HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 30, 1976

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.1 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendments Nos. 1 *and* 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Clause 5, page 3—Line 10—After "repealed" insert "and the following section is enacted and inserted in lieu thereof:

57a. Power to take plea without evidence—(1) When a person is charged with sexual intercourse with, or an indecent assault upon, a person under the age of seventeen years, the justice sitting to conduct the preliminary examination of the witness may, without taking any evidence, accept a plea of guilty and commit the defendant to gaol, or admit him to bail, to appear for sentence.

(2) The justice shall take written notes of any facts stated by the prosecutor as the basis of the charge and of any statement made by the defendant in contradiction or explanation of the facts stated by the prosecutor, and shall forward those notes to the Attorney-General, together with any proofs of witnesses tendered by the prosecutor to the justice.

(3) The Attorney-General shall cause the said notes and proofs of witnesses to be delivered to the proper officer of the court at which the defendant is to appear for sentence, before or at the opening of the said court on the first sitting thereof, or at such other time as the judge who is to preside in such court may order.

(4) This section shall not restrict or take away any right of the defendant to withdraw a plea of guilty and substitute a plea of not guilty."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon its amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Page 4 (Clause 12)—After line 18 insert new subsection as follows:

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, a person shall not be convicted of rape or indecent assault upon his spouse, or an attempt to commit, or assault with intent to commit rape or indecent assault upon his spouse (except as an accessory) unless the alleged offence consisted of, was preceded or accompanied by, or was associated with—

(*a*) assault occasioning actual bodily harm, or threat of such an assault, upon the spouse;

(*b*) an act of gross indecency, or threat of such an act, against the spouse;

(*c*) an act calculated seriously and substantially to humiliate the spouse, or threat of such an act;

or

(*d*) threat of the commission of a criminal act against any person.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The recommendations of the conference as they have come back to this Chamber are that a new section 57a should be inserted in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and that the present section 57a should be deleted. The agreement on that provision was reached when the Legislative Council members realised that, in fact, its amendment would have had the effect of inserting two sections 57a in similar terms into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act; they therefore agreed to this amendment. The Government is prepared to accept this amendment. Amendment No. 3 of the Legislative Council was the so-called rape-in-marriage amendment. The conference considered the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council and, after some discussion, agreement was reached that a new subclause (5) should be inserted into the Bill as part of clause 12. The clause now provides that a person shall not be convicted of rape unless one of four other matters are present at the time of the rape. The actual terms of the amendment provide that the four matters referred to must be part of or consist of or preceded or accompany or be associated with the rape. The four matters are as follows:

(*a*) assault occasioning actual bodily harm, or threat of such an assault, upon the spouse;

(*b*) an act of gross indecency, or threat of such an act, against the spouse;

(*c*) an act calculated seriously and substantially to humiliate the spouse, or threat of such an act;

or

(*d*) threat of the commission of a criminal act against any person.

The Government believes that the acceptance of this amendment will not destroy the principle of the Bill. It will possibly provide some protection for an accused person. It certainly does not destroy the principle that a married woman should have the protection of the criminal law, as does any other woman in society.

Mr. ALLISON: I support the motion. The amendment to section 57a is obviously designed to protect the alleged victim, particularly someone under the age of 17 years, from further upsets in appearing to give evidence. In subsection (4) of section 57a it is equally obvious that the rights of the defendant are still protected because he has the opportunity to withdraw a plea of guilty and substitute a plea of not guilty should he later consider that he would be better advised to do so. New subclause (5) to clause 12 is more specific than the amendment that I proposed in the Committee stage.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by "more specific"?

Mr. ALLISON: It deals with specific instances.

Mr. Millhouse: You mean it is more complex.

Mr. ALLISON: It is more complex, but it deals with specific instances when someone can be charged. It deals with certain definite charges, when a wife can make charges and when a conviction might be sustained and registered against the alleged offender. Although I applaud the fact that the conference reached a compromise, the onus of proof will still be difficult. That situation has not changed one iota and there is still a great need to provide something more in this situation, namely, shelter for an aggrieved wife in an emergency to which she can go and where she can obtain advice and counsel.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not like this at all and, although the member for Mount Gambier may pompously applaud the compromise reached by the managers at the conference, the fact remains that this is one of the most significant Bills that we will have before Parliament in this session, and there are quite a number. The inescapable fact remains that the Bill goes further than the recommendations of the

Mitchell committee report to which I was committed and to which I understood members of the Liberal Party were committed. Now, as a result of one of these silly conferences an even sillier compromise to the Bill has been worked out. The member for Mount Gambier says he applauds the compromise. I do not. I have only had a chance to look at the amendment since it was distributed in the House an hour or two ago. I believe it is extraordinarily complex, and it is therefore impossible to foresee what meaning it will have. After leaving the Bill as it is, apparently this new subclause (5) is added as follows:

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, a person shall not be convicted of rape or indecent assault upon his spouse . . . unless the alleged offence consisted of . . . assault occasioning actual bodily harm, or threat of such an assault, upon the spouse;

If the offence consists of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, it is not rape; it is an offence of assault occasioning bodily harm. That looks to me, on first sight, to be inconsistent and a contradiction. The new subclause states, "was preceded or accompanied by"; "preceded", I suppose, means that these things happened before the rape. The words "accompanied by" are also included; I do not know why the two are conjoined. Some meaning can be got out of that, but what is meant by "was associated with"? I do not know, and I wonder whether anyone else knows what it means. I have been on many conferences in the past, although I do not often get on a conference now; perhaps I shall do so in the future. Normally, the so-called compromises which we have from the conferences are quite unsatisfactory. In the past, they were worked out in the middle of the night. Now, at least they are done at a more reasonable time, during the day time, and one would have expected that to be reflected in the sense and the substance of the compromise, but alas that has not happened in this case. We have departed from the Mitchell committee report recommendation and put in its place a so-called compromise which is either meaningless or very difficult to construe.

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't support all the recommendations of the Mitchell report, would you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I spoke in the original debate in favour of the recommendation on this matter, and I understood that the member for Rocky River supported his own Party and me in what we said about this, and that he voted that way. Now, in an inane interjection, he asks whether I support all the recommendations in the report. What on earth has any other recommendation in the report got to do with this matter?

Mr. Allison: It was a relevant interjection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The loyalty of the member for Mount Gambier outruns his discretion. He knows as well as I do (and even the member for Rocky River now realises) that it was a silly interjection. We are talking of only one matter: rape in marriage. We have here an amendment that will be extremely difficult to construe. It will mean that there is uncertainty in this branch of the law where there should be, as there is in every other branch, certainty. That will not be an uncertainty made by lawyers (as I remind the member for Fisher, who is so vocal against the legal profession), but an uncertainty, which apparently he is going to support, made by this Parliament.

