—	1	—	2	36	24
Saddleworth—								
1971-72 . . . . .	—	—	—	1	—	1	14	3
1975-76 . . . . .	—	—	—	1	—	1	15	4
Freeling—								
1972-73 . . . . .	—	—	—	4	—	4	11	8
1973-74 . . . . .	—	—	—	2	—	2	13	10
1974-75 . . . . .	—	—	—	2	—	2	15	10
Greenoch—								
1972-73 . . . . .	1	—	—	—	—	1	11	1

There has been nil construction in Wasleys, Lyndoch and Williamstown since June 30, 1970.

### 3. THE TRUST'S ENVISAGED BUILDING PROGRAMME FOR 1976-77.

Gawler: Since July 1, 1976, the trust has completed a further 28 dwellings in Gawler (9 single units, 6 double units and 13 single-storey maisonettes), and it is expected that a further 44 units will be completed there in the remainder of this financial year, including 3 timber-frame single units, 22 double units, 9 single-storey maisonettes and 10 cottage flats for elderly persons.

Kapunda: The trust has programmed two timber-frame single unit houses for construction at Kapunda during 1976-77. However, orders for the construction of these units have not been proceeded with at this stage because, although applications indicate that there is a demand for housing in the town, this has not proven to be the case, as recent vacancies from existing houses have been difficult to fill.

Saddleworth: The trust now has one timber-frame single unit house under construction in Saddleworth and this should be completed this financial year.

Freeling: Two timber-frame single unit houses are presently under construction in the town and are scheduled for completion during 1976-77. It has been programmed that contracts for a further two timber-frame single units can be let as work progresses on the two houses now under construction.

Wasleys: To date, the trust has not constructed any dwellings in Wasleys, but it is expected that a contract for two timber-frame single units there will be let by November of this year.

Greenoch, Lyndoch and Williamstown: The trust has not programmed the construction of any dwellings in these three towns during the 1976-77 financial year.

#### 4. APPLICATIONS NOW ON HAND

##### Gawler

Ordinary rental applications (i.e. double units, single storey maisonettes etc.)	218
Cottage flats (elderly citizens)	59
Purchase applications	50
Total	327

##### Kapunda

Rental applications	12
Purchase applications	1
Total	13

##### Saddleworth

Rental applications	1
Purchase applications	1
Total	2

##### Freeling

Rental applications	4
Purchase applications	nil
Total	4

##### Wasleys

Rental applications	2
Purchase applications	nil
Total	2

Greenoch, Lyndoch and Williamstown: No housing demand is evident to the trust in any of the above towns, and it has no applications (either for rental or purchase) on hand for these areas.

### PENFIELD INTERSECTION

Dr EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action is being taken by the Highways Department, and/or any other authority, to effectively design, signpost or otherwise treat the Heaslip Road and Womma Road crossing at Penfield?

2. When is it expected that any work will be undertaken, and when is it expected to be completed?

3. What number of fatalities have been recorded at this intersection?

4. Has any consideration been given to the installation of traffic lights?

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

1. Both roads are under the care, control and management of the District Council of Munno Para. Council has taken the following action:

(a) Erected oversize symbolic "cross road" signs on all approaches.

(b) Erected a "reduce speed" sign in advance of the "cross road" sign on the eastern approach of Womma Road.

(c) Provided in its 1976-77 budget for the installation of two street lights at the intersection.

The Highways Department is investigating, at council's request:

(a) the need for "stop" signs.

(b) The feasibility of adding a right-turn lane from the southern approach of Heaslip Road into Womma Road.

2. See 1.

3. Records are readily available only since 1971. Two fatalities have occurred since then.

4. Yes.

### PETROL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the entry of additional wholesalers into the market for petrol and petroleum products in this State?

2. Has this policy been communicated to ACTU-Solo and, if so:

(a) when;

(b) by whom;

(c) how; and

(d) with what response, if any, from ACTU-Solo?

3. In view of the establishment of a reselling outlet by ACTU-Solo, is the present policy to be altered and when, and in what respects?

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

1. There has never been any restriction on the entry of wholesalers into the market.

2 and 3. *Vide* No. 1.

### PARA HILLS INTERSECTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it now intended to install a set of traffic lights at the junction of Bridge Road and Kesters Road, Para Hills and, if so:

- (a) when was the decision to install lights taken;
- (b) by whom was it taken;
- (c) what considerations have prompted the decision; and
- (d) when will the set of traffic lights be installed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This intersection is not included in this year's programme.

#### MITCHAM JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Mitcham Junior Primary School to get a new classroom and if so, when and of what kind?
2. If a new classroom is not to be built, why not?

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

1. and 2. Mitcham Junior Primary School is programmed to receive an additional transportable classroom. The proposed room is at present in use at the Highbury Primary School, which is in the process of being upgraded. When the classroom is released from Highbury it will be transported to Mitcham Junior Primary School as soon as possible. It is expected that this will occur towards the end of term III, 1976, and on present programming will be available at Mitcham Junior Primary School for the beginning of school in 1977.

#### TOURIST BUREAU DIRECTOR

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were applications for appointment to the position of Director of the Tourist Bureau sought by advertisement and if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) why; and
- (c) how many applications were received?

2. When was it decided not to take steps currently to appoint a new Director, and why was this decision taken?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Applications for the position of Director of Tourism were invited in December, 1975;

(b) The position was due to become vacant with the retirement of the Director, Tourist Bureau, P. F. Pollnitz, on January 22, 1976;

- (c) A total of 23 applications was received.

2. Because none of the candidates were acceptable to the Government they were advised accordingly at the end of March, 1976.

#### TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT BUSES

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What are the expected progressive dates on which new buses being built for the Transport Department for the metropolitan area will be put into service, and in what numbers will they be introduced on these dates?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As approval for the design of the body frames has not yet been given, it is not possible to provide the information sought.

#### CORBETT REPORT

Mr. VENNING (on notice): Is the Government taking any action to amalgamate Government departments in accordance with the Corbett report and, if so:

- (a) what departments are involved and where are they now located; and
- (b) what new areas of administration are likely to be created by any amalgamation?

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

(a) The following amalgamations of departments and regroupings of divisions have taken place since the date of the Corbett report with the effect of reducing the number of departments from 46 to 30:

amalgamation of the Small Lotteries Section of the Chief Secretary's Department with the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department;

amalgamation of the Totalizator Section of the Police Department with the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department;

amalgamation of the Chief Secretary's Department with the Hospitals Department and the abolition of the Chief Secretary's Department as a consequence;

transfer of the Worker Participation Branch of the Labour and Industry Department with the Premier's Department, resulting in a new Unit for Industrial Democracy;

amalgamation of the Minister of Works Department with the Engineering and Water Supply Department;

transfer of the State Information Centre, Public Buildings Department with the Government Printing Department;

amalgamation of the reporting functions of the Government Reporting Department, the reporting functions of the Supreme Court, Local and District Criminal Court, Industrial Commission and Planning Appeal Board and placement in the Attorney-General's Department;

placement of the remaining functions of the Government Reporting Department with the Public Buildings Department and the abolition of that former department;

amalgamation of the Fisheries Department with the Agriculture Department into a new Agriculture and Fisheries Department;

transfer of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office from the Attorney-General's Department to the Premier's Department;

amalgamation of the Produce Department with the State Supply Department and the transfer of the grain inspection functions of Produce Department to Agriculture and Fisheries Departments;

amalgamation of the Minister of Education Department with the Education Department;

amalgamation of the Botanic Garden Department with the Environment Department, incorporating a change of name from Environment and Conservation Department;

amalgamation of the Superannuation Department and the Department of the Public Actuary with the Treasury Department;

amalgamation of the State Taxes Department with Treasury Department;

amalgamation of the Registrar-General's Department (excluding the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Branch) and the Valuation Department with the Lands Department.

amalgamation of the Public Trustee Department, the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Branch (Registrar-General's Department) and the following functions of the Attorney-General's Department: Companies Office; Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch; Licensing Branch; Trades Measurements Branch; Office of the Inspector, Places of Public Entertainment; Office of the Builders Licensing Board; Office of the Credit Tribunal; administration staff of the Land and Business Agents Board and the Land Valuers' Licensing Board, the Land Brokers' Licensing Board, the Commercial and Private Agents' Board and the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers' Licensing Board; to form a new Public and Consumer Affairs Department;

amalgamation of the State Supply Department, the Government Printing Department, the Chemistry Department and the A.D.P. Centre, Public Service Board Department, into a new Services and Supply Department;

amalgamation of the Minister of Agriculture Department with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department;

creation of a new Further Education Department;

amalgamation of the Attorney-General's Department, the Crown Law Department, and the Local and District Criminal Courts Department into a new Legal Services Department;

transfer of the Magistracy from the Legal Services Department to the Premier's Department.

The present administrative locations of departments involved in amalgamations are indicated above.

(b) Amalgamations have brought together existing areas of administration and have not created any additional areas of administration. The titles of amalgamated departments are referred to above.

#### CRYSTAL BROOK DEPOT

Mr. VENNING (on notice): Is the Highways Department depot at Crystal Brook to be transferred to Port Augusta, and, if so:

(a) why; and

(b) what use will be made of the present assets of the Highways Department at Crystal Brook?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No decision has yet been made.

#### URANIUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Are officers of the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department inquiring into a proposal for a uranium processing centre at Redcliff and, if so:

(a) why; and

(b) what inquiries have been made, and with what result?

2. Will the Government have any such inquiries stopped immediately, at least until the report of the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry is made public and, if not why not?

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

1. In December, 1974, the Government established a Uranium Enrichment Study Committee comprising departmental officers and outside specialists to report on the feasibility of establishing a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia and on the associated environmental factors, including recommendations for any particular studies considered necessary. The committee has utilised the services of the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department, the Environment Department (Amdel), and the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.

(a) The decision to establish the committee arose mainly because of the Whitlam Government's initiatives towards a joint Japanese-Australian feasibility study and because the then Minister of Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) publicly acknowledged that the area around the head of Spencer Gulf had attractions as a possible site for an Australian enrichment plant.

(b) The committee has produced an interim report which shows that the Redcliff site could have the necessary economic and environmental attributes for such an industry. The report is available to members of Parliament.

2. The Government intends to take no further action until after the report of the Ranger inquiry is made public.

#### STATE INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What action is being taken to reduce the deficit of \$25 000 incurred in 1975-76 in maintaining the State Information Centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No action is being taken as the \$25 000 shown in the audit report in regard to the State Information Centre referred to the actual expenditure incurred by the Government Printing Department in providing information to the public, mounting displays in the State Administration Centre, and managing the South Australian Government's pavilion at the Royal Show.

#### GLANVILLE WORKSHOP

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Why has action not been taken in budgetary control and responsibility of accounting in the Glanville workshop of the Marine and Harbors Department?

2. What matters of higher priority have necessitated the Auditor-General's again reporting on this problem?

3. When will the Auditor-General's advice be heeded on these matters and, if it is not to be heeded, why not?

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

1. Action has been taken. A system of budgetary control exists, but as such does not meet the full requirements of

the Auditor-General. In that respect further investigations are proceeding.

2. The need to review departmental charges.

3. In the present financial year.

Cost a pupil enrolled  
in State schools

	Primary	Secondary
	\$	\$

1975-76 . . . . .	619	1 122
1976-77 . . . . .	745	1 335

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SALARIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action has been taken to ensure that incorrect salary payments to ancillary staff employed by the Education Department will not occur again?

2. How did such errors occur during 1975-76, and why?

3. What is the total amount involved in salaries overpaid and underpaid, respectively, during 1975-76?

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

1. In respect of the overpayments, this matter has now been resolved by the implementation of a system of payment whereby ancillary staff are paid on the basis of contracted hours of duty (that is, as if the contracted hours have actually been worked), with positive returns of hours worked being submitted subsequent to these payments detailing the actual hours of duty. This modification to the system thus allows adjustments to be made to payments, where "short time" has been worked, immediately subsequent to the initial payment and thus inhibit delays and the compounding of overpayments. Underpayments no longer occur, as sufficient staff cover is provided to ensure that incremental progression throughout the salary structures for all ancillary staff is now an on-going factor within the pay-fortnight within which the increment date occurs. This has been achieved by creation of an increment register, which readily identifies all incremental dates.

2. The overpayments occurred because of method of payment adopted in the first and second school terms in 1974, whereby payment was made on the basis of contracted weekly hours without any positive check being regularly made as to whether such hours had been worked. The underpayments occurred as a result of normal annual increments within the salary structures not being paid, because of the lack of a system that would readily identify the incremental date for ancillary staff, and thus expedite payment. The basic reason that compounded these incorrect salary payments was the then inadequate staff numbers engaged in the control of these payments.

3.

	\$
Underpayments . . . . .	24 595
Overpayments . . . . .	11 188

#### SCHOOL COSTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What was the cost for each pupil enrolled in State primary and secondary schools, respectively, during 1975-76, and what is the estimated cost for each pupil for these schools for 1976-77?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The actual cost a pupil enrolled in State primary and secondary schools for 1975-76 has not yet been calculated. The estimated cost for 1975-76, and the preliminary estimate for 1976-77 are:

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BONDS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What firm is employed by the Education Department to collect amounts from bond debtors, and what is the attitude of the department towards those who are unable to meet their liability?

2. Of the \$2 721 000 outstanding under bond liability, what is the date of and amount of the oldest debt outstanding, and when will it be repaid?