We are putting in a lot of gobbledegook to try to save someone's face, whether of the old gentlemen in the Upper House or of the people in this House, the Attorney-General and others, I do not know. No disrespect was meant to anyone, Sir, by that description. I hope that this will not go through automatically, as do most of these so-called compromises after a conference of managers at which some sort of agreement has been patched up between the Houses. It would be far better to ditch this Bill altogether and to start again than to let this go through. If the Liberals are going to be silly enough, after all they have said about this Bill, after what their Attorney-General (shadow though he may be) in another place has said about it, then I think even less of them than I did previously.

Mr. EVANS: The procedure that took place in the conference was the procedure normally carried out in the case of disagreement between the Houses, and when an opportunity exists for compromise members tend to work towards such a compromise. To suggest that these are silly amendments or that it was a silly procedure to go through is, I believe, a matter of opinion that the member for Mitcham wished to express, because he wished to be different, as usual.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought I was being consistent with the view I took before.

Mr. EVANS: He is not being consistent, because he has argued that the court or the legal profession can decide the meaning of "substantial". If that can be decided, the meaning of "associated with" can also be decided.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell me the meaning of "seriously and substantially" in this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fisher has the floor.

Mr. EVANS: I can tell the member what "seriously" means, although I believe it would mean nothing in a court, because the member for Mitcham has admitted that many laws are not clear and certain. He has said that in this Chamber recently. He likes at times to prove that he is different from others. I have attended a few conferences, and I thought this was a sane and sensible approach. It was one of the most pleasant conferences I have attended, because there was no indication that a hard line would be taken, with no attempt to compromise. I am sure the Attorney-General would agree. The opportunity was available for both groups to meet on common ground without destroying the principles of the Bill and without causing great concern to members of the legal profession or to those who will administer the law in the future. The member for Mitcham knows, as we all know, that this legislation will be used seldom and that, when it is, trying to prove a point will be difficult. Lawyers will spend plenty of time on that, without worrying about the meaning of such things as "seriousness" or "associated with". The conference was successful, and I have no regrets about the decision made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot allow the member for Fisher to say such things. It is perfectly obvious, from the tone of what he has said, that he regrets that his Party is now committed to supporting this compromise. I do not mind, from the point of view of the legal profession, such a thing. It means that the law will be uncertain, probably for ever, and certainly for a long time, and the only way to get some sense into it (and whether the courts succeed will remain to be seen) will be through the courts, and that is to the narrow benefit of members of the legal profession involved in the litigation. The people for whom we should be taking care and for whom we are legislating are those who may find themselves in the unfortunate position of having their liberty depend on the construction of the amendment now before the Committee. They are the people who will

suffer, and for the member for Fisher to toss it off so lightly, as he tried to do, is foolish in the extreme and irresponsible.

Let us look at another of the phrases here. I invite the Attorney-General to tell us what he believes and what the managers thought they meant by the words "an act calculated seriously and substantially" (it must be both, conjointly) "to humiliate the spouse or to threaten seriously and substantially to humiliate the spouse". What on earth does that mean? What meaning can possibly be put on placitum (*c*) of this proposed new subclause? I do not know what it could mean, and yet it has been solemnly put in here, without one word of explanation of its meaning from the Attorney-General.

He did not explain the first one, but I think I can understand that, and I hope it is all right. This relates to rape in marriage, the focus of the debate in the community and in this place, and the Attorney-General owes us some detailed explanation. Is this just something patched up (and no-one has denied it) to save face? I ask the Committee, in the absence of some satisfying explanation (and I hope I will listen with an open mind to the Attorney-General if he deigns to give us one; I do not say that I will be able to accept it, but I shall bend my best efforts to accepting it), to vote against it; and in the absence of some explanation of the meaning and the intention of the managers, I certainly propose to vote against it.

Question—"That the recommendation be agreed to"—declared carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide.

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: There being only one honourable member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion thus carried.

QUESTIONS

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

PERPETUAL LEASE LAND

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When can an answer be expected to the question titled "Perpetual Lease Land", appearing on page 1498 of *Hansard* of October 13, 1976?

2. If the appropriate department is having difficulty in providing an answer, what additional detail is required to permit an early answer?

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

1. and 2. Perpetual leases have rents fixed in perpetuity except for about 700 which contain a rent revaluation condition. Perpetual leases subject to rental revaluation were issued between 1888 and 1893. All perpetual leases have an expresed or implied purpose. Should the Minister of Lands be satisfied following recommendation by the Land Board, that land being transferred subject to a perpetual lease is put to a purpose other than that expressed or implied in the lease, the Minister will require the transfer to be effected by surrender of the existing perpetual lease and issue of a new perpetual lease. The purchaser will receive the new perpetual lease incorporating the changed purpose with an increased rental appropriate to its new purpose. Consideration of change in purpose of perpetual leases at transfer has been in operation for a number of years. The effect of urban expansion and activities intruding into rural areas is a basic cause of change in purpose of perpetual leases.

LAND LEASES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What types of land leases are available from the Lands Department, what are the specific features of each type, and what is the method of determining the annual rental to apply to each?

2. Have any significant changes been effected recently and, if so, what are those changes?

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

1. The types of leases available, the specific features of each and the method of determining the annual rental:

(1) There are 19 different types of perpetual leases and six different types of terminating leases as under:

A. Perpetual leases

(*a*) ordinary perpetual
(*b*) soldiers acquired lands perpetual
(*c*) surplus lands perpetual
(*d*) soldiers perpetual
(*e*) war service perpetual
(*f*) closer settlement perpetual
(*g*) closer settlement homestead perpetual
(*h*) irrigation town perpetual
(*i*) irrigation perpetual
(*j*) irrigation soldiers perpetual
(*k*) war service irrigation perpetual
(*l*) homestead perpetual
(*m*) agricultural graduates perpetual
(*n*) developed lands perpetual
(*o*) village settlement perpetual (commonage)
(*p*) village settlement perpetual (horticultural)
(*q*) town perpetual (Whyalla)
(*r*) education perpetual
(*s*) marginal lands perpetual

B. Leases for fixed periods

(*a*) miscellaneous leases for various purposes
(*b*) pastoral leases
(*c*) Aboriginal leases
(*d*) forest leases
(*e*) development leases
(*f*) water leases

The leases classified under "A" are all perpetual leases, and the differences are largely technical.

Some of the main differences are:

(i) Approximately 700 perpetual leases issued between 1888 and 1893 contain a revaluation clause, and the leases are subject to revaluation every 14 years. These leases were not subject to land tax, and a lessee can apply to surrender his lease for an ordinary perpetual lease not subject to revaluation.

(ii) Marginal lands perpetual leases specifically exclude any opportunity to freehold the lease.

(iii) Irrigation perpetual leases contain conditions and covenants peculiar to irrigation areas and contain no provision for freeholding.