3. Over what period is it expected that the sum of \$2 721 000 will be repaid?

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

1. George Laurens (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., and Bishop Collections Pty. Ltd. The department is reluctant to take the extreme measure of employing such a firm and it is only in extreme circumstances that this action is taken.

2. Some debts over 20 years old have been referred by the department to the Crown Solicitor for recovery. It is not possible with any degree of accuracy to estimate when they will be paid.

3. See 2.

#### HAIRDRESSING SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How much time was saved by the Hairdressing School in accepting a lease with an additional cost of \$365 000 over a maximum period of 10 years?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The time saved by accepting the lease referred to by the Hairdressing School was about 12 months and that action also prevented an immediate outlay of \$300 000, which was the cost of the improvements involved.

#### SCHOOL FIRES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which schools suffered damage by fire during the financial year ended June 30, 1976, and:

(a) to what extent;

(b) what was the estimated amount of damage;

(c) what is the estimated cost of replacement of school buildings, books, articles, and property; and

(d) have all damaged or destroyed equipment, books, and articles been replaced and, if not, why not?

2. Are all school buildings, equipment, books, and articles fully covered by insurance for loss through fire or theft?

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

1. See attached table.

2. Insurance cover: all school buildings, equipment, books, etc., are covered by insurance for loss through fire or theft. On this the Government carried its own insurance.

## FIRES AT SCHOOLS DURING FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1976

School	Date	Extent of damage	Total estimated cost (building and contents)	Building costs	Contents costs	Repairs and/or replacement of equipment
Burra High	1/7/75	Fire occurred in corrugated iron sports shed, destroying departmental equipment	\$ 2 990	\$ 1 500	\$ 1 490	Completed
Elizabeth South Primary	31/7/75	Fire destroyed canteen and equipment	32 058	27 000	5 058	Completed
Hillcrest Primary	7/9/75	Fire destroyed two prefabricated wooden classrooms and departmental equipment	36 750	35 000	1 750	Completed
Findon High	27/9/75	Fire destroyed galvanised iron shed and departmental equipment	8 040	5 000	3 040	Completed
Urrbrae Agricultural High	31/10/75	Fire occurred in hay shed at school	1 500	—	1 500	Completed
Gepps Cross Girls High	2/11/75	Fire destroyed four wooden classrooms	104 973	100 000	4 973	Approval now being sought for replacement of departmental equipment
Mitcham Junior Primary	3/11/75	Fire occurred in office and bookroom, destroying departmental equipment	7 967	6 000	1 967	Approval now being sought for replacement of departmental equipment
Grant High	18/11/75	Minor fire occurred in science laboratory	74	50	24	Completed
Para Hills Primary	28/11/75	Fire damaged a portable classroom and caretaker's shed	913	900	13	Completed
Scott Street Primary	2/12/75	Fire occurred in activity room, destroying departmental equipment	1 330	1 000	330	Completed
Two Wells Primary	21/12/75	Grass fire in reserve destroyed departmental plants and dripper pipes	210	—	210	Completed
Vermont High	4/1/76	Fire damaged canteen, store, two classrooms, art room together with departmental equipment	255 445	250 000	5 445	Treasury approval granted for replacement of destroyed equipment. Departmental stores requisition now being issued for replacement of departmental equipment
Thebarton Junior Primary	12/1/76	Fire occurred in storeroom, destroying departmental equipment	18 605	9 000	9 605	Supply of all replacement equipment nearly completed
Marryatville Primary	28/1/76	Fire occurred in galvanised iron storage shed, destroying departmental equipment	116	—	116	Completed
Highgate Primary	12/2/76	Fire damaged triple wooden unit, destroying departmental equipment	46 621	40 000	6 621	Completed
Campbelltown High	22/4/76	Fire bomb hurled into administration block, damaging corridor, walls, and ceiling	10 000	10 000	—	Completed
Marion High	10/5/76	Fire destroyed prefabricated art room and damaged two other prefabricated rooms	205 415	200 000	5 415	Approval now being sought for replacement of departmental equipment
			\$733 007	\$685 450	\$47 557	

## REGISTERED TRADE UNIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many trade unions are registered in the State Industrial Court?

2. Have all registered unions presented their audited balance sheets for each of the past five financial years and, if not:

(a) why not;

(b) which unions are in default;

(c) what action is being taken to rectify the position; and

(d) what is a reasonable time allowed for the lodgment of balance sheets?

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

1. A total of 72 associations are registered pursuant to Part IX of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972.

2. The Federated Artificial Fertilizers and Chemical Workers Union of Australia has not presented audited

balance sheets and statements of receipts and payments for the years 1974, 1975 and 1976, because that union and the Federated Iron Workers Association of Australia are in the process of amalgamation. The Registrar agreed that because of the amalgamation discussions, balance sheets need not be presented, but as the amalgamation has taken longer than expected the Registrar has recently been following up the matter. He has been informed that amalgamation should be achieved shortly. The lodgment of balance sheets (as well as the other returns of officers required under the Act) is checked by the Registrar on a monthly basis. Defaulters are reminded by pro forma letter and by telephone.

#### HOSPITALS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action is the Government taking to rectify the lack of an effective internal auditing arrangement within the Hospitals Department?

2. When will such effective controls be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Acting on the recommendation of the Auditor-General, the Hospitals Department plans to establish a policy audit group to supplement the traditional internal audit activities of the department that it considered will result in effective internal audit.

2. Three positions have been provided on this year's manpower budget to form the members of the policy audit group, and these positions will be filled as suitable personnel and funds are available.

#### ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Have departmental records for the Environment Department been completed in relation to property, plant and equipment, and in accounting procedures for salary and wages, as recommended by the Auditor-General and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Appropriate property and plant and equipment records have been established, although documentation of the property procedures has not yet been finalised. The work commenced during 1975-76 on documenting procedures for the payment of salaries and wages has now been deferred because of a decision that the department's salaries will be processed by computer under the common pay-roll system being implemented within the Public Service. It is expected that the department will transfer to this system in March, 1977.

#### MINISTERIAL DRIVERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Of the estimated sum of \$285 000 to be paid in salaries to drivers of motor cars in the Ministerial car pool during the present financial year, how much will be for overtime?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An estimated \$110 000.

#### MID-NORTH POWER STATION

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (September 8).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Electricity Trust of South Australia has appointed a committee, the Northern

Power Station Environment Committee, to advise it on the most suitable site and also the preparation of an environmental impact statement. The report being prepared by this committee is in its final stages. The committee's recommendations and draft environmental impact statement are expected to be presented to the trust within the next few weeks. The draft impact statement will be subject to public scrutiny and comment before a final decision is made.

#### HIGHBURY TRAFFIC

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (September 7).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The intersection of Lower North-East Road and Valley Road is not considered to be unduly hazardous. This location has a very low priority for the installation of traffic signals, and no other improvements are proposed at the present time.

#### BRIGHTON ROAD

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (August 19).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At present there are no plans to declare Brighton Road a clearway. The city of Brighton Traffic Plan, prepared for council by P. G. Pak Poy and Associates, includes recommendations for a median in Brighton Road, and this will be considered at a council meeting later this month. An earlier median proposal, prepared by the Highways Department, has been held in abeyance pending the outcome of the council meeting.

#### TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (September 7).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The priority for the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road has advanced. It is expected that traffic signals will be installed at this intersection in late 1977-78, subject to the availability of funds at the time.

#### DROUGHT RELIEF

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what action the Government is taking to ensure that South Australian farmers will receive the \$10 000 000 available to the State from the Commonwealth Government for drought relief? In his Budget statement the Premier, as Treasurer, announced that \$11 500 000 was to be spent on drought relief, of which \$10 000 000 would come from the Commonwealth under a long-standing agreement on drought relief under which the State would spend \$1 500 000. South Australia intends to spend \$1 500 000 on rural unemployment relief, but this is related to rural economic crisis and not to the drought, the effects of which have simply added to rural difficulties. In the Senate this afternoon, Senator Jessop asked the Minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

Has money spent on unemployment of persons affected by drought always been accepted by the Commonwealth as part of the State's contribution of the \$1 500 000 needed to qualify for Commonwealth assistance?

The Federal Minister's reply was, in effect, that, at least for the previous 10 or 15 years, this has not been so. Will the Government therefore allocate the necessary \$1 500 000



to drought relief projects immediately, so that the \$10 000 000 can be obtained urgently from the Commonwealth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State is willing to allocate as much money as can be spent, under the approved areas by the Commonwealth, on drought relief. That is to say, in relation to all the approved areas of drought assistance the State will meet all the funds necessary to cover our \$1 500 000, and more: there is no difficulty about this. In relation to every one of the things the Commonwealth has approved, the State will spend the money. There is no problem, and no question of our not meeting every bit of what the Commonwealth has proposed as the area in which it will meet its commitment after our spending \$1 500 000. It is not a question of allocating the money: it is there. Our interest in this matter is that the Commonwealth should extend its area of support, because we do not think that that area of support to which it has committed itself does enough in relation to the drought relief problem.

Dr. Tonkin: You will hold it up because—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, we will not: we will spend all the money for which there is a relevant application in areas approved now by the Commonwealth for drought relief support. There is no question of any holding back of State money in those areas.

Mr. Venning: Well, get on with it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are doing so. Applications are open and we have invited them, and we are ready to spend the money as soon as it is applied for. There is no question of holding back money by the State. We have suggested to the Commonwealth that it should broaden the area of its support, so that we may get more money into the rural area by doing so.

Dr. Tonkin: Have you participated in the \$10 a head for slaughtering charges that has been proposed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are willing to do that: there is no question about it.

Mr. Venning: You haven't said so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We have said so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have already said so, and will do it.

Mr. Venning: No, you haven't.

The SPEAKER: Order! There should be one question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My Deputy has expressed the support of the State for that programme, and it will be done.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I did it in this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, there is no question of the State's holding back any money involving drought relief. We have asked the Commonwealth for additional support, which has not been forthcoming, but that does not mean that we will not spend the money to the limit of the applications we have received in the approved areas: that will be done.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My attention has been drawn to a reply given by the Minister on September 8 (page 883 of *Hansard*). To avoid any misunderstanding, perhaps the Minister will explain what he meant by the statement he made at that time, as follows:

I am pleased to say that the State Government will participate in the bounty payments to graziers who lose stock, in addition to the slaughtering facilities already established.

I know the Minister would want me to read the next part of his reply, otherwise he would say that I was dodging the question. His reply continued:

We are anxious to hear from the Federal Government exactly how it expects the scheme to be administered, when payouts are to be made, and so on.

The scheme referred to, as I understand it, relates to the scheme already operating in Victoria for cattle, and in Western Australia and New South Wales, where I understand it applies to cattle and sheep. These are schemes under which cattle or sheep are presented for slaughter, they are slaughtered under supervision, the figure of the number of stock slaughtered is known, and bounties are paid accordingly. Is the Minister now saying that such a scheme is to be set up in South Australia; if so, when; if not, will he explain how it is intended to distribute in South Australia the bounty referred to when at present no system exists whereby stock can be presented for slaughter, numbers and types can be checked, and the scheme can be administered as in other States?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has finally recalled my statement in this House that we would subscribe to the scheme. He disagreed initially, when I said the statement had been made, but he was good enough to say that he was sorry about that; he had missed the point. Let me make plain that I meant then that we had announced already, irrespective of assistance from the Federal Government, that we would, with the co-operation of local government, set up in certain parts of the State points for slaughtering stock, and that the State Government would bear totally the cost of such slaughtering; no cost would be involved to the farmer, who would deliver the stock, which would then be slaughtered and buried, or disposed of as necessary. In addition, we would pay to graziers \$10 a head for cattle presented for slaughter, not cattle lost, or anything of that sort. That was as I understood the situation then. I do not suggest that there has not been some change of view. I have not conferred with the Minister of Agriculture since that time. He and the Minister of Lands are responsible for the administration of this scheme, and no doubt they will be looking at the details of it. The point I made was and still is relevant: we were awaiting further details, which were required urgently, from the Commonwealth to indicate how it wanted the scheme administered. Surely, that in itself would have indicated to the honourable member that, if the Commonwealth wanted us to do certain things to make the scheme available to as many people as possible in drought-stricken areas, we would do them. Getting the money from the Commonwealth would be contingent on certain matters; it would lay down the criteria.

Mr. Nankivell: But you've rejected deputations from the stockowners.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know what has been rejected. I am not the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Agriculture; I am simply replying to the question put to me by the member for Mallee. If the honourable member wants further information about what is happening now, about whether the Commonwealth Government has come to the party with the information we requested, and about whether the scheme has been altered in any way to meet the requirements of the Commonwealth, I will get it for him. The honourable member did not ask me in his question to do so. However, I shall be pleased to obtain what additional information I can for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

## FRUIT JUICES

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to consider legislating for the purpose of labelling the contents of fruit juices on sale in this State? Many constituents have asked me about the difference in quality of fruit juices available in supermarkets and delicatessens at many different prices. Many commodities show details of the content, a practice that helps people when making their purchases. Surely, showing the fruit juice content on the label would be a guide to the purchaser as to the quality of the product.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall be pleased to bring this matter to the attention of my colleague. I have had approaches about this matter from housewives and other people in my district who have said they believe there is no real control in this area, so that it is difficult for them, when making purchases, to decide whether or not an item has value.

## TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Premier satisfied with the operation of the Woods and Forests Department and does he visualise any difficulty for the timber industry in future? An unsatisfactory situation in the Woods and Forests Department has been highlighted in the latest Auditor-General's Report which, at page 248, states:

The matter of unsatisfactory budgeting procedures associated with forestry administrative and service operations was referred to the department in May, 1974. The position at June, 1976, was still unsatisfactory. The net earnings from plantations on which all expenditure has been recouped is stated in the balance sheet as \$6 480 891 for the year ended June 30th, 1976. Last year a report was forwarded to the department concerning *inter alia* the procedures adopted in connection with the determination of such surpluses, and this aspect is now being investigated.

Moreover, the South Australian Minister of Forests has recently thrown doubt on the future of the timber industry by suggesting that projections for timber packaging had been grossly exaggerated and that population increase had declined so that there would be a much lower building rate in the 1980's and 1990's. He also suggested that the timber industry was fragmented in comparison with other industries and was therefore vulnerable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The timber industry in South Australia, apart from imports, is largely based on the State forestry enterprise, which has been enormously valuable to us. The Minister has been concerned to see that, in the administration of the industry, proper marketing practices have been undertaken. I am sure that this is now happening. I do not foresee difficulties of any marked nature for our timber industry. We do not produce enough timber in South Australia for our own requirements, and we still rely heavily on timber imports in the building industry. I believe that with the improvements in technology in the State timber enterprise—

Mr. Goldsworthy: We need it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We still rely heavily on imports and we are not able, at the moment, to cope with the demand for our own local timber products. Recently, we have been able, in our own timber industry, to produce products that have never been available previously from our own man-made timber resources. I am sure that we will be able to provide satisfactorily

for South Australia from these timber resources and that the industry has a sound future. I admit that there have been problems in the past and that there have been some criticisms of organisation within the industry, but I believe that each of these problems is being coped with and that the Minister has made a series of changes in policy and administration that have coped with this series of problems.

## TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether his department has been successful in taking over the maintenance of traffic lights at intersections? When this procedure was first instituted, there seemed to be some criticism from certain quarters about whether this work could be done efficiently by the department concerned.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the only problem still existing is to try somehow or other to find a way in which to get road users to avoid knocking over the lights, because regrettably we seem to have an everlasting problem in replacing lights that are demolished by vehicles that get out of control. All in all, the transfer to the Highways Department of the maintenance and servicing function has been successful. Although no positive dates have yet been fixed, we are still pursuing the proposal that the whole of the operation, including the installation, will be taken over by the department.

## ABALONE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier tell me whether he has a Minister of Fisheries at present and, if he has, will he take whatever steps are necessary to have that Minister make some decisions on some matters sometimes, and at least answer, within a reasonable time, my letters to him? Two of my constituents, Messrs. Williams and Telfer, have been seeking, since 1967 and 1971 respectively, permits to take and sell abalone. The records reflect that those gentlemen have followed their original application by several personal visits and, indeed, by a great amount of correspondence to the department seeking an indication of when those permits will be issued, if at all. I am informed that they are now sick and tired of what may, could, or could possibly happen in relation to the various economic management and other studies being carried out by the research section of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. Their concern is spread over some years and I, too, share the frustration that they have in what appears to be a grossly delayed authority procedure by the department. My patience was particularly torn recently when, on a second deputation to that person who I presume is acting in the capacity of Minister, he said, "I don't run the Fisheries Department."

The second part of my question concerns the correspondence I have sent to the Minister on several occasions, but particularly an item of correspondence I sent on September 2, when I asked him whether he would kindly favour me with a report on the progress of abalone permit issue to applicants seeking to enter the zone embracing waters adjacent to Kangaroo Island. I also requested of the Minister in that correspondence some advice on the current criteria used for making such determinations. The whole object of that correspondence to the Minister was to seek sufficient information on which to rest a case on behalf of these two constituents, yet as late as last week I still had not received any correspondence. I

therefore went along with those two gentlemen to wait again on the gentleman referred to, without any basic understanding of the criteria on which the department was resting its determinations. As I am concerned on behalf of these two constituents, I ask the Premier at least to give me some information on the two specific matters I have raised.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am somewhat at a loss to understand the lack of communication between the honourable member and the shadow Minister of Fisheries.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's strange that they are not talking to one another.

Mr. Becker: What has that got to do with the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will tell you.

Mr. Chapman: He might ask another question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me outline my position on this matter and then perhaps the honourable member will be able to have a better communication with his shadow Minister. Under the Liberal Government there were 110 licences for abalone taking in South Australia and they have been allowed to decline from wastage from the industry to 32. Studies by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department of the take of abalone per man hour has shown a slight increase in recent years. Consequently, after studies by the department it was proposed to increase the number of abalone licences by 10; of course that would not restore the position to the number of abalone fishermen who were previously licensed under Liberal Governments but it would approximate the position which would give what was previously a reasonable return per man hour of take.

Mr. Chapman: So the economic studies are in the economic interests of the fishermen?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were to look at the economic interests of the fishermen, and it was proposed that two extra licences for abalone fishing be given in relation to waters adjacent to Kangaroo Island. Some of the existing 32 fishermen immediately objected violently to that proposal because they had previously had Kangaroo Island included in their zone, and they considered that the areas in which they were fishing, which were off Yorke Peninsula, had been fished out to a sufficient extent that they needed to return to the Kangaroo Island fishing grounds. Therefore, decisions were made allowing them to return to Kangaroo Island, and decisions about extra licences were held up on the protests made by the existing fishermen, by the shadow Minister of Fisheries (because he protested publicly about what was being done in relation to abalone fishers) and by fishermen in Port Lincoln as a result of representations which were made publicly there and to which the member for Flinders has given voice. The decisions about extra licences have been held up because of protests made by the existing 32 licensed fishermen and the members concerned in their districts, and the shadow Minister of the Opposition Party in this House.

Mr. Rodda: And the criterion that has been laid down.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Surely the criterion laid down was that we believed it was reasonable to extend the number of licences. That would have allowed for the licences about which the honourable member has made representation. Surely that was proper rather than that the existing 32 fishermen be allowed 32 relief divers, with no additional licensed fishermen in the area at all. That would have ruled out the honourable member's proposals.

Mr. Chapman: That is what we understood when Mr. Chatterton came to Kangaroo Island earlier this year—that he would give due consideration to those locally resident fishermen.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is giving due consideration to them. The contrary of what the honourable member is putting to us (because what the honourable member is putting to us is in accordance with what has been so far the Government's view) is what the shadow Minister has been putting to us or what has come from the Abalone Divers Association of Port Lincoln. Frankly, we must sort out this problem. The abalone fishermen demand that, instead of licensing anyone extra, including the honourable member's constituents, we have a survey (which would take some years to carry out) on existing abalone resources in South Australia before issuing more licences, and that in the meantime we put in 32 relief divers, who have no licences. That is the proposal before the Government at present, put forward on behalf of the abalone fishermen by the honourable member's shadow Minister. I suggest that the honourable member sort out this situation on his own side of the House and that members come to us with a concerted programme. I can tell the honourable member that, so far, the Minister is in favour of the case he has put.

Mr. Chapman: Thank you. That's a start.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I tell the honourable member that, but I suggest he sort the matter out with his colleague.

#### TELEVISION SERVICE

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General consider amending the Companies Act to give adequate protection to members of the community? At present, there seems to be an influx of unscrupulous people who are content to remain awake all night devising ways and means of hoodwinking the public. The latest report concerns a complaint about Australian Teleservice Pty. Ltd., of Greenhill Road, Wayville. The firm, operating as a colour television maintenance service, has been offering a policy at a cost of \$20 a year for maintenance and service charges for defective colour television sets. A constituent complains that, although attempts have been made on no fewer than four occasions to contact this firm for service, apart from an inspection of the set, no repairs have been effected. At the latest attempt she has learned that the firm has vacated the advertised address, and the matter has been referred to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. Will the Attorney investigate the possibility of preventing further acts of malpractice of this nature committed against the public generally?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The firm of Australian Teleservice Proprietary Limited is quite well known to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. From the time that that organisation commenced advertising its telefix service at, I think, \$20 a year, it has been under close investigation. I understand that on several occasions members of the public have approached the department seeking information regarding this organisation, and they have been told that any organisation purporting to provide a television repair service for \$20 a year is likely to be operating an extremely shaky business. We have advised a number of consumers not to do business with this organisation. When members of the public come across organisations such as this which seem to be offering what would, if it were a fair deal, be a fantastic one, they should

be extremely wary when dealing with such firms. Almost inevitably, when the element of something for nothing creeps into business transactions, one can be fairly certain that the organisation does not have a firm financial basis. It is difficult to legislate in this area because, until an organisation actually defaults, it is difficult to allege firmly or to prove that it is in fact a bogus organisation, out to deceive and to take down members of the public. Certainly, I shall look at what methods of legislative control could be introduced to govern the activities of such firms. I do not know that an amendment to the Companies Act is called for; I think a tightening of some of our consumer protection legislation could well be the best method of dealing with the matter. However, I shall look into the matter and bring down a report.

#### LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report on the latest position regarding the reconstruction and widening of the Lower North-East Road between the Torrens River at Dernancourt and Anstey Hill? The Minister will be aware that I have raised this matter over a number of years in letters and questions and in speeches in the House, the last time being the adjournment debate on September 7. On July 22 this year I received a written reply from the Minister in which he stated in part that, subject to the availability of funds, it was still intended to commence the duplication of the road between the Torrens River and Lyons Road during 1978-79 and between Lyons Road and Valley Road during 1979-80. He also said that the section between Valley Road to Anstey Hill would not be constructed before 1981. An assurance was given that the priority of these works would be kept under review. I am pleased to hear that, but I would prefer that the road be given a higher priority. I wish specifically to address my remarks to the words "subject to the availability of funds" in the Minister's reply. When the Minister replies, will he say whether the previous plans for work on this road have been affected by the State's allocation for road work under the 1976-77 Federal Budget? I do not think it is necessary for me to say that I hope that that is not the case.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because this is a fairly involved matter, I believe that I should obtain a full report for the honourable member and bring it down for her.

#### GOOSE-NECK TRAILERS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the category of registration to apply to goose-neck trailers has been drawn specifically to his attention? In addition, is the Minister aware of the consequence of a recent departmental decision that isolates goose-neck trailer operators in this State from those in other States? A goose-neck trailer is attached to the back of a light truck. The goose-neck trailers that I have inspected are used to cart horses. A manufacturer at Kersbrook employs two people to manufacture these trailers, which are being sold throughout Australia. As the result of a recent decision in this State, a person who operates such a trailer must register it as an articulated vehicle, thereby bringing it into the semi-trailer category, with the result that the person who drives the vehicle must hold a class 3 driver's licence. In America and elsewhere in the world, and certainly in other States of Australia, the goose-neck

trailer is considered to be an ordinary trailer, and the special requirements that I have outlined do not apply. If an extended pivot were put on the back of a truck that would allow the goose-neck trailer to pivot on it, that would create much danger, and it would not improve the general mobility and safety of such a vehicle.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The safest thing for me to do would be to ask the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to pivot around the honourable member's question and, when he has, I will bring back the information for him.

#### DIVORCE

Mr. WOTTON: Following the release of figures showing a large increase in the number of divorces granted in this State and, indeed, throughout Australia, has the Minister of Community Welfare or his department any plans to take some form of preventive action to help reduce the number of divorces in this State and, further, is any form of study being carried out to try to ascertain the effects of these divorces on society generally and, in particular, on the children of broken marriages? The number of divorces in Australia in 1974 was 17 495. That figure rose dramatically to 24 182 in 1975. The number of divorces in South Australia increased from 1 564 in 1974 to 1 734 in 1975. The statistics that have been released recently for 1974 (the latest figures available) show that, for 1974, 25 192 children were involved in broken marriages. Although I appreciate that this increase results partly from the backlog and partly because divorces are easier to obtain under the new Family Law Act, I ask the Minister to consider the matter.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: One is tempted to remind the honourable member of what Mr. Trudeau said: that the Government should stay out of the bedroom. It could be said in this instance that the Government should stay away from two partners in marriage. However, I appreciate the honourable member's question and his concern for the matter. The question of how many divorces occur is, to some extent, involved with the law, which is a Federal matter. As a member of a State Government I can make submissions to the Federal Government, but I am not involved directly. In replying to the honourable member in this way, I point out that the South Australian Government and the department of which I have the honour to be its Minister are vitally involved in the maintenance of the family. If the honourable member was familiar with the Community Welfare Act he would know that the precept stated clearly in that Act is that an aim of the Government and the department is the maintenance of the family—the very point being raised. However, the Act is also realistic in recognising that, primarily, the maintenance of the relationship between two people devolves mainly on the two people concerned, irrespective of any laws that may be made in Houses of Parliament or anywhere else. In being so realistic, the Act sets out a framework for assistance to families and children disadvantaged as a result of the failure of the marriage. South Australia can point with some pride to its activities in this area. I commend the activities of the officers in my department in the district offices throughout the State who provide assistance regularly to the people referred to by the honourable member.