(iv) War service leases contain terms and conditions peculiar to war service land settlement.

The leases classified under "B" are issued for fixed periods for specific purposes and contain terms and conditions related to that purpose. The rental for a lease is fixed at the time of issue and, in fixing the rent the board has regard to the proposed use for the land and the Crown's

interest in that land. The Crown's interest is generally related to the unimproved value of the land and the rent fixed reflects a fair return on this interest.

2. The impact of urban expansion and activities into rural areas has caused the Land Board to examine the expressed or implied purpose of perpetual leases subject to transfer. Where the board recommends and the Minister is satisfied that the purpose of the lease is subject to a change, the Minister will require the transfer of interest in the land to proceed by surrender of the existing lease and issue of a new perpetual lease containing the changed purpose and an appropriate increased rental. This requirement has been in operation for a number of years.

RATE REMISSIONS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has the Government taken to review the maximum remission of $100 in respect of council rates permitted under the provisions of the Rates and Taxes Remission Act?

2. If no review has been made, will the Minister of Local Government undertake to raise the subject with his Cabinet colleagues and report the result of such review by December 9 and, if not, why not?

3. What has been the cost to the Government of the local government component since commencement of the Act, what is the estimated cost for 1976-77, and what is the projected cost of existing or altered maxima for 1977-78?

4. What is the estimated increase in rates payable to local government by ratepayers for the 1976-77 financial year, and what percentage increase does this represent over 1974-75 and 1975-76, respectively?

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

1. No review has been taken since Cabinet approved of the scheme on June 23, 1975.

2. Cabinet discussed the matter yesterday and concluded that no evidence had been presented to justify an increase in the maximum remission of $100.

3.

	$
1973-74	1 336 270
1974-75	2 044 905
1975-76	2 463 536
1976-77	2 800 000

It is not practicable to provide an estimate for 1977-78 until councils resolve the rate in the dollar for that year.

4. It is estimated that rates payable to local government by ratepayers for 1976-77 (based on an estimated increase of 14 per cent) is $74 520 000. This represents an increase of $9 050 000 from 1975-76 (14 per cent) and an increase of $21 020 000 (39 per cent) above the figure for 1974-75.

CEMETERY ROAD BRIDGE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the bridge which spans the Angaston-Gawler railway line as an extension of Cemetery Road, Gawler, been repaired recently and, if so, what has been the extent of the work, the cost involved and the period of time that the bridge has been closed for road traffic?

2. Was any warning of this closure given to persons whose property is north of the bridge and, if so, by whom and when?

3. What number of railway employees were deployed on this work, on what days did they work on the project and were there any undue delays in completion of the work and, if so, what were those delays and why did they occur?

4. When is it expected that the work will be completed and the bridge opened for use, and, if it is to be delayed beyond December 6, 1976, why?

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

1. Following an inspection of this bridge, which revealed white ant activity, the bridge was closed for repairs on August 9, 1976. It was intended to rebuild in timber, but because the necessary timber was not readily available it was rebuilt in steel.

The estimated cost to rebuild the bridge which was closed from August 9 to November 26 is $13 000.

2. The District Clerk of the District Council of Barossa was advised on July 27, 1976, of the impending closure of the bridge. The leading hand of the district council advised all landowners adjacent to the bridge of the impending closure and the council erected "road closed" signs on August 9.

3. Four employees were employed on the job from August 10 to September 29. A delay occurred due to the non-availability of jarrah timber for the bridge deck, work recommencing on November 9.

4. The bridge was reopened to traffic on November 26, 1976.

STRATHALBYN WATER SCHEME

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is the interim report on the Hartley-Woodchester-Strathalbyn reticulated water scheme still under consideration?

2. Does this interim report refer to the surveys carried out to assess the need and requirements for such a scheme, are those surveys completed and, if not, what other information is being sought to assist with these surveys?

3. Does the Government intend to release this interim report and, if so, when; if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes. Early in 1977.

BUSINESS STUDIES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is the Centrepoint location intended to be a permanent home of the schools of business studies in view of the fact that no further expansion is possible on this site?

2. Under what conditions, including the length of lease and ownership of additions provided by the Government, has the Government obtained this so-called "favourable" lease?

3. Can the Minister of Education say, without qualification, that the cost of $106 000 includes the provision of all facilities necessary for the conduct of the two schools of business studies at the Centrepoint location, including all partitioning, floor coverings, sound proofing, light fittings and air-conditioning?

4. Does the use of the Centrepoint location mean that there will be no Adelaide community college in the near future, or does it mean that the schools of business studies will have to move again in the next few years?

5. How does the Minister of Education justify the use of $106 000 of taxpayers' money in times of economic stringency, especially in the education area, if the Centrepoint location is eventually found to be unsuitable for the conduct of a school of business studies?

6. Can the Minister state how many students attending the schools of business studies actually come from places of

business in the Rundle Mall area, Victoria Square Government offices and from the city area as a whole, respectively, and what percentage do these students comprise when compared to the whole school enrolment?

7. Can the Minister give an unequivocal assurance that the Adelaide City Council car parks near the Centrepoint building will remain open until after the last class to be held each night has finished?

8. Is the Minister aware of the cost of six hours parking in the area in view of the fact that the parking stations in the area encourage short-term parking and can the Minister give an assurance that these parking stations will allow long-term parking for staff and students at reasonable flat rates?

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

1. No.

2. The term of the proposed lease is 10 years. The additions will remain the property of the Government. The lease in other respects will be a standard leasing agreement approved by the Crown Solicitor.

3. Yes.

4. It is expected that the school of business studies will remain in the proposed location for the duration of the lease. The establishment of an Adelaide Community College is contingent upon a site and funds being available for its construction.

5. The existing situation of college fragmentation and poor conditions has been criticised by students and staff. The Centrepoint proposal will provide far more suitable accommodation at minimum expenditure.

6. Records held by the school of business studies cover students' home addresses only and as the students have completed classes this year the provision of this information is not possible. It should be noted, however, that business studies courses are conducted at other metropolitan colleges, so most students will attend the proposed new location as a matter of choice.

7. If sufficient demand is shown by staff and students the Adelaide City Council may open the adjacent car park. It is believed that students' ability to park their cars to attend the proposed new location will be no more difficult than at the present location.

8. The rates charged for car parking is a matter for the Adelaide City Council.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it anticipated that the branch mains from the Kimba-Polda main will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Apart from minor clean-up work the branch mains are complete.

COOBER PEDY WATER SURVEY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Government conducted any surveys in the Coober Pedy area to determine whether there is any suitable underground water which could be utilised to service the town of Coober Pedy and, if so, what were the results of such a survey?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Mines Department is at present conducting a water well survey in the area of Coober Pedy to gather data on the known water supplies. Based on the results of this survey a drilling programme is expected to commence in early 1977, and is designed to locate suitable low salinity underground water supplies for the town of Coober Pedy.

SAMCOR

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it anticipated that the consultant's report into the operations of Samcor will be available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report was laid before Parliament on July 28, 1976. Copies are expected to be available publicly on completion of printing early in the new year.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What has been the individual and total distribution of funds for community projects made by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department in each of the financial years 1974-75 to 1976-77, inclusive?

2. What number of thus far unsuccessful applications are held by the department, and what total sum do they represent?

3. What criteria are used in determining the suitability and/or priority of submitted applications?

4. Have any of the recipient bodies subsequently sought either a subsidy or financial assistance for maintenance or management expenses and, if so, has any assistance been given and, if so, to which bodies, from what source and under what terms?

5. If no assistance has yet been granted, is it intended that such assistance may be available in the future?

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

1. The individual and total distribution of funds for community projects made by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department are as follows:

Project	Description	Approved Funds	
		State $	C/Wealth $
1973-74—			
Whyalla Recreation Centre	Multi-purpose sports hall, indoor swimming pool, squash courts, gymnasium, coffee lounge, etc.	180 000	400 000
Campbelltown High School	Dual provision school/community sports hall	—	40 000
Marion Swimming Pool	Olympic outdoor swimming pool, learners' pool wading pool and change facilities	150 000	150 000
Olympic Sportsfield, Kensington	Synthetic "all weather" athletics track	75 000	75 000
		25 000 (esc.)	25 000 (esc.)
Loxton Community Recreation Centre	Indoor sports hall, changerooms, meeting rooms	71 333	71 333
O'Sullivan Beach Sports and Social Centre	Gymnasium, changerooms for outdoor and indoor purposes and clubrooms	—	29 000

Project	Description	Approved Funds	
		State $	C/Wealth $
1974-75—			
Elizabeth Leisure Centre	Multi-purpose sports hall, squash courts, health centre, meeting rooms, gymnasium, coffee lounge etc.	189 500	28 300
Renmark Swimming Centre	Olympic outdoor swimming pool, learners' pool, wading pool and change facilities	100 000	100 000
		17 308 (esc.)	17 308 (esc.)
Enfield High School	Dual provision school/community sports hall	—	60 000
Port Augusta Leisure Centre	Extensions to Port Augusta basketball stadium to provide recreation centre	35 666	78 000
Modbury Recreation Centre	Small multi-purpose hall, squash courts, meeting rooms and coffee lounge	75 000	75 000
Barossa Valley Community Recreation Centre.	Indoor sports hall, changerooms, meeting facilities, craft rooms and squash courts	69 171	69 171
Blue Lakes Sports Park Mount Gambier	Development of outdoor multi-purpose grassed area area with pavilion/change facilities	32 888	32 888
City of Salisbury—Para Paddock Scheme	Development of multi-purpose grassed area in conjunction with main scheme	19 800	19 800
Corporation of Murray Bridge	Development of outdoor basketball facilities	400	—
Ceduna Football Club	Improvements to clubrooms and development of playground	580	—
Clare Combined Netball Club	Clubhouse and change facilities	2 850	—
Robertstown Football Club	Improvements to clubrooms and change facilities	1 100	—
Burnside Hockey Club	Clubroom extensions	1 930	—
Mundoora Community Sports Club	Lighting for cricket, basketball and netball plus playground equipment	3 922	—
Grange Men's Hockey Club	Development of three new pitches	2 600	—
Saddleworth Netball Club	Development of two netball courts, fencing and lighting	655	—
Tailem Bend & District Progress Association	Development of tennis and netball courts at Jaensch Park	1 200	—
Adelaide Y.W.C.A.	Lighting for existing netball courts, plus renovation of playing surface	2 500	—
Edwardstown Football Club	Clubrooms and change facilities	2 000	—
Mylor Baptist Camp	Heating of swimming pool	1 700	—
District Council of Paringa	Development of tennis courts	7 000	—
Federal Box Factory (City of Adelaide)	Assistance in provision of equipment and new community centre	8 000	—
S.A. Amateur Gymnastic Association	Provision of equipment	1 000	—
Henley and Grange Memorial Swimming Pool	Provision of sea water filtration system	9 983	—
Elizabeth Netball Association	Development of clubrooms and change facilities	5 000	—
Christies Beach Community Centre	Development of tennis courts	3 600	—
Woodville Tennis Club	Lighting of tennis/netball courts	2 000	—
Belair Community Centre Gym Club	Provision of equipment	472	—
Clarendon Recreation Ground Committee	Resurfacing of tennis/netball courts	2 667	—
Payneham Swimming Pool	Provision of heating equipment for pool	7 333	—
LeFevre Peninsula Community and Youth Centre	Provision of equipment	1 940	—
Naracoorte Swimming Lake	Improvements to water circulation system	4 000	—
Naracoorte Palette Club	Provision of equipment	633	—
Wallaby Gym Club, Murray Park	Provision of equipment	500	—
Flinders Park Methodist Sports Ground	Lighting for tennis/basketball courts	1 333	—
Glenlea Tennis Club, Camden Park	Development of tennis court	1 333	—
St. John Netball Club, O'Sullivan Beach	Lighting, change facilities and toilet facilities	3 767	—
Lameroo Youth Centre	Provision of equipment	540	—
Kadina and District Youth Centre	New floor surface for hall	1 567	—
Hahndorf Tennis Club	Development of tennis/netball courts	3 333	—
Salisbury Little Athletics Centre	Provision of athletics equipment	450	—
Ingle Farm Little Athletics Centre	Provision of athletics equipment	450	—
City of Port Adelaide	Development of adventure playground	3 000	—
District Council of Riverton	Development of adventure playground	2 000	—
Corporation of Hindmarsh	Development of adventure playground	2 993	—
Crystal Brook Lawn Tennis Club	Development of clubroom, toilet and change facilities	16 000	—
Minlaton Tennis Club	Lighting and resurfacing of courts for multi-purpose use	4 000	—
Banksia Park Concert Band	Provision of equipment	3 275	—
Bellevue Heights Gymnastics Club	Provision of equipment	230	—
Klemzig Area League Basketball Club	Lighting and resurfacing of courts	3 333	—
Albert Park Church of Christ	Resurfacing of courts for multi-purpose use	600	—
Kybybolite Memorial Sports Club	Development of change facilities and clubrooms	10 000	—
Cummins Memorial Swimming Pool	Tiling of pool and new toilets	16 000	—
Nuriootpa Centennial Park Committee	Development of irrigation system	4 400	—
Owen Swimming Pool	Provision of diving facilities	650	—
All Saints Methodist Church—Plympton	Resurfacing of courts for multi-purpose use	1 891	—
Colonel Light Gardens Congregational and Presbyterian United Church	Lighting and resurfacing of courts for multi-purpose use	1 283	—
Forestville Hockey Club	Provision of toilet and club facilities	8 000	—
Spalding Sports and Recreation Complex	Development of outdoor basketball facilities	5 467	—