I point out (perhaps the honourable member did not realise the full import of his question) that one of the necessary supports when a family is undergoing problems of this kind is finance. Only recently I made further

approaches to the Federal Minister on the matter of financial support for deserted wives during the early period of their desertion. Despite the fact that Senator Guilfoyle had stated publicly that the Federal Government's and, for that matter, the Liberal Government's social welfare argument is that maintenance of income is a Federal function, recently I received from Senator Guilfoyle a reply to my submission in which she said she intended to take no further action on the matter and that this activity would be still met by the States. In South Australia, the State Government handles this matter as well as it can under the present financial arrangements; that is, we pay virtually the same amount that is paid by the Commonwealth, a position that does not apply in other States. As a Minister, I know that the Government and I are aware of the problems and recognise that people will make their own decisions about this matter whether or not there are laws, however Draconian they may be, or even, as was suggested in a recent newspaper, that it should be more difficult to get married. That may be one way of slowing down the number of marriages, but it may not necessarily slow down the number of partings that occur. On reflection, the honourable member may agree that the Government can only propose support action, and we should be reviewing this all the time in order to ensure that it is the best available, whether it be family planning advice, marriage counselling, or whatever.

Mr. Wotton: That is all we are asking.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the honourable member asks a question he must expect to receive a full reply at times, and that is what he is getting now, although he seems to be losing interest in the question, because he is not receiving the reply he expected. I have more details, but I will send further information to the honourable member if he so desires.

#### LOCUSTS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy ask the Minister of Agriculture to waive charges the Agriculture Department intends to impose on councils that provide landholders with spray to destroy locusts? A letter I have received about this matter from the District Council of Murat Bay states:

It has been indicated that this insecticide will be made available to councils at the subsidised cost of \$1.84 a litre, and then council will recoup the cost from the landholder to whom the chemical is supplied. Council is of the opinion that, if landholders are charged for the insecticide, ineffective locust control will result, as farmers will be reluctant to treat locusts and pay for chemicals involved. Council feels that due to seasonal conditions farmers have been burdened financially without the further cost of paying for chemicals to protect what little stock feed they have left from plague locusts.

Will the Minister discuss this matter with his colleague? He will be aware that the District Council of Murat Bay is centered on Ceduna, an area that is suffering from severe drought conditions.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will do that.

#### NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government has decided the future of the vast unnamed national park located in the north-western region of South Australia? It is common knowledge that a conflict exists between the Minister and the

Premier concerning the future of this national park. I understand that the Minister believes that it should be named and dedicated, but the Premier believes that it should be handed over to Aborigines. In the public interest, will the Minister indicate clearly what is the future of this vast reserve, which is regarded as one of the largest national parks in the world?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: At present this area is a conservation park: it is a remote area, and there is little demand for it for any other purpose. I do not think I have anything further to add. It is a conservation park, and a valuable area. The acquisition of other similar land has been considered, but so far nothing has been done.

#### EIGHT MILE CREEK DRAINAGE

Mr. ALLISON: Has the Minister of Works considered favourably the request sent to him late in August by the Eight Mile Creek Drainage Review Committee to abolish drainage rates in that area? The committee and the residents appreciate that the recent legislation enacted by the Minister was a move to assist them, but they consider strongly that the abolition of the rate would be a fairer solution than a continuance of the present inequitable rating whereby the South-East average drainage rate is 17c a hectare while the Eight Mile Creek rate is about \$7 a hectare.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I received a copy of a letter signed by four or six residents of Eight Mile Creek in connection with this matter, and I have replied to it suggesting that, when the matter of rate review is considered (and it must be reviewed within the next six months), this request will also be considered. I point out to the honourable member that the comparison of rates he made is not valid. The Eight Mile Creek drainage system is provided for under a separate Act because there is 50 miles of drainage that is vital to the existence of the area, and it was correctly accepted that much higher maintenance would be required in that area than would be required in other parts of the South-East drainage scheme. A big difference is obvious between the two schemes. I have given an undertaking to the settlers that, when the matter was being reviewed, I would have their request considered and that they would be given a chance to have a say in the matter. I also tell the honourable member that, some years ago, I negotiated with the Eight Mile Creek settlers to enable them to maintain the drains themselves. In other words, I was willing at that time, when we were in Government, to suggest to the Government that a statutory body be created so that the settlers could maintain the drains, as they were then complaining about the high cost of maintenance. That proposition was rejected not by the Government but by the settlers, and I ask the honourable member to bear that in mind.

#### HOARDINGS

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Transport consider having hoardings removed from railway property in township areas or, if that matter is now outside his control, will he recommend to the Federal Minister that they be removed? The Minister may recall that about four or five years ago, under the provisions of the Control of Advertisements Act, many signs in country areas were removed from main roads. At that time I raised the matter of large hoardings situated on railway property.

At that time, it was said that there would be no action to have hoardings removed from within township areas. I remind the Minister that, in some areas of this State, the hoardings are unsightly and hideous, and should be removed. On the western crossing in the township of Nairne is a nice group of pines and large gum trees that help the aesthetic value of that village, but people cannot see this forest because of three large hoardings. Coming down the Hills towards the Murray Bridge township from the eastern side of the river one's view of the swamp lands and approaching town is marred by hoardings, which are about 2 metres high and 4 to 5 metres wide. We know that Rosella sauce and Rexona soap exist without our being reminded that they are available for use, by hoardings in such strategic places. Will the Minister consider, or ask the Federal Minister to consider having these signs removed from railway property?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question of hoardings on railway property has been subject to discussion for a long time by the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Planning and me. About three years ago we amended the policy and instructed the railways that contracts for signs were to be limited to a 12-month period so that, when a positive policy was enunciated, we would be able to give effect to it within a reasonable period. That is where the matter stands. I do not think it is wise to deal in isolation with signs unless there is something peculiarly objectionable about them. The one example of that which I give is the sign at present on top of the Railway Station, which seems to be bugging the member for Mitcham and other people.

The railway deficit is quite considerable and, whilst the revenue from hoardings is not a substantial portion of that sum, it is quite a sizable amount, and it is understandable that the railways would be loath to lose that revenue. I am sure the State Government would not relish the thought of increasing the deficit without good reason and I am quite sure, from the way Mr. Nixon carries on nowadays, that he would want to take steps to improve the deficit rather than make it worse. I am reminded of several locations where there are still signs that were erected by the Liberal Party prior to the last election campaign. Those signs are far more objectionable to me than are the ones on railway property, and I think the honourable member might undertake a campaign to better the environment by having all those signs removed.

### SHARK NETS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Coast Protection Board has considered providing shark-proof nets along our beaches in an effort to make them safer for swimmers during the forthcoming summer session? This is done in some other States. There has been an increased number of shark attacks along the South Australian coast recently, and professional abalone divers and fishermen are saying that never before have they seen so many sharks in South Australian waters. An article in today's *Advertiser* reports a Mr. J. R. McGovern as saying the following:

"It's common sense—now that fishermen are not after shark because of its high mercury levels—that there are more sharks growing and breeding," he said. "On Friday I warned a secretary to the Minister of Marine (Mr. Corcoran) that sharks are on the increase.

The report later states:

Mr. McGovern said the Government should be investigating the possibility of meshing Adelaide beaches against sharks.

I ask what, if anything, the Government is doing to make beaches safer for swimmers and what help, if any, swimmers can expect from the Government.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Coast Protection Board has assisted in several areas in the country to provide shark-proof bathing areas. For example, it has taken part in a project at Port Lincoln, which is now complete. There is also a project at Wallaroo costing \$120 000, of which the Coast Protection Board is contributing a major share. This project has been delayed while the council arranges for its share of the finance. In addition, consideration is being given to a shark-proof enclosure at Penong, where a schoolboy was killed early in 1975. I do not think it is a particularly satisfactory solution to the problem for metropolitan beaches to be provided with shark-proof nets. In any case, this matter should stem from the initiative of the local government area. I am sure that, if councils for any of the metropolitan beach areas are interested in providing this sort of facility, they would receive serious consideration if they put the proposal to the Coast Protection Board.

Mr. Mathwin: You won't take any initiative?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think it is primarily a local government matter. It is the responsibility of the beach councils to do something about protecting their beaches, and the least they can do is make an approach to the Coast Protection Board if they believe these nets will be a worthwhile facility. If they do, the board will consider the matter. It is not good enough for the honourable member to assume that the Government has to take every initiative in areas which are properly the responsibility of local government and not to accept any responsibility himself. If the honourable member considers that nets would be effective against shark attacks (and I have very great doubts that they would, given the great length of coastline used for swimming in the metropolitan area), I suggest that he approach his local council and get it to do something, because it is the council's responsibility. If the Coast Protection Board can give councils any assistance, and the project is worth while, I am sure the board will consider the matter.

### COAL DEPOSITS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the quality and estimated quantity of coal deposits in the Inkerman and Port Wakefield area, and whether there is any intention that this resource will be used for the production of electrical or other energy? Following a question I asked concerning the Mid North power station a couple of weeks ago, I was contacted by an elderly gentleman who claimed that there were deposits of coal not only in the Inkerman area but also in the area on the eastern side of Yorke Peninsula or on the western side of St. Vincent Gulf. In his answer the Minister suggested that one of the problems was the cost of transportation of coal. I understood that the environmental study committee was to consider sites as far south as Wallaroo. I ask what is the extent of this deposit at Inkerman and whether such a lode could be used for the production of electrical power in a coal power station on the Spencer Gulf coast.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, may I make one point of clarification, namely, that I think it is obvious that the Electricity Trust of South Australia would aim to work out the Leigh Creek coal deposit before operations

were transferred to any other coal deposit. The northern power station, to be built in the early 1980's, has a planned capacity that will enable the remaining coal supplies at Leigh Creek to be fully utilised. I am sure the honourable member appreciates that, with the amount of infrastructure and developmental costs that have been made at Leigh Creek, that is the only possible policy. Therefore, the coal deposits in the Balaklava, Inkerman and Clinton area would be relevant to the next power station, after the northern power station has been constructed. They may well have a considerable relevance, because the estimated quantity of coal in that basin is about 700 000 000 tonnes. The overburden ratio is about seven to nine and, although the overburden is larger than one would want in certain parts of the area, nevertheless it is, I believe, fairly sandy soil, and problems of removing the overburden would probably not be as difficult as they are at Leigh Creek. The fundamental problem arises in relation to the quality of coal. It is a low-grade coal and is fairly high in sodium and a fouling problem could arise in relation to using the coal. It is possible that the sodium content could be reduced by prior treatment, and tests must be carried out to see whether that is possible. One of the basic problems in assessing any coalfield, particularly if it is low-grade coal, is that enough coal must be dug up to determine whether it can be burnt, and what the problems are likely to be in burning that coal. These tests still have to be carried out. Moreover, it is hoped that additional exploration of that field will be undertaken during the coming year in order to determine its limits, more precise knowledge of the depth of the seam, the amount of overburden, and the general conditions that apply. As I have said, the usage of that field would be for the power station after the northern power station. In terms of the lead time for planning power stations, that is not too far away. Therefore, it is important to go ahead and investigate the Inkerman field in detail soon.

*At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 1081.)

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): When speaking in the debate last Thursday, I was referring to the effects of rural land tax and how the land that was being taxed represented about three-quarters of the income-earning assets of the primary producer. When we compare that with the metropolitan landholder's income-earning capacity attributed to the land value, in many cases it represents only 10 per cent. However, it is interesting that the Government, despite its concessions, big announcements and the vote-winning propaganda it has put out about land tax, will really have a reduction of only \$1 160 000, which, compared to the overall amount, is indeed a small sum. Of the four major tax concessions which have been widely publicised in connection with the Budget papers, the Government made announcements of a big reduction in stamp duties, whereas in reality there has been an increase of \$9 000 000.

Regarding succession duties, the amount involved was basically the same, even though the concessions had been announced previously. Concessions in pay-roll tax have again been put forward as an incentive to industry. Nevertheless, in this case there will be an additional \$16 500 000; the figure increased from \$119 500 000 to \$136 000 000.

I believe that a political philosophy must be interpreted when one looks at the total receipts of this State. In this Budget, the Government is expecting a revenue of \$1 171 000 000. This increase of about \$140 000 000 is relatively small on a year-to-year basis. However, the total, since the 1971 Budget, has gone from \$386 000 000 to \$1 171 000 000, or a three-fold increase. This is disturbing to me inasmuch as that, in a relatively short period under a Labor Government, we have had the Government drawing from the public a three-fold increase in revenue. This Government must be shown to be a Government of taxes. It has designed its social welfare policies around increased taxation. It is gaining more and more from the people, and South Australia is becoming more and more a socialist State.

In addition to the \$1 171 000 000 Budget, there is also the increased aspect of the tax-sharing entitlement from the Federal Government. This year, we have received an increase of \$75 000 000. I wholeheartedly agree with the new federalism policy of the Federal Government. This policy throws back on the shoulders of State Governments the responsibility of being able to raise certain funds in their own right and of being answerable to the general public for some of their expenditure. Whilst we would all like to be able to spend freely, with no purse strings attached, I think that, if State Governments are obliged to raise revenues themselves to provide the extras over and above the normal running expenses of the State, more consideration will be given to the matter. Despite the criticism of some people, purely for political purposes, the new federalism system is working well, and its effectiveness will increase significantly, as planned, during the present financial year.

All the essential machinery for the practical operation of the new federalism at State and local government levels has been established; this means that you, Mr. Speaker, and I, and everyone who pays rates or who lives in a local government area will benefit. Under the new federalism, untied Federal grants to local government will increase from \$79 900 000 this year to \$140 000 000 next year. New federalism means that States will receive about \$55 000 000 more this year than they would have received under the Whitlam Government's formula; these are significant revenue increases. No council will receive less than it received previously. Some of the other major aspects of the new federalism to be implemented during the next year include the introduction of stage one of personal income tax revenue sharing, and the establishment of a council for inter-government relations, incorporating representatives of Federal and State Governments and local government and the community.