Project	Description	Approved Funds State $	Approved Funds C/Wealth $
1974-75—continued			
District Council of Dudley (Kangaroo Island)	Resurfacing courts for multi-purpose use, extensions to boat ramp and improvements to football club change facilities	1 900	—
Willunga Recreation and Sporting Centre	Provision of equipment	1 700	—
S.A. Amateur Fencing Association	Provision of equipment	2 000	—
Berri International Rules Basketball Association	Development of outdoor basketball complex	16 667	—
District Council of Barmera	Lighting of Barmera oval	7 200	—
District Council of Franklin Harbor	Provision of change facilities	1 000	—
Hatherleigh Football Club and Sport and Recreation Centre	Provision of change facilities	5 333	—
Gladstone Swimming Pool	Tiling of pool	3 025	—
Flagstaff Hill Tennis Club	Development of courts for multi-purpose use	5 000	—
Belair Community Centre	Purchase of playground equipment	285	—
1975-76—			
Blackwood Community Recreation Centre	Indoor sports hall, small practice hall, changerooms, meeting facilities and squash courts	133 975	133 975
Kadina and Districts Community Recreation Centre	Multi-purpose indoor hall, squash courts, change facilities, clubrooms and tavern	217 000	217 000
Bowden Indoor Cricket Centre—Withdrawn	Purchase of vacant factory for conversion to indoor cricket facilities and squash courts (later stage)	—	—
Marino Quarry Recreation Park	Development of nine hole golf course, barbecue/picnic areas and playgrounds	30 000	60 000
North Adelaide Lacrosse Club	Complex comprising change facilities, clubrooms and meeting rooms	21 667	21 667
Port Augusta Tennis Association	Development of additional hardcourt tennis facilities	—	20 000
Surf Lifesaving Association	Provision of headquarters at West Lakes	80 000	—
Parnanga Camp	Fitness studio	18 392	—
Royal Life Saving Society	Provision of reserve boat and equipment	2 206	—
Elizabeth Little Athletics Association	Provision of equipment	480	—
Edwardstown District Cricket Club	Provision of cricket practice facilities for community use	2 800	—
Corporation of Prospect	Development of changerooms, toilets and store on Charles Cane Reserve	14 980	—
Southern United Sports Complex, Morphett Vale	Lighting and clubrooms	1 600	—
Clayton Church Homes Inc.	Provision of equipment	667	—
S.A.C.R.A., St. Clair	Replacement of floor for roller skating and other use	8 000	—
Taperoo Surf Lifesaving Club	Provision of vehicle for beach patrol and other equipment	700	—
Kalangadoo Community Gymnastics Club	Provision of equipment	1 000	—
Cambrai Tennis Club	Provision of lighting to enable multi-purpose use	2 700	—
Wilmington Tennis and Netball Club	Provision of lighting	1 400	—
District Council of Central Yorke Peninsula	Development of multi-purpose courts, playground and rest rooms	12 000	—
Booborowie Recreation Grounds Committee	Redevelopment of oval playing surface	3 300	—
Long Plains Cricket Club	Provision of new artificial pitch	460	—
Bute Croquet Club	Provision of lighting	333	—
Adelaide Cricket Club and S.A. Rugby Union Inc.	Extensions to existing facilities	16 500	—
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Lighting for Newton Sports Ground	2 847	—
Morphett Vale Youth Club	Replace flooring in hall	2 000	—
Norwood Tennis Club	Provision of lighting	3 200	—
Corporation of St. Peters	Development of adventure play park	4 025	—
S.A. Rifle Association	Provision of toilet and shower facilities	8 000	—
Parilla Sports Ground	Provision of toilet facilities	4 667	—
Oaklands Tennis Club, Yorketown	Resurfacing of courts for multi-purpose use	2 000	—
District Council of Angaston	Provision of lighting for Angas Recreation Park	4 235	—
Elliston Tennis and Netball Clubs	Provision of lighting for multi-purpose use	1 000	—
Jamestown Lawn Tennis Club	Development of new courts	4 500	—
Murraytown Cricket Club	Provision of new artificial pitch	300	—
Pony Club of S.A. Southern Zone	Provision of equipment	5 380	—
Victor Harbor Yacht Club	Radio equipment	480	—
Millicent Youth Centre	Conversion of hall	7 000	—
1976-77—			
Paraplegic Sports Club of S.A.	Specialist equipment to allow group to continue existence—repair to wheelchairs used for sporting and recreation use	1 584	—
Corporation of the City of Salisbury/Para Hills Primary School Council	Development of gully area owned by Salisbury City Council for community recreation	3 000	9 000
Hope Valley Tennis and Netball Club	Development of two additional courts with backstops and lighting	4 000	4 000
S.A.C.R.A.—Salisbury Recreation Centre	Extensions to centre incorporating additional sports hall and conversion of existing small hall into squash courts	37 000	—
Woodville Lacrosse Club	Construction of training wall and storage shed	487	—
Thebarton Community Association Inc.	Development of multi-purpose outdoor area at Holder Memorial Church	2 030	7 000

Project	Description	Approved Funds State $	Approved Funds C/Wealth $
1976-77—*continued*			
International Cadet Association of S.A.	Purchase of mould to construct hulls	600	—
Ottoway Boys and Girls Club	Improvements to existing club house	2 400	—
Port Adelaide Netball Association	Extensions to clubrooms	2 000	6 000
Plympton Methodist Netball Club	Lighting of two courts on Weigal Oval	880	—
Sturt Hockey Club	Provision of club-change rooms in south park lands	24 000	—
Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	Floodlighting of Daly Oval	1 417	4 250
Athelstone Football Club	Provision of lighting	2 450	4 550
Adelaide Rowing Club	Extension and upgrading of change facilities (Stage II of submission only)	4 400	—
S.A. Hard Court Tennis League	Renovation of four main courts with porous concrete surface and lighting	15 000	—
Adelaide Harriers Amateur Athletic Club	Extensions to existing clubrooms	6 000	10 000
Uraidla and District Soldiers Memorial Park Inc.	New tennis/netball courts	1 100	3 500
S.A.C.R.A.—Angas River Campsite	Development of multi-purpose outdoor activity area	910	2 500
George Street Reserve Committee of Management	Development of reserve	2 000	6 000
Myponga Memorial Oval Inc.	Development of concrete cricket pitch	1 000	—
Hamley Bridge Cricket Club	Development of concrete pitch with "play deck" surface	655	—
District Council of Clare/Clare Chamber of Commerce	Study into future recreation facility needs	4 000	—
Williamstown Jubilee Park Committee	Tiling of swimming pool	18 000	—
Maitland Community Tennis Club	Resurfacing of six courts	1 334	4 000
Eudunda Amateur Swimming Club	Painting of swimming pool	640	—
Reidy Park Tennis Club Inc.	Development of eight courts, clubhouse and car park	10 000	—
Naracoorte and District Youth Centre	Development of four squash courts on to existing indoor recreation centre	30 000	—
Mount Gambier Y.M.C.A.	Repairs to indoor heated swimming pool	2 500	12 500
Birdwood Park Committee	Improvements to recreation facilities at Birdwood Park	4 100	12 300
Paracombe Progress Association	Development of clubhouse/change facilities	1 300	3 500
Broughton Amateur Basketball Association	Development of two courts with lighting	1 360	3 900
District Council of Laura	Improvements to Laura oval	2 000	4 000
Le Hunte Basketball Association	Development of court and lighting	1 000	3 000
Noarlunga Recreation Centre, Stage I	Regional indoor community recreation centre	25 080	—
Morphettville Community Recreation Centre	Regional indoor community recreation centre	Approved in principle	
South Australian Amateur Swimming Association	Timing equipment	18 900	—
Modbury Recreation Centre	Karadinga/Modbury (escalation)	65 500	—
Blind Welfare Association Inc.	Recreation equipment	12 000	—
Meadows Memorial Hall Inc.	Upgrading community recreation centre	3 750	—
Marree Hall Committee	Recreation hall development	6 750	—
Parnanga Camp	Fitness studio (escalation)	7 671	—
Port Adelaide Rowing Club	Reticulation repairs	230	—

RECREATION AND SPORT DIVISION—CAPITAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

	Total Number of Applications Received	Total Value of Applications	Applications Approved	Total Number Advised Unsuccessful	Total Value of Unsuccessful Applications (Estimate)
		$			$
1974-75	295	15 800 000	69	226	13 300 000
1975-76	346	19 500 000	38	308	17 300 000
1976-77	265	12 000 000	40	225	10 300 000

3. Summary of criteria used in selection of projects for recommendation under the Recreation and Sport Division capital assistance programme—September, 1976:

A. Explanation of scheme.

The capital assistance programme is a scheme of non re-payable Government grants available to local councils, community groups and sporting organisations, for the development of recreation and sporting facilities. It does not cover maintenance costs, running costs or salaries. Equipment will only be considered where it is an essential part of the establishment of a facility and its provision is of a non-recurring nature.

Note: The term "recreation" should be interpreted in its widest sense, i.e., to include both active and non-active pursuits.

B. Eligibility.

Projects eligible for financial assistance include the following:

Facilities for either indoor or outdoor community recreation and sport.

Additional recreational and sporting facilities.

Innovative community projects.

Extensions to existing facilities.

New equipment of a recreation or sporting nature that will assist in the creation of new community activity.

Projects that will significantly increase the use of existing facilities.

Encouragement will be given to projects that:

fulfil a significant local need;

provide multi-purpose facilities intended for use by a wide cross-section of the community;

do not duplicate others in the area that are not fully utilised;

have the support and approval of the local government and the community; and

are ready to commence in the current financial year.

Note: Where the proposed facilities are of a major nature, it is normal for the department to fund through the local government authority.

C. Policy constraints.

No priority is given to:

(i) Projects on school land—interpreted as including both public and private school land (N.B. Change in this policy has been recommended with regard to minor projects on school land which specifically serve community groups).

(ii) Purchase of land for recreation development.

(iii) Bodies which are substantial revenue earners in their own right, such as horse-racing, trotting, dog-racing, league football, soccer, district and shield cricket, and professional tennis.

(iv) Projects to be developed on private land.

(v) Projects that have already commenced or have been completed.

(vi) Commercial enterprise projects.

(vii) Provision of marine facilities for recreational craft—responsibility as follows:

Coastal areas—Coast Protection Board.

River Murray—Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department.

Low priority is given to:

(i) Golf clubs.

(ii) Bowling clubs.

(iii) "Olympic" 50-metre outdoor swimming pools—encouragement given to indoor 25-metre heated pools linked to other indoor recreation facilities.

High priority is given to:

Projects in lower socio-economic areas which may be termed as "disadvantaged", where the benefits can be related to needs within the area.

Note: This policy was recently introduced following an amendment to the A.L.P. platform, therefore, its effects will not be apparent in approvals to date.

4. Some local government authorities have raised through the Recreation Advisory Council financial assistance for maintenance of recreation areas. Two recipient bodies have subsequently sought financial assistance for management expenses. No financial assistance for maintenance or management expenses has been given.

5. Assistance for maintenance and management expenses has not been considered for the immediate future.

MARREE STREET SEALING

Mr. ALLEN (on notice): As the sealing of the Lyndhurst main street will be carried out during 1978-79, is it the intention of the Government to commence sealing the Marree main street during this period?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

COAL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. In what areas of the State does the Electricity Trust intend to carry out the search for coal reserves?

2. Does the increased search for coal indicate that the Government does not intend to develop nuclear power in South Australia and, if not, why not?

3. Is the Government still considering the Redcliff site for nuclear processing?

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

1. The Electricity Trust of South Australia has begun investigation of an area extending northerly from the Inkerman-Balaklava coalfield and of the Anna area. There is potential for occurrence of brown coal in the former area, which constitutes the northern extremity of the St. Vincent Basin, while investigation of the latter area is centred on sampling previously defined coal measures on the western margin of the Murray basin. The Mines Department is providing technical support. E.T.S.A. and the Mines Department are jointly investigating the Polda Basin (on Eyre Peninsula) and the Eucla Basin. There is potential for occurrence of coal in both areas and drilling operations have commenced. A total of 26 exploratory holes is intended in these search programmes.

2. It is important that all energy resources are fully assessed before decisions are made regarding design and location of electric power stations in the near future and for this reason the Government has embarked on a programme of testing of areas that have potential for satisfying demands of conventional installations. It seems likely that South Australia's coal resources will be more than adequate to provide fuel necessary for such facilities to the end of the century. For that reason nuclear power development is not being contemplated.

3. The Redcliff site has been investigated by the Uranium Enrichment Committee and no development would be undertaken unless the South Australian Government was satisfied that it was completely safe to do so. In any event, no development could take place without the agreement and active support of the Commonwealth Government.

TEACHERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the present number and ratio of male teaching staff to female teaching staff in primary and secondary schools, respectively?

2. How do these figures compare for each year for the past five years?

3. What is the minimum number of male teachers out of a total of 24 teaching staff?

4. What action is the Government taking to increase the total number and ratio of male teaching staff?

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

1. and 2.