The establishment of this council is, I believe, a significant milestone in the financial relations of the Australian Government. It means that for the first time not only State Governments and local government but also individual members of the community will have direct access to the Federal Government to enable their voices to be heard. The opportunity is there for local government organisations and for the community generally to influence the course of future Commonwealth Government financial planning. I believe that in the next 12 months we will see significant advancements in the operation of this policy to help State



Governments and local government and, through them, every individual Australian.

The Treasurer's statement referred to various stages in the tax-sharing agreement, and I believe some of the statements should be commented on here. Stage I (1) states:

In any year the States would be entitled to a fixed percentage of Commonwealth personal income tax receipts, excluding Commonwealth surcharges or rebates, collected in that year.

Stage I (6) and (7) state:

For each of the three years 1976-77, 1977-78 and 1978-79 the States would be guaranteed at least as much as they would have received under the Financial Assistance Grants formula (including the effect of a 3 per cent betterment factor).

The four less populous States would continue to be free to apply for special supplementary grants on the recommendation of the Grants Commission.

I believe other aspects of the agreement are in the interests of the States. Stage I (4) states:

These relativities between States would be reviewed from time to time.

Stage II (8) states:

A working party of officers would be given the task of establishing an appropriate framework so that States would be able to impose income tax surcharges in 1977-78.

This gives the State Governments the power to raise revenue if they are bold and game enough to go to the public and say they want to increase taxes for a specific reason.

Comments have been made during this debate about the unemployment situation. I am disturbed by the unemployment situation, because no-one likes to see an unemployment problem, but I believe we should all look at the problem in perspective. Much mention has been made of the 1 700 workers who are likely to lose their jobs at the Whyalla shipyard. In 1953-54, 234 000 people were employed in the work force of South Australia of whom 43 000 were engaged in the rural industry. That represented 18.5 per cent of the total work force. In 1964-65, 333 000 people were employed in the South Australian work force of whom 33 900 were engaged in the rural industry, which represented only 10 per cent of the total work force. In 1974-75 (the latest figures available) 449 000 people were employed in the work force of South Australia of whom 26 900 were engaged in the rural industry, which was only 5.98 per cent of the total work force. Over a 20-year period, about 17 000 jobs have been lost from the rural industry. They have been lost because of Government policies over the years, particularly centralisation policies, which have meant that South Australia is dominated and governed by metropolitan Adelaide. I relate those 17 000 lost jobs with the 1 700 jobs currently in jeopardy at Whyalla. Whilst 1 700 is a large number of jobs I believe we must keep the matter in perspective and look at the fact that we have lost 17 000 jobs from the rural industry, in the name of progress. This has been a legacy of a centralist philosophy that has brought more and more people to the metropolitan area and has caused more and more small country towns to become ghost towns and the viability of many country towns to be threatened.

I spoke earlier in the debate about the manner in which the Government brought forward the Budget papers. They were appealing papers designed for electoral purposes. The electoral boundaries legislation has had the effect of putting South Australia on a 14 to 33 country-metropolitan ratio. Combined with clever electoral spending in the Budget, the electoral legislation completely guarantees a continuation of a Labor Government in South Australia for another term. There are many tragedies in these

new electoral boundaries for country people. When finally implemented, they will mean that country people will have had five seats taken away from them. These seats will be transferred to the metropolitan area. That is one of the most tragic aspects of the Bill.

If we combine the electoral gerrymandering with the budgetary buttering up of the electorate in this Budget, we have the ingredients to perpetuate this present Government in office in South Australia for a long while to come. That is a tragedy, because this Government has not demonstrated much concern for country people; I have spoken about that previously. Perhaps the worst tragedy of all is that members who sit on this side are powerless to do anything about the Government's electoral, vote-grabbing philosophy in this Budget or about the Government's neglect of country people. Certainly, there are sincere hard-working members on this side trying to do their best for country people in difficult circumstances. The job ahead is to win metropolitan seats, and country members are to a certain extent hampered in presenting their case in relation to that. I know that this Budget is designed to win an election for the Labor Government in this State in the near future, but I also know that the Opposition in its present state is powerless and incapable of regaining Government. Unless we straighten ourselves and have an objective, realistic and fresh look at our priorities, with much more emphasis being placed on doing the right thing by people who live outside Adelaide, we will be sitting in Opposition for 10 years. The National Country Party accepts the concealed message in this Budget. It accepts that an election is not far away in this State, and accordingly at a recent central council meeting it decided to heed the Budget signs and to call nominations for candidates to contest certain districts. We do not have the power of the Government to direct Budget funds to bolster Party standing in selected districts, nor do we possess the vast financial and organisational strength of the Opposition, but we do possess a spirit and a determination to do our best to right some of the tragic wrongs to which both sides of this House have been parties, to the detriment of country people. It is about time the Government and the Opposition accepted that there is much more to South Australia than metropolitan Adelaide, and that 250 000 people still live in the country. Unless both sides do this, they abandon any right they have to represent country people.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I intend to direct most of my remarks to the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. I am disappointed that the Minister who represents the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport is not in the Chamber at the moment, but I hope he will return shortly. My comments relate mainly to recreation and sport because of a reply I received from the Minister on Tuesday last to a Question on Notice. The department has been operating only since early 1974. It is a comparatively new department, and we have received little information from it. Since Tuesday last, some members have received a little information that was not available previously: thanks to some people in the department, certain documents have been directed to us through the Minister. The first document I received in relation to the department was during the time the member for Henley Beach was Minister. The pamphlet stated that the leisure environment was important, and further stated:

As an individual, or as a representative of a recreational body, do not hesitate to talk to our staff about your ideas. You may be able to receive some useful assistance, and what we learn from you may well help us in planning for future developments in recreation and sport.



I hope that that applied to members of the Opposition, not only to outside organisations or to Government members. I was given the responsibility recently of the shadow Ministry dealing with this matter, and I decided to seek further information. Following advertisements and articles published, I asked of the relevant Minister a list of Questions on Notice. I expected a reply on Tuesday last, but I would not have minded if I had had to wait for three weeks for the replies. Of the questions I asked, none was difficult, nor was any question of the type that a member of the Opposition or the public should not ask. I defy the Minister or anyone else in this House to say that the Questions on Notice were of that type. Everyone knows that it is possible for the Minister to say that information will be made available at a subsequent date, as has happened in the past, but, on September 14, I received the following reply:

The honourable member asks for details to so great an extent that it is not considered reasonable to spend the time and public money necessary to complete such a series of interrogations.

The Government must realise, as must the department, that today, more than at any other time in the history of South Australia, the Government has press secretaries, research officers, and a massively staffed department to inform the Minister and Cabinet of what is going on. Unless that detail is made available to the Opposition, we do not have open government, yet this Government has long claimed to be an open Government.

The Minister must have taken some action in relation to one Question on Notice, or Cabinet directed him, because I believe the Minister in the other place is so weak that that is where the problem lies: that Cabinet had to direct him to see whether information in the department should be made available to us. Subsequently, I believe most members would have received last week (I did, and some of my colleagues did) a letter from the Minister, sent out on September 14, the day on which the Question on Notice was to be answered in the House. The letter states:

The South Australian Government, through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, has established several innovative schemes for the development of sport. One such programme, the junior sports coaching scheme, is available to sporting clubs and associations and provides financial assistance towards the conduct of coaching programmes for juniors. During the scheme's first year of operation, the following sporting groups in your electorate have received assistance: Heathfield Aldgate United Football Club; Mid Hills Netball Association. I have attached brochures and publications relating to sports development programmes and will in future inform you of approved grants in your electorate as they occur.

Probably three people should receive a full list of support made available from the department: the Whip or the Leader of the Opposition, and the representatives of the two minor Parties. We should be given full details of those grants, made by a comparatively new department. The document included was entitled "Sports development in South Australia", and referred to club administration courses, the State coaching plan and junior sports coaching, and gave a programme of the State coaching plan and general comments on the aims of the department in relation to sport. The first of my Questions on Notice was as follows:

Have recreation and sporting committees been set up at local government level, and, if so:

A list of five questions follows, seeking details of how such committees have been set up, and where they are located. Surely, it would not be impossible to answer that question, nor should it take a great deal of research; the detail should

be available immediately, and we should not have to ask for it. It should be directed to us so that we can be an informed Opposition. There is no way in which we can compete with the sort of Government machine that is a closed shop, a secret operation. I was told in reply that that was interrogation. I also asked the following question:

What role will the Recreation Advisory Council take in matters relating to recreation within the community?

I wonder how many members in this Chamber have ever received, as we receive copies of documents from other departments, copies of a publication entitled *Leisure Lines*? One edition was published in August, 1975, and another in July, 1976. The 1975 edition was in the Parliamentary Library, as I found on making a request. The issue for July, 1976, was made available today, following questions about whether copies were available. That document should have been in the library at the time it was published. The documents mention the advisory council; the issue of August, 1975, contains on the back page a reference to the Recreation Advisory Council, detailing the members of the council, the positions they hold, and whom they represent.

If I had known that that information was available, it would not have been necessary to ask some of the questions I placed on the Notice Paper, but we were not told about it. The July, 1976, issue was published long before I put my Questions on Notice, but it was not available to the library, and the department did not make it available to anyone in the Opposition. I wonder whether Government members or you, Mr. Speaker, received a copy. That document states that the Minister has appointed an advisory council. It sets out the composition of that council, which is about the same (with only a few different personnel) as the one established earlier in 1975. The 1976 publication indicates that council members have been appointed for a two-year term and, over the page, gives advice to members of the Sports Advisory Council and sets out the composition of that council. They were the questions that I put on notice. I asked the questions in September because I knew that such an operation was occurring. However, I did not know how people were to be appointed, by what method a person could be appointed to the advisory councils, or what functions they would have.

What sort of reply did I get? I was told that I was interrogating the Minister, yet this document was published by the department and should have been public and should have been in the Parliamentary Library. The publication was not made public until I asked certain questions. It was only then that it came to light. In fact, the Parliamentary Library received its copy today. Another publication called *Sports lines* was posted to members last week. I presume that most members received a copy of that publication, which was accompanied by a letter from the Minister. It contains useful information and is a good document. The copy I received, however, was volume 1, No. 2. I asked the Parliamentary Library whether it had the earlier edition, but it did not. The first edition turned up today, and it is stamped with the Parliamentary Library's date stamp—September 21, 1976. It is edition No. 1. Had that edition been made available earlier, most of the Questions on Notice that I asked would not have been asked.

It is stated in the publication that a sports development unit will be established. It refers to the Sports Advisory Council and the amalgamation of the National Fitness Council with the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. It also refers to the junior sports coaching scheme and the sports grants approval for March-April, the role of

the coach in injury and sport, club administration courses (one of the questions I asked), sports injury clinic for South Australia, volunteer workers' insurance scheme, voluntary leadership survey, coaching of coaches courses, and so on.

Why was that document not made available at least to the Parliamentary Library to keep members informed? Was it because the Government did not wish members to know about those matters, or was it because the Minister was lax and was niggly that questions had been asked because someone was perhaps close enough to a member of the advisory council to know about some of the things that were happening? Using that method would perhaps have meant that some of the information I had been prompted to ask would have been available to me.

Dr. Tonkin: Would you call it arrogant and secretive government?

Mr. EVANS: It is, especially when one gets the sort of answer I received to simple questions. I also asked a question about courses conducted at Salisbury College of Advanced Education because I had spoken to someone at that college and had some knowledge of what was happening there. The Minister did not even reply to that question, yet at page 7 of the document that was published in July, 1976, it is stated that the Recreation Advisory Council over the past two years has taken an active interest in the establishment of the course in recreation established at Salisbury College of Advanced Education. Why was one not given replies to questions asked about that matter? Why was it stated that that was interrogation? Who is the Treasurer fooling in this State when he says he believes in open government, a Government to which you, Mr. Speaker, belong? What sort of Government is it? I will now continue to consider some of the areas in which the Minister believed he should not reply. The penultimate question I asked on September 14 was as follows:

Are proposals still being considered to establish a major indoor stadium, and heated swimming centre, for South Australia, and, if so:

- (a) what sites are being considered for such proposals;
- (b) who is expected to participate in the funding;
- (c) when is it expected final selection of a site will be made;
- (d) what is the expected construction time;
- (e) what would be the estimated cost of each project;
- (f) what is the expected spectator accommodation available, and what would be the main purpose of each centre;
- (g) which sites have been rejected;
- (h) what is the economic viability of such projects;
- (i) what consultants have been used to date in feasibility studies for such a project, and what are the amounts of money paid to consultants for their work; and
- (j) what amount of money has been allocated for continuing studies in this area during 1976-77?

None of those questions is difficult to answer. They are not interrogation. It is the sort of information that members of the Opposition and the public should be given. Let us now consider the newspaper articles that led to my asking certain questions. In the *News* of April 8, 1975, appears an article headed "Super stadium planned for South Australia—talks start". The article contains a photograph of the Houston Astrodome in Texas and states:

A major indoor stadium for sport and entertainment is planned for Adelaide. The Federal and State Governments are independently studying the most suitable type of stadium, the facilities it should include, and its location. The article continues with Mr. Broomhill making a statement about the stadium's operation and stating that Mr. Brian Taylor, a senior officer of the department, was in Queensland with officers of the Federal Government and

other State Governments discussing the need for stadium facilities. That was only one of the articles relating to the stadium. The *Advertiser* of December 18, 1975, at page 3 states:

South Australian sports stadium mooted in grants. The Federal Government will pay for a feasibility study for an international sports stadium and recreation centre in Adelaide.