	Primary				Secondary			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
1976	2050	28·57	5123	71·43	3849	56·45	2970	43·55
1975	1962	28·32	4964	71·68	3668	56·44	2831	43·46
1974	1933	29·48	4621	70·52	3297	55·52	2641	44·48
1973	1837	30·00	4286	70·00	2964	55·43	2383	44·57
1972	1876	30·41	4292	69·59	2784	55·36	2245	44·64
1971	2072	34·80	3888	65·20	2401	56·43	1854	43·57

3. There is no firm policy. Schools are staffed according to their total needs and care is taken to ensure a satisfactory balance of male and female teachers to meet these needs.

4. No deliberate action is being taken although we would like to see some increase in the number of males in the junior section of primary schools. The aim is to select the best possible persons offering for employment, irrespective of sex.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered compulsory third party property motor vehicle insurance and, if so, what were the findings and recommendations?

2. Will the Government introduce legislation to provide for this type of insurance and when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Premier gave an answer to the matter raised in this question on October 5, 1976. I refer the honourable member to page 1230 of *Hansard*.

HORTICULTURAL REPORT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Does the Government intend to make available to the public the report on the preservation of land for horticultural and viticultural use and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet is to consider the report of the Committee on the Preservation of Land for Horticultural and Viticultural Use, including the question of its release to the public, within the next few weeks.

BOUNDARIES REPORT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Does the Government intend to make public the report of the Committee on Urban and Regional Boundaries and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not yet finalised its study of this report. When it has, it will give consideration to its release.

MOTOR CAR STUDY

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What was the purpose of commissioning the study "Private Motor Cars in Adelaide, Usage and Attitude Study", and what use will be made of the study?

2. Why was this study undertaken for the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department instead of the Transport Department?

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

1. The report referred to a "Private Motor Cars in Adelaide, Usage and Attitude Study", was undertaken to provide concrete information about the market potential for an electric car with the capabilities of the Flinders University Mark II electric vehicle. In the first instance the results will be used in a report being prepared by the Electric Vehicle Concept Committee for the Director-General of Transport.

2. The study is being undertaken by the Trade and Development Division on behalf of the Department of Transport because the committee mentioned is examining the industrial development potential of the Flinders University electric vehicle technology. Needless to say, there is close collaboration between the Department of Transport and the Trade and Development Division on this project. The committee's final report is expected to be completed early next year.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE RENOVATIONS

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Is it the Government's intention to implement the findings of the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on Parliament House Redevelopment (Phase II), dated August 27, 1976, and, in particular, that section dealing with the upgrading of the kitchen and servery areas and, if so, when will this work take place?

2. What will be the expected programme for sittings of the House in 1977 in view of the committee's recommendation that the above work should be completed by July, 1977, and must be carried out whilst Parliament is not in session?

3. If this recommendation is not to be carried out, what temporary arrangements are to be made?

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

1. The recommendations of the Public Works Committee with the exception of the reference to the need for additional accommodation are to be implemented. Provision of additional accommodation is currently being examined, but is not planned for inclusion in Phase II. The upgrading of the kitchen and servery areas will take place between January 4, 1977, and July 7, 1977.

2. It is expected the House will meet late in March or early in April for a period yet to be determined. The length of that sitting will govern the commencement of the new session of Parliament in June or July. If necessary, alternative arrangements can be made for members to obtain meals during this sitting.

3. See 2.

SAMCOR LOAN

Mr. RODDA (on notice): What is the amount of money loaned by the State Government to Samcor, and what is the interest rate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Total amount loaned to Samcor by the State is made up of 15 debentures totalling $2 450 000. Each debenture, or loan, is being repaid over 42 years and the rates of interest vary from 3 per cent per annum to 10·25 per cent per annum. Some of these rates of interest are fixed for the term of the loan and others are subject to review by the Treasurer at various periods, depending on the terms of the loan. The amount outstanding at June 30, 1976, was $1 856 493.

PENOLA

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. Will Penola be regarded as a growth centre in the development of the green triangle and, if so, when will an announcement be made?

2. If Penola is not to be a growth centre, why not?

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

1. Penola is situated within the boundaries of the "Green Triangle" growth area. However, Penola has not been nominated as a growth centre for the purposes of the South Australian Decentralisation Incentives Scheme for industry.

2. An attempt to share growth evenly throughout the "Green Triangle" area would greatly diminish the ultimate growth potential of the region. Therefore, a strategy of concentrating growth in the large centres of Mount Gambier, Millicent and Naracoorte has been adopted, and it is considered that other centres in the region—such as Penola—will derive considerable spin-off benefits through the availability of a wider range of employment opportunities, and better access to services. I would bring to the honourable member's attention that although Penola is not considered a growth centre, industries establishing or significantly expanding there could be eligible for the following incentives: provision of factories on a lease/purchase arrangement, and Government guarantees and financial assistance through the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. Further, in exceptional circumstances, the specific incentives (payroll tax rebates, relocation grants) applicable in growth centres could be considered for a Penola location.

TOXIC WASTE

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What methods are used in the metropolitan area to dispose of toxic wastes and toxic waste water, respectively?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A reception and treatment facility at the Bolivar sewage treatment works is designed to treat and dispose of acid, alkali, cyanide and sulphide waste waters. These particular waste waters account for approximately 70 per cent by volume of all toxic liquid wastes generated in metropolitan Adelaide. The facility comprises evaporation lagoons for the disposal of acid and alkali waste waters and a chemical treatment plant to convert cyanide and sulphide waste waters into non-toxic liquids which are then disposed of by evaporation. Whilst toxic solid wastes are not accepted, their disposal is kept under surveillance by the Environment Department and the Public Health Department. It is intended in the near future to accept cyanate waste waters.

ORIENTEERING ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to grant permission to the Orienteering Association of South Australia to walk in Engineering and Water Supply Department catchment reserves, a practice which is permitted in the Eastern States?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

MILLIPEDES

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Now that Mr. P. M. Allen has returned from Montpellier, France, what measures will be put into effect to control the millipede menace that prevails within South Australia and, in particular, in the Adelaide Hills residential area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Mr. P. M. Allen has not yet submitted a report following his inquiries overseas, and a decision on what future action, if any, might be taken by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department to control the millipede problem will be made following receipt of his report and an examination of its contents and recommendations. He has indicated verbally, however, that from his visits to Montpellier and other institutions engaged in entomological research, he was unable to obtain any useful information of direct application to assist in devising effective control measures; and he is not aware of any specific investigations overseas into parasites of this species.

DOCUMENT THEFT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Government receive a report from the police concerning the alleged theft from the Premier's Department in February of this year of documents relating to a proposal for a banking corporation, and was such report in writing and, if so, will the Government now make that report public and, if not, why not?