An article in the *Advertiser* of July 4, 1975, states:

A feasibility study will begin this financial year on the planning and location of a multi-million dollar sports and entertainment stadium in the metropolitan area. A study also will be made for a heated indoor swimming pool of international standard.

The Government has been making statements for publicity purposes to promote its grandiose ideas on these projects. All I asked was how far the project had gone, what had been spent on it, what sites had been considered, and so on, only to be told by a so-called open Government that that is interrogation. That is not open government. No-one opposite can claim that it is. Government Ministers should be ashamed of that sort of reply to that sort of question.

Mr. Millhouse: Who are you blaming for all this?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and his Australian Labor Party colleagues who support him in retaining information that should be available when they advocate that they form an open Government. The Opposition and the interjector know that this Government is not an open Government. Other newspaper articles were written, too, about this subject. An article published on August 3, 1975, stated that financial assistance was available to conduct junior sports coaching programmes. Details were given about how people should apply for that assistance. In my questions I asked whether members had been told of any public meetings that were to be held relating to club administration courses. I am keenly interested in that matter, as a member and otherwise, because of my association with about 17 clubs. I am keen to know the sorts of course offered. In a discussion I had with a departmental officer relating to a legal aspect in this field, he referred to this course. I thought I could look for that later. I also discussed with him another aspect. An advertisement in the *News* of July 16, 1976, stated:

Public Meeting  
VOLUNTEER SPORTING AND RECREATION  
WORKERS INSURANCE SCHEME

Venue: South Australian Institute of Teachers Hall, 163a Greenhill Road, Parkside.

Date: Monday, 26th July, 1976.

Time: 7.30 p.m.

Commencement Date of Insurance Scheme: Monday, 2nd August, 1976.

Why could not the Minister through his department tell members that the meeting was being held? It was an important meeting, and this was a new sphere of Government expenditure.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Wasn't it mentioned earlier?

Mr. EVANS: No, because the journals were not available to Opposition members, and no-one knew of any publication being issued by the department. The Parliamentary Library did not know about this.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The word "publication" means that they are public.

Mr. EVANS: I agree, but how do we know they are available until we receive the first one? After receiving the first one, we could ask for them. It would have been reasonable if the Minister had said in his recent reply that several publications, which were available at the

department but which were not in our library, would be of help to members, but we did not receive that sort of reply. Many sporting clubs employ paid coaches with salaries from \$100 to more than several thousand dollars. I have spoken to a person who may be called the legal officer in the Minister's department, and I know that he is conscious of the problem. Under the present workmen's compensation laws these clubs employing coaches take a grave risk if they do not cover the coach by workmen's compensation cover. That could be expensive but, if the coach is injured while undertaking his duties, the club could be sued for a large sum. I am concerned that these clubs have not been told, and have not taken out the necessary cover. The Government has introduced a scheme to insure voluntary workers in sport and recreation, and I congratulate the Minister on that action. No doubt volunteers need that sort of protection, but the Minister should be aware that there is a need to extend this scheme so that paid coaches, who do not receive a large salary, say, up to \$1 000, are covered by it. This matter should be considered keenly, because I can visualise the day when a coach is seriously injured (as was a prominent footballer recently), and the club, if it is not incorporated, could be embarrassed because its committee members could be liable to a claim under our existing laws. I hope the Minister is aware of the seriousness of this situation.

Recently, the member for Gilles said that the Federal Government was cutting out or reducing some sporting grants, and was critical of that Government. If the honourable member had spoken to his Minister, he would have received proof that what he had said was inaccurate. A report in the *Advertiser* on April 30 this year, under the heading "Canberra axes aid for sport in South Australia" and the subheading "Disgusting breach of faith—Casey", referred to cut-backs by the Federal Government concerning recreation project in South Australia. I do not mind the Minister at times making political capital with half-truths or even lies, but I decided to write to him, about the matter, and on August 16, I sent the following letter:

Dear Mr. Minister,  
I wish to ascertain from you whether the following projects are to continue: the \$460 000 conversion of 32 hectares of quarry land at Marino for a golf course and barbecue area; stage two of a \$650 000 district recreation centre at Kadina; extensions to the Blackwood Youth Club to provide a multi-purpose sports hall; the \$180 000 indoor cricket and recreation centre at Bowden; tennis courts and shelter at Port Adelaide; and new changerooms, clubrooms, and other facilities at Gepps Cross for the North Adelaide Lacrosse Club.

When are the programmes that are being proceeded with expected to be completed? What is the method of funding each? If any projects have been postponed, what are now to be the commencement and completion dates?

On August 27, I received the following reply from the Minister:

I refer to your letter dated August 16, 1976, requesting information on different projects and advise as follows:

Project	Status	Funding		
		State \$	Federal \$	Local \$
Marino Quarry recreation centre	Work commenced—anticipated completion February, 1977.	270 000	60 000	130 000
Kadina recreation centre	Half completed—anticipated completion December, 1976.	217 000	217 000	217 000
Blackwood recreation centre	Work commenced—anticipated completion February, 1977.	134 000	134 000	134 000
Tennis courts and shelter at Port Augusta	Tenders being called. Anticipated completion November, 1976.	Nil	20 000	10 000
North Adelaide Lacrosse Club clubroom facilities	Tenders being called. Anticipated completion March, 1977.	21 667	21 667	21 667
Indoor cricket and sports centre at Bowden	The Ground and Finance Committee of the S.A. Cricket Association Inc. has decided not to proceed with the establishment of this centre.			

Concerning the indoor cricket and sports centre at Bowden, I ascertained that the South Australian Cricket Association would now have to find about \$300 000 instead of \$63 000, as was originally suggested for each of the three bodies, and that, although this project would not be undertaken, a similar one was contemplated near the Adelaide Oval. Obviously, there has been no reduction in Federal funds for any of these projects, as the member for Hanson emphasised last week, when he read a letter from the Federal member for Kingston (Mr. Grant Chapman), who said that \$11 000 000 was available from the Commonwealth, and that more money could be granted to councils where it was necessary. A report in the *News* of August 18, 1975, under the heading "Sir Mark hits at those bad sports" states:

The Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, lashed out today at poor sportsmanship. Sir Mark said he was "greatly disturbed" at the gradual but insidious rejection of the principle of sportsmanship. The main thing these days seemed to be victory at any cost. "Of course, it's nice to win . . ."

What the Governor says applies to this Government. It wants victory at any cost, even if this means refusing to give the sort of information that should be available not only to the Opposition but to everyone in the public sector.

Perhaps because someone on a recreation advisory council was able to talk to someone, there was a complaint, but there should not have been.

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

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the second reading. In his explanation the Treasurer refers to matters concerning the Commonwealth Government and the difficulties (in his opinion) of withholding funding for the States. He states:

We all know that the Commonwealth Government is strenuously pursuing a policy of reduced public spending both in its own area and that of the States. I have said on a number of occasions, both publicly and to the Prime Minister himself, that I believe this policy can only increase unemployment beyond the already high and unacceptable level, reduce consumer confidence, discourage private investment and generally lead to an overall economic decline. It ignores the present plight of the building and construction industry which is operating at about only 75 per cent of its capacity in this State and which is in even worse straits in some other States.

I suggest that many reasons can be given for the decline in the areas mentioned by the Treasurer other than the excuses he gives in that statement. There is strong evidence that the South Australian Government has launched

a concerted attack on the Commonwealth Government. In verbal and written form, Ministers constantly state that the Commonwealth Government is not meeting its responsibilities in providing money to the States. I am sure it would do Government members good to read and understand exactly what is meant by the Commonwealth Government's federalism policy.

The Government in Canberra has a responsibility, as have the State and local government. If the State Government would only accept the request and challenge of the Commonwealth Government and co-operate, the situation would resolve itself in a better manner and more quickly than otherwise envisaged by this Government. Members on this side are continually confronted by a barrage from Government members to the effect that we do not co-operate. It has been said that the Leader of the Opposition is a knocker. When the Leader comments about Government proposals, policy statements by the Treasurer, and statements by the other Ministers, what he says is justified and proffered as constructive criticism.

An attitude of accusation is adopted by the Government of this State when considering the Commonwealth Government and the Prime Minister. If there was acceptance of and co-operation in the federalism policy, I am sure we would see a successful Australian economy. It is not only the economy of the country that counts but also the consideration of the people and the philosophy of that country. There is a distinct difference between the philosophy of the previous Whitlam Government and that of the present Fraser Government. I challenge the Government to understand and accept the philosophies and economic considerations of the Federal Government. Through such co-operation, we will see success in our nation, as well as at State and community level.

This afternoon the Leader asked a question about drought conditions in some areas of South Australia and about what the Government was doing to assist in that situation. We know that the Government has announced certain assistance regarding transportation of fodder, for breeding stock, and through local government avenues for the disposal of the carcasses of stock that must be destroyed. Also, 40c has been offered for sheep having a weight of 18 kg or more for the production of meat-meal. This afternoon, the Treasurer said that action had been taken by the Government, but as far as I know these are the only measures that have been announced. In answer to a question I asked about a week or so ago concerning further action to assist in the drought situation, the Treasurer said a committee was investigating further measures that could be adopted to assist the drought areas in the country.

The Treasurer also said that he would make available to me any information or recommendation that came from that committee. I suggest that that committee has not been very active and has not reached any conclusions on this matter, because as yet I have not received any advice that further action has been recommended. I am concerned about this matter. It was distressing, when travelling from Kadina towards Adelaide over the high ground in the area known as the Hummocks, that until a week ago when there was some rain not a blade of green grass was to be seen. I refer to the Nantawarra, South Hummocks and Port Wakefield area, extending to Snowtown, Brinkworth and areas in the hundred of Everard. I raise this matter again because this is one of the areas worst affected by the drought. In fact, only last weekend people who have seen many seasons told me that this was the worst year in living memory in many areas. I appeal to the Government and the respon-

sible Ministers for something to be done soon to assist these areas—something more than is being done at present. In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer states:

We are in the grip of one of the worst droughts on record, and there are no prospects of relief. The Government expresses its sympathy to all of the rural community affected. As a practical token of our concern we have included in this Budget total appropriation for drought relief of \$11 500 000, of which we expect the Commonwealth to provide \$10 000 000 and the State \$1 500 000 in accordance with the established guidelines.

I recall that, when I asked a question a few weeks ago, the Treasurer mildly rebuked me for not knowing that the State Government had first to spend \$1 500 000 before Commonwealth money could be attracted to the State for this scheme. I appeal to the Government to get on with the job and spend the \$1 500 000, which is needed to assist in this period of drought and, when the State Government has fulfilled this condition, I am sure that the Federal Government will honour its part of the agreement.

Last week, a primary producer contacted me about the bounty for the disposal of sheep and cattle. I hope that agreement will soon be reached between the State and Federal Ministers so that the producer may avail himself of the opportunity of applying for the cost per head of those cattle and sheep he must dispose of because of the drought.

As I have said, the Commonwealth Government is being accused of not providing sufficient finance and of hamstringing the State in spending money. I refer to the railways situation. At page 409, the Auditor-General's Report states:

Debt charges (interest) decreased by \$7 808 000 to \$1 284 000 for 1975-76 mainly on account of the cancellation, pursuant to the railways transfer agreement, of \$124 000 000 loan liability to the Commonwealth and liability of \$15 664 000 to the Commonwealth under various railway agreements as from July 1, 1975. Therefore, the total deficit of \$43 140 000 for 1975-76 is not directly comparable with that for 1974-75. In 1974-75 the State Treasurer transferred \$40 000 000 from Consolidated Revenue towards the deficit for that year but a similar transfer was not made in 1975-76. Under the terms of the railways transfer agreement the Australian National Railways Commission during the year recouped the State \$22 300 000 towards the estimated non-metropolitan deficit for 1975-76. . .

I make the point that last year the State had to pay \$40 000 000 for the South Australian Railways, whereas this year it has been saved \$22 300 000, and an additional \$7 808 000, making about \$30 000 000 altogether. I know that the Government would say, "What a wonderful agreement we have made." I am not debating that point now; what I am saying is that the State has been relieved of about \$30 000 000 this year at the Commonwealth Government's expense. Therefore, in addition to all other moneys, it has cost the Commonwealth Government about \$30 000 000 this year for the railways transfer agreement. Will not that large sum from the Commonwealth benefit the State? Yet that point has not been made, as far as I can recall, by the Government. The Government has complained at length about lack of money from Federal sources, whereas that one matter has cost the Commonwealth Government about \$30 000 000 this year.

Recently, I asked the Treasurer a Question on Notice about the sum that would be transferred from the South Australian superannuation fund to the Commonwealth superannuation fund as a result of the agreement. At that time, it was not possible for the sum to be disclosed, because final agreement had not been reached. Many railway employees (possibly all railway employees) are

concerned about their conditions of transfer. In reply to a question asked by the member for Semaphore, the Minister said that the matter of conditions of employment was the hold-up in the finalising of the transfer agreement. On August 11, I asked the Minister whether South Australian officers and employees had been kept informed of current negotiations in the implementations of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, and, if not, why not. In reply, the Minister said that discussions had been held with the South Australian Railways representatives on no less than 15 occasions during the past four months.

If that is the case, I am sure that the information is not being passed on to all the employees. I am sure that, if this were to be done, there would be a greater acceptance by them and that they would be more content. They are concerned about their conditions and their future. I believe that, while negotiations are continuing, these employees and their families would be happier and more contented if they received information about the progress made concerning the railways agreement. When speaking about taxation, the Treasurer said:

In the normal course, revenue from land tax would have increased by about 25 per cent in 1976-77 as a result of rising land prices and thus higher valuations.

It is acceptable that the method of valuation for land tax purposes is being carried out according to the Statutes of this State. When speaking about valuations, I am not criticising the men who make them: their valuations are controlled by circumstances and perhaps by a court ruling, rising costs, and different conditions that apply in certain areas, such as the case of the hobby farmer. The valuers carry out their task according to factors over which they have no control. If land tax is to be modified, it is the responsibility of this Parliament to adjust the scale of taxation. The Treasurer continued:

However, having regard to the growth which has occurred in these receipts in recent years, to the desirability of giving relief to taxpayers, if possible, and to the present favourable Budget position, the Government has decided to give substantial concessions in land tax rates and exemptions. In looking at the prospective effect of continuing the existing provisions we were very conscious of the probable impact in two particular areas, the city of Adelaide and rural areas. It is appreciated that considerable relief will be given in rural districts. I believe there are two reasons why this relief is being given. First, receipts from land tax in 1970 were about \$9 000 000, whereas last year they were \$19 800 000. The Treasurer said that if relief had not been given a further \$6 200 000 would have been received during the present financial year. The Government saw that something had to be done to reduce land tax. The rate that will prevail will be unacceptable even after these concessions are given. Secondly, rural organisations, farmer organisations and other people, particularly members on this side, have shown the Treasurer and the Government the iniquitous proportions land tax has reached. I appreciate that the Government has seen fit to abolish land tax in rural areas on primary producing land. In relation to the city of Adelaide, the Treasurer said:

In deciding how to give concessions we had in mind the special problems in these areas. Accordingly, we decided to remove from the progressive scale of rates the top five increments above 28c for \$10, to reduce by 1c each of the 12 steps from 6c to 28c for \$10 and finally to remove land tax on primary producing properties.

Although these considerations are acceptable and appreciated, I am sure that in the future, if some other adjustment is not made, the average citizen will pay much more for land tax than he has previously paid, because the estimated receipt from land tax in South Australia for next year is \$18 600 000. In answer to a question the Treasurer has

said that the receipt from rural land tax is \$1 100 000. If that sum is deducted from the actual receipts last year, it will be seen that the metropolitan area and provincial cities will this year pay the same amount as they paid last year.

Last year the estimate of receipts from licences under the heading "Labour and Industry" was \$6 000. The actual receipts totalled \$1 074 495, and the estimate for this year is \$1 114 000. I presume that builders' licences are included in this line. In his statement the Treasurer said that the decline in building was caused by a lack of finance for buildings from the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that there is a decline in building because of the cost of building, and the Government of South Australia has contributed by its workmen's compensation provisions to the high cost of building. When this matter was mentioned last year the member for Gilles said that there must be more builders' licences granted than there had been. I say that statement is correct, for the following reason. In country areas, builders are going out of business because of the escalating cost of employing labour. One drastic cost of labour is workmen's compensation insurance, which costs about \$20 a week for each employee. In Kadina, a large builder is going out of business, and I know that the same thing is occurring in Balaklava and one of the towns in the District of Light. I understand that the employees who are being dismissed because of rising costs are applying for restricted licences. When those licences are granted, the Government will receive greater revenue from builders' licences than it has received before.

In conclusion, I say that the Government is falsely accusing and criticising the Federal Government for lack of funding, but I challenge it to accept the corrective measures being taken and to co-operate. The South Australian Government has received the immense amount of \$30 000 000 from the Federal Government through the railways agreement. I ask the Government to do everything possible to expedite drought assistance in country areas, while thanking it for the assistance given in the relief of land tax in country areas.

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

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Although I support the second reading of the Bill, I should like to make some observations on the documents presented to Parliament and the Treasurer's explanation of them. The Treasurer has made a great ploy of presenting a balanced Budget, at the same time stating that the Budget contains virtually no increased charges. Unfortunately, the method adopted by the Government in recent years in presenting the Budget gives the average man little opportunity to form a clear picture in his mind of precisely what is happening in relation to the finances of the State. No longer does the Government present a Budget clearly indicating the charges it is making, the increased taxes it will impose, and where the revenue is to be spent.

During the period of 12 months before the introduction of the Budget, the Government slowly but surely introduces increased taxation measures at intervals so that the public is not aware, when the Budget is presented to Parliament, of the total impact. The concessions provided in this Budget amount to a little less than \$9 000 000; on the other hand, we have only to look at the items increased during the preceding period, whether they be port charges, water rates, sewerage charges, licence fees or motor vehicle registration fees, to come up with a figure of \$18 000 000 in that area alone. The Government is living

largely on an inflationary situation. Overall total receipts for the State in the present situation will amount to about \$50 000 000, largely as a result of inflation and increased wages.

A good example of that is pay-roll tax. The Treasurer made a great deal of the pay-roll tax concessions with the increase in the statutory exemption, which amounts to an increase of 15 per cent. In a full year, that gives a concession of about \$1 000 000 in an area of taxation which, to June 30, 1975, yielded \$101 426 425 and which, to June 30, 1976, provided the State Treasury with \$119 482 421, an increase of about \$18 000 000. The concessions provided amount to a mere \$1 000 000 in a full year, so although the Treasurer gained much publicity from that move the value to the community or to industry was extremely small. Referring to pay-roll tax, the Treasurer states:

The Government proposes to provide within the approved guidelines a range of incentives to industries wishing to establish or expand their operations in South Australia. An amount of \$160 000 is provided for this purpose.

That sum will do absolutely nothing to improve the situation or to create the necessary incentive. As an example of a decentralised industry, I cite the case of the Riverland Cannery, a company which pays to the South Australian Government between \$80 000 and \$100 000 annually. On the figures provided, to June 30 of this year the company paid to the State Government about \$81 000 in pay-roll tax. The new exemption level provided in the Budget will reduce the payments by the company by about \$320; that is, a reduction of \$320 on \$81 000. If that is the concession and the incentive the Treasurer is talking about, we will not see a great deal of flow-on from that source.

Mr. Evans: It will pay the postal charges.

Mr. ARNOLD: Quite right. In this House on August 18, I made the claim, which I believed to be conservative, that the Riverland area was contributing to the State Government more than \$1 000 000 annually in pay-roll tax: that sum is a direct deduction from the returns primary producers in the area would have received; it is \$1 000 000 less that goes into circulation in the area and into commerce in the district. On that \$1 000 000, the concessions provided by the Treasurer would amount to about \$3 200. The concessions therefore are virtually non-existent, and I reiterate that it is imperative that this Government introduce a decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebate similar to that operating in Victoria to alleviate some of the burden placed on existing decentralised industries in South Australia, at the same time providing a genuine incentive for other industries to establish in decentralised areas.

The Treasurer announced major concessions in relation to land tax, but on examining the move we find that, in the past year, a little more than \$19 800 000 was collected from land tax. As a result of revaluation and inflation, and after exempting rural producing lands, the Government still expects to collect \$18 600 000 from land tax. Again, the concessions are indeed limited. In many instances people in the metropolitan area will be paying considerably more land tax than they have paid in the past. On the surface it would seem that the Government had adopted many of the policies enunciated by the Opposition. When one delves into the matter, however, one ascertains that those policies have been adopted in name only and that they have no depth, because the concessions are extremely limited and revenue collected by the Government will still be extremely high.

The depressing effect on industry throughout South Australia will still exist and, until the Government makes a genuine effort to alleviate some of the burden placed on producing industries in this State, especially outside the metropolitan area, South Australia has little hope of achieving genuine decentralisation. Victoria has been most successful in achieving decentralisation, which I attribute largely to the effects of its Decentralised Industry Incentives (Pay-roll Tax Rebates) Act. That Act has given Victorians a considerable advantage over decentralised producers or manufacturers in this State.

I mentioned the magnitude of pay-roll tax paid by Riverland Cannery and said that it amounted to about \$6 for each tonne of fruit delivered to the company for processing. South Australian producers are at a distinct disadvantage compared to their counterparts in Victoria to the extent of \$6 a tonne. The New South Wales Labor Government undertook before the recent State election that if it was elected to Government it would introduce a Decentralised Industry Incentives (Pay-roll Tax Rebates) Act similar to that which applies in Victoria so that the advantages and incentives provided in Victoria would also apply in New South Wales. Unless the South Australian Government does something genuine in this field, there is little hope of relief for industry outside the metropolitan area.

It will be recalled that in recent years the Auditor-General has criticised the operations and management of the Environment Department. It is interesting to note in this year's report that the Auditor-General again refers to the criticism that he levelled at that department some time ago and says that efforts have been made to improve the situation as far as management is concerned. In relation to departmental accounting, the Auditor-General states:

In my previous report I commented on the unsatisfactory position relating to property, plant and equipment records, and also to accounting procedures in relation to the payment of salaries and wages. Some property records have been established, but these have not as yet been completed nor have property procedures been fully documented. Plant and equipment records have been established, and arrangements are being made by the department for physical checks to be carried out at individual parks. Procedures relating to the payment of salaries and wages have not been finalised. Preliminary discussions have been held with officers of the Public Service Board with a view to the department having its salaries processed by computer under the common pay-roll system being implemented within the Public Service.

That department has not had a good record in regard to the management of its affairs. I hope that the Government will raise the efficiency of the department, because it will have an increasing role to play in future. The public is far more aware of the environment than it was 10 years ago. Unless the department is efficiently and effectively managed, the funds provided for it will be to little avail.

In my view, several areas of operation of the National Parks and Wildlife Service should also be considered closely in relation to management. During the past 12 months the cost of purchase of land for national reserves amounted to almost \$1 500 000. I continue to question whether or not that allocation is wise. Unless the department or the Government has the financial resources and manpower to manage additional reserves adequately, I believe the land would be better left for now in the care and management of private individuals.

Recently, funds were used from the Wildlife Conservation Fund to buy Nullarbor Station. The sum paid for that property is listed in the Auditor-General's Report as \$49 000. I assume that that is the sum that was paid out of that fund to buy that station. Earlier this afternoon I

asked the Minister for the Environment what the Government intended to do with the vast national park in the north-western section of South Australia. As far as I can ascertain, the Government has not decided how it will manage or what it will do with that park. To proceed with the purchase of Nullarbor Station, when it has not been decided how the north-western national park should be maintained or managed, leads me to claim what I have claimed so many times that, rather than continue to buy unlimited tracts of country, the department would be better off dedicating itself to managing existing parks effectively. I understand the department or the Government has about 181 reserves. That is an enormous number, and totals about 3 500 000 hectares. The Government has the responsibility to manage these parks effectively, because private individuals have the responsibility of checking noxious weeds and vermin, and the same responsibility should rest on any Government department. It was interesting to note that, during the debate on the Pest Plants Bill, the Government refused to accept the responsibility that it had imposed on the private sector, and would not accept an amendment binding the Crown in the same way as individuals were bound. Although the Government refused to accept that amendment, it has a moral responsibility to maintain effectively areas under its control, in the same way that it expects private individuals to maintain their areas: that is, to control noxious weeds and vermin, and reduce the fire hazard to an absolute minimum.

Fires starting on these large parks can be a hazard to individual farms located near these parks. Also, the department has a real responsibility to ensure that adequate feed, water, and fencing are provided in areas under its control. Many times the Government has stated that it does not have the financial resources to undertake this sort of management and, unfortunately, in these circumstances, a conflict continues between the department and landholders. Naturally, wildlife will not remain on reserves when feed and water are available on a neighbouring farm. This conflict arises not only in connection with wild life but also in relation to noxious weeds. The control of noxious weeds is extremely difficult if the Government will not accept its responsibility and keep the land under its control in a condition that is expected of the private landholder, as provided in our legislation.

I refer now to the irrigation pumping station that has been established on Ral Ral Creek. This decision was made in 1970 by the Government, contrary to the advice it received that there would be future problems. Recently, I suggested to the Minister that, to solve the problem of water quality in this creek, a canal should be cut from the creek to below lock 5, as this would create a flow of water through the creek and maintain a reasonable quality of water in that anabranch. The Minister rejected the proposal on the ground that it would increase the overall salinity in the Murray River. In about 1970, when the Renmark Irrigation Trust was commencing the rehabilitation of its distribution system, a proposal was made to the Government by the board of the trust that the trust should pump the necessary water that would allow the Government to provide for the irrigation needs of Cooltong and Chaffey. This suggestion was completely rejected by the Government, because the Government had decided to do its own thing, and wanted no interference.

We know about the present problems, yet all that would have been required at that stage was to increase by about 1ft. the diameter of the rising main along Ral Ral Avenue, and that would have provided all the water necessary for the Government irrigation schemes at

Cooltong and Chaffey. That proposal to the Government was not investigated to any degree, and eventually was rejected, and that is a good reason for the Government to accept its responsibilities and act as a matter of urgency to improve the situation existing in that area. A disaster is certain to occur, if we continue to pump water from Ral Ral Creek in the present situation. I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LACEPEDE (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I refer to the intended transfer of the Aircraft Research and Development Unit and No. 10 Squadron to Edinburgh Air Base. Many people have objected to the intended upgrading of Edinburgh Air Base—

Mr. Evans: Why; because it creates employment?

Mr. GROTH: —mainly because of noise pollution.

Mr. Evans: From the workers!

Mr. GROTH: You got your go; it would do you fine to shut up and sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GROTH: You interject on everybody. Just listen and shut up, and you might learn something, and I mean what I say.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The objection I have is that the honourable member should not refer to me as "you".

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member must refer to other honourable members as "the honourable member".

Mr. GROTH: I am sorry; I apologise for that. The objections have come mainly from people active in various associations in the area—from school councils, councillors of the Salisbury council and other interested people. The Chairman of one school council sent letters to parents to find out what were their reactions. He reports:

Almost to a man local people protested about noise and safety problems associated with the Aircraft Research and Development Unit. Others mentioned the fall in property values and the problems of shift workers who sleep during the day.

Authorities have their own measurement of noise. A reading of 40 is given to the area at the end of the runway, where normal life for humans would be impossible. Some houses have already been built recently in a subdivision where the reading reaches almost to 30, and certainly well above 25. The proposed Salisbury West school to be built on Burton Road, will just touch the 25 N.E.C. contour. Salisbury North West will have a little less. Inside the 25 N.E.C. zone life will certainly be restricted. Houses and schools will need sound proofing, but an open window or a crack somewhere would bring the inside of the house back to the level outside. And you can't live totally indoors.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you have the decibel reading?



Mr. GROTH: No. The noise exposure contour is measured by an instrument used by officials of the Edinburgh Air Base. The report continues:

If the Mirages become a reality, we will be back to the conditions we have when the occasional supersonic jet has used Edinburgh. Even outside the 25 N.E.C. zone, conversation is restricted and during take-offs telephone conversation is impossible. The recent absence of Mirages has given people in Salisbury North very little on which to form their opinions. Perhaps the airfield authorities could arrange for a test day when three or four fully laden Mirages made a couple of test runs. Local people, council authorities and people from the Education Department and the Department of Environment could then judge for themselves whether this is what they want.

I have a further submission made by a person well informed and well thought of in the community who says:

The upgrading of the Edinburgh airfield to become one of the three major air defence bases of Australia demanded an analysis of the pollution on the environment and in this case noise pollution. The analysis revealed that of the 890 hectares still to be developed for residential, 380 hectares is beyond the 25 noise exposure contour (the upper acceptable limit for residential development) and, of that 380 hectares, 130 hectares is 30 or beyond N.E.C. forecast.

The date for the Beneficial Finance Company appeal against the Salisbury District Council for restricting residential building in the 25 and above N.E.C.F. has not been set. The legal proceeding for this appeal could continue for many months. The decision of the last meeting to refrain from any decision until the court decision is known on the 25 N.E.C.F. could create a major problem. Most of the existing land that is not under N.E.C.F. restrictions has formal approval for building residential homes. Formal approval for about 1 814 homes has been given which could mean a further increase of 7 250, population increase. Petitions were also sent to various people; one petition containing 80 signatures found its way on to my desk. I proceeded to take up the matter with the Federal Minister for Defence through my colleague, Senator Don Cameron. The Minister replied in a letter dated September 8, 1976. I do not have time to read all the letter, but the last sentence of his reply concerns me most, and this will be all right if the Minister means what he said.

Mr. Evans: He would.

Mr. GROTH: Of course the member for Fisher would say that because he is one of the honourable member's colleagues. The Minister said:

I am confident, therefore, that despite the increase in flying which will result from the transfer of Royal Australian Air Force units to Edinburgh, the interference caused by aircraft noise can be kept to acceptable levels and that the overall benefits to the community of having important elements of our defence forces properly located will be understood.

That suits me, provided that at some time in the future supersonic aircraft are not used at that base. The officers at Edinburgh are sincere and have been good in what they have done. They have invited some members to Edinburgh and taken them up in aircraft.

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

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): On July 27 in the adjournment debate I raised the matter of drought relief and expressed the need for something to be done urgently regarding provisions for stocks of grain and the slaughtering of stock. I also suggested that the Government consider the compensation scheme put forward in Western Australia and drew attention to the fact that a compensation scheme was functioning in Victoria. I did this because I had had discussions with grower organisations, which told me that they were anxious to have a compensation scheme established in South Australia and that they were pressing the

Government and making representations to the Minister for the introduction of such a scheme. In a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* on August 16, 1976, the Minister (Mr. Chatterton) laid down clearly the South Australian Government's policy on drought, as follows:

Your editorial (13/8/76) called for an unequivocal statement by the South Australian Government of its policy on drought. I am surprised there should be any doubt about the clarity of the Government's drought policy.

Then he reiterates the policy, and, before concluding, states:

Your editorial calls for genuine help to those in need. This is precisely what is being given by the South Australian Government. A bounty on surplus stock is not genuine help to those in need. It is an inadequate and inequitable distribution of funds that will provide no constructive support for those in need.

There is a positive and unequivocal statement, as the Minister says, on Government policy with respect to bounty payable on surplus stock slaughtered because of the drought. As recently as September 8, at page 883 of *Hansard*, I raised the question of the problem of providing a reasonable application system, because I believed that the present application forms (22 pages of detailed information) for assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act were completely frustrating, frightening and unnecessary, particularly when one considers that the Development Bank lends money and all that it requires is a double page of information, a folded page of information on the back and front of each sheet. It therefore seems to me extraordinary that the State department should need all this information. However, in reply to my request concerning the provision of drought relief funds, the Hon. J. D. Corcoran made a statement, to which he again referred in the House today, as follows:

I will obtain replies as quickly as possible on the points raised by the honourable member. I had discussions this morning with the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture regarding drought relief assistance, following the announcement by the Federal Government. I am pleased to say that the State Government will participate in the bounty payments to graziers who lose stock. In addition to the slaughtering facilities already established, we are anxious to hear from the Commonwealth Government exactly how it expects the scheme to be administered and when payments are to be made . . .

I point out that the Minister referred to graziers who lose stock. It is not the Federal Government's area of responsibility to come to the State and tell it how to administer a drought scheme. All that the Federal Government is willing to do in the circumstances is to indicate that it will find the funds if the Government implements such a scheme. However, such a scheme has not been implemented and, despite what the Deputy Premier said today, the Premier's confirmation, and what was said in the Deputy Premier's earlier reply (that he had consulted the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture and that such a scheme was to be accepted), there has been no statement by the Minister of Agriculture.

I have consulted the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, which had a deputation to him as recently as 10 o'clock yesterday morning and which knows nothing of any scheme for cattle compensation. Whom are we to believe? The Deputy Premier and Premier say that there is such a scheme, but the Minister says that he will not countenance such a scheme. The people who have been pressing for such a scheme say that he has not indicated in principle that he will accept such a scheme. Exactly where do we stand in this matter? This is the situation in which we find ourselves all too frequently with the Minister of Agriculture. He takes a positive stand in one direction and appears to be inflexible.



He has it in his mind that the only assistance farmers will need is carry-on finance.

I understand that he has gone on record as saying that some of the \$27 500 000 reserve the Government has set aside will finance such a scheme as he envisages to provide term loans under reasonable terms of interest to farmers who need assistance. However, I have not heard the Premier say that that is intended, because an act of this sort would, to all intents and purposes, be setting up a merchant banking operation that would provide much money in a different form from that presently provided. If the money is to be provided under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, the rate of interest would be 10½ per cent and, if that is a reasonable rate of interest under the terms set out in that Act, or used by those people who interpret the Act, I suggest that it will not be used any more in future than it has been used in the past.

What we want, and what I hope we will get, is a firm positive statement from the Government about its drought policy. It is all very well for the Premier to weep tears of blood, as he did in his Financial Statement, and say that he recognises the problems of those in need. He realises that some farmers need financial support. He is concerned, because most of the State's agricultural zone has been declared a drought area and the drought shows every sign of being the worst in the State's history. We know that, and it is all very well to set aside in the Budget \$11 500 000 for natural disaster, but we must realise that \$10 000 000 of that sum is to come from the Commonwealth Government, and that Government has not agreed to provide money for unemployment relief. The Government has already provided \$11 000 000 in the Supplementary Estimates in advances and grants for unemployment relief projects and transferred that sum to the Deposit Account last July. Until we spend \$1 500 000 in those areas in which the other States are presently giving relief, so as to entitle us to the same assistance as the Commonwealth is offering, we are not doing the right thing by the people in the rural areas of this State.

Perhaps the Government would prefer to use the alternative proposal put forward by the Prime Minister, if he is having difficulty in spending the \$1 500 000 in the areas that the Minister of Agriculture has defined as being in need of support. Why do they not say that they will split it \$1 for \$1? I understand that this is the offer. If the Government does not want to find \$1 500 000 so that the Commonwealth will give the rest, the Commonwealth will split it down the centre \$1 for \$1. Perhaps that is what the Minister of Agriculture would prefer. I suggest it is time that, if some compensation scheme is to be provided, the machinery should be set up. As I pointed out in the debate in July, the stock do not always belong to people, because the stock agents have stock mortgages on the stock that must be reconciled. There is also the question of accountability for numbers and the problems associated with running such a scheme. These schemes are smoothly operating in Western Australia and Victoria, and it is tragic to me that such a scheme has not been introduced in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that the honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I draw members' attention to a matter which, I believe, is of importance to the community, namely, the care of the aged in nursing homes. Currently, concern exists that the proposed changes in Federal

Government funding will lower the standard of patient care available. I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of July 9, under the heading "Nursing homes fear cut in funds for staff", which states:

Nearly 50 religious and charitable nursing homes in South Australia are concerned that proposed changes in Federal Government funding will lower the standard of patient care available. Administrators of the homes say they face staff reductions of up to 50 per cent if a Government report's recommendations to cut nursing home funding are adopted. The report of the Hospital and Allied Services Advisory Council recommends base staff levels for a "normal" nursing home.

That article further states:

Confusion has arisen among nursing home administrators in the past fortnight since they were told orally by Department of Health officials that the Federal Government wishes to implement the report in subsidies given to the homes for 1976-77. This has been complicated by the fact that no copies of the completed report, which was given in draft form in September, 1975, were available in South Australia until this week. Administrators are worried that grants made available as monthly advances under a deficit funding agreement will be cut because the department will decide that, under the report's guidelines, they are overstaffed.

The South Australian president of the geriatric section of the Royal Australian Nurses Federation (Matron R. White) warned yesterday that the standard of patient care would ultimately drop if staff cuts had to be introduced.

A spokesman for the Elderly Citizens Homes of South Australia said last night the organisation was most concerned that the present standard of care would be reduced. The president of the Residential Aged Care Association (Mr. R. C. Crittenden) said funding of nursing homes at the lower level for a "normal" home would be a retrograde step.

This is substantiated by an editorial appearing in the press on July 16, 1976, as follows:

A crisis will soon be upon charitable nursing homes for the aged in South Australia. As a result of a recent report by the Hospital and Allied Services Advisory Council, the Federal Government intends reducing the level of its financial support for these homes. The likely effect as described by administrators of these homes in recent weeks gives cause for serious concern. If the Budget cuts are carried out, the homes will be left with a stark choice. They will have either to cut their staff numbers, which will mean inevitably that the standard of care for their patients will drop. . . .

In Australia, we have at present 55 600 nursing home beds, of which 9 700 are operated by religious or charitable organisations under a system of deficit financing that will cost the Federal Government \$67 500 000 in this financial year. The remaining 45 900 are run by State Governments or private proprietors. The Federal Government's subsidy system is such that all eligible patients recover the basic age pension, and many receive the supplementary assistance of \$5 a week. In addition, the Government pays a basic rate of \$3.50 a day for all patients. Those classified as intensive care patients receive an additional \$3 a day.

On top of that, all pensioners included in the Pensioner Medical Scheme receive an additional hospital benefit, which varies in amount from State to State. When the subsidy was first introduced in 1963, it was intended that nursing home fees should never be so high as to require the pensioner to contribute the whole of his pension. However, over a period the fees have increased to such an extent that only in some cases is the intention of a pensioner's retaining part of his pension still honoured. In many cases, the relatives of pensioners must contribute the difference between the pension plus the subsidies provided and the total charge, because the fees of nursing homes range from \$112 to \$120 a week.

I am aware, because of approaches to me by constituents and by relatives of persons in nursing homes, that they have

to pay the difference between the pension plus the subsidies and the total charge, and they are placed in a difficult position. Most of us are aware of the shortage of accommodation for aged people in nursing homes; specialised care is expensive and increasingly more difficult for persons with no means beyond the pension.

Much of the Government money in providing services and subsidies is, unfortunately, going to people with some means, while many elderly pensioners who are poor live out their lives in their own private accommodation which, in many cases, is unfortunately of a low standard. The situation in relation to nursing homes is one of crisis. This is nothing new (we have moved from one crisis to another over a period), but the situation is becoming more pronounced and accommodation for the aged more difficult to obtain. Of course, the cost situation is becoming more difficult for people of meagre means.

I am not suggesting alternatives to the situation, but one point that has occurred to me may be of some assistance

in relieving the situation: we should encourage domiciliary services and home nursing to a greater degree. At present, only 5 per cent of the Federal Budget aid for aged care is allocated in this direction. It is necessary, if we are to assist the aged where accommodation is difficult to obtain or costs are high, that we endeavour to promote as much as possible the idea of people being cared for in their own homes, and the provision of extensive domiciliary care services. It certainly would not assist if the report of the Hospital and Allied Services Advisory Council were adopted by the Federal Government. No decision has been made; I understand that it has been deferred until some time in December. I trust that the recommendations will not be adopted and that patient care in nursing homes in South Australia will not be affected.

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 22, at 2 p.m.