2. What further action, if any, is to be taken concerning the alleged theft?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A verbal report was received from Superintendent Thorsen. The report was in the nature of an interim report to bring me up to date on the police investigation, and was not meant to be final. The way has been left open for police action if further evidence comes to hand. It is absurd to suggest that internal matters to the police force engaged in detecting crime should be made public, thereby warning the criminal. The report did show that the document was stolen from a waste paper basket of a secretary in the Premier's Department, that it was a confidential draft of a proposed submission, which was later rejected by me. The report was received by Dr. Tonkin in circumstances detailed by me in the House.

S.G.I.C.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it the policy of the State Government Insurance Commission to pay hospital and medical bills and other, and if so, what, out-of-pocket expenses are paid of a person making a claim against its insured?

2. If such is the policy of the commission:
   (*a*) in what circumstances are the payments made;
   (*b*) is a full discharge from further liability then taken from such a person; and
   (*c*) what attempt, if any, is made to explain to such person rights to claim general damages?

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

1. Payments of hospital and medical expenses and loss of wages are made in those circumstances where this is warranted.

2. (*a*) Payment is made when liability is not in issue.
   (*b*) A full discharge is taken only when indications are that the claimant's condition has stabilised, or where settlement is sought.
   (*c*) The commission's staff does not engage in discussion regarding an individual's rights unless specifically requested to comment. However, prior to a full discharge being obtained, the individual is advised of the effect of the execution of such document.

The commission's practice is no different from that adopted by other insurers in the past and by those still handling such claims under policies issued prior to their withdrawal from the approved insurers scheme.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the usual house-owners and house-holders policy of insurance issued by the State Government Insurance Commission exclude cover for theft whilst the property insured is unoccupied for any period, and, if so:

(*a*) for what period;

(*b*) why; and

(*c*) is it now proposed to abandon this exclusion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The usual form of household insurance issued by the State Government Insurance Commission excludes theft "whilst the property insured is unoccupied for any period". Although these are the exact terms of the policy, it is consistent practice to apply the exclusion only if the premises are not closed. In the case of people leaving the property properly secured, S.G.I.C. requires notice only if the absence is to be in excess of 60 days. Most other insurers require notification of absences in excess of 30 days.

(*a*) In cases where loss has occurred whilst the client is temporarily off the property, at the local shop, or briefly visiting a neighbour, the property is deemed to be still occupied and claims for loss by theft are met.

(*b*) The theft exclusion is inserted in the interest of encouraging an attitude of responsibility on the part of the person insured with regard to prudent care of property. The duty imposed is not a great one and only involves closing (not locking) doors and windows and the putting away of any valuable articles outside before leaving the property. Similar provisions will be found in household policies issued by other insurance organisations, and therefore the commission is not unique in this regard.

(*c*) There are no plans to abandon the exclusion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the practice of the State Government Insurance Commission to give all new insurers with the commission a separate policy of insurance and, if not, why not, and is this practice now to be reviewed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Policies are not issued for insurances arranged under the commission's combined business, combined rural and motor vehicle covers. In these cases certificates are issued. The certificates embody a provision which enables clients to obtain policies if desired. A certificate is also issued for combined home covers. However, an eight-page booklet is provided, detailing the scope of the insurance arranged. The practice of not issuing policies has been adopted because of considerable savings in administrative costs, the benefit of which is passed on to clients. In addition, no demand, as such, has been made for policies, confirming that the practice has been successful. No changes to the system are contemplated.

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. What is the proposed site of the offices to be erected in Mount Gambier for the State Government Insurance Commission?

2. When will construction be commenced?

3. Will other Government departments be housed in this building and, if so, which departments?

4. What is the anticipated cost of construction?

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

1. 2. 3. and 4. This matter is still under active consideration.

MIDDLE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is the Government aware of the proposals of Mr. D. J. Anders that there should be a middle school system and, if so, does it support these proposals, and what action, if any, is to be taken to put them into effect?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Officers of the Education Department have investigated the middle school concept as it exists in some oversea countries, but they have not been sufficiently impressed with it as an alternative to place it for consideration before the Government. The implementation of such a system would involve costs in excess of what the Government would be prepared to meet. Mr. Anders has not at this stage placed any specific proposals before me.

REAL PROPERTY ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it still proposed to introduce, during the present session, amendments to the Real Property Act concerning encumbrances and, if so, when?

2. If legislation is not to be introduced in the present session, why not, and is it proposed to introduce such amendments at some and, if so, what time in the future?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. The legislation is being prepared and will be introduced in the next session of Parliament.

CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What plans, if any, are there now for the establishment of a hospital in the Christies Beach area?

2. Has the Government received any requests for the establishment of such a hospital and, if so:

(*a*) how many and over what period of time; and

(*b*) from whom?

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

1. No definite plans concerning the establishment of a hospital in the Christies Beach area can be reached until the full effects of the Flinders Medical Centre in the southern suburbs can be evaluated.

2. (*a*) The question of a hospital in the Christies Beach area has been the subject of several queries from both inside and outside Parliament, including the Question on Notice asked by the honourable member on March 28, 1972.

(*b*) The most recent requests have come from the Rotary Club of Noarlunga and Mr. W. B. Wreford.

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it still proposed to introduce during this session legislation to amend the laws concerning landlords and tenants and, if so, when and which Acts is it proposed should be amended?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government does not propose to introduce legislation this year concerning landlords and tenants.

FESTIVAL PLAZA

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is now the estimated date of completion of:

(*a*) the plaza between the Festival Hall and Parliament House;

and

(*b*) the car park underneath?

2. What has made progress on this job so slow?

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

1. (*a*) December 22, 1976.

(*b*) March 4, 1977.

2. Progress may have appeared slow due to the necessity for considerable excavation in rock and for extreme care to be taken in the work associated with the underpinning of Parliament House. However, progress with the job has been in accordance with the original contractual programme, plus authorised extensions of time.

MUSIC CENTRES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Are particular secondary schools being developed as music centres, and, if so:

(*a*) which ones;

(*b*) why; and

(*c*) at what total cost?

2. Is special air-conditioning being incorporated in buildings at such schools and, if so, why and at what cost?

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

1. Yes.

(*a*) Brighton and Marryatville High Schools were established as special interest music centres in 1976. Woodville High School will be established in 1977. Fremont High School will be established in the near future (either 1978 or 1979).

(*b*) The rationale behind the development of music schools in general includes the following factors:

The need to rationalise to some degree the provision of expensive and specialised equipment, e.g. instruments, recording equipment, electronic equipment, etc.

Opportunities can be provided in a special music school for talented music students to integrate their music studies into the "normal" school routine without limiting their options for future careers. In a non-specialist music school, music students often spend many hours on practice and tuition in addition to normal curriculum commitments.

Talented students in music, particularly in choral, orchestral, and other group work can benefit from the company of other talented students.

The special music schools will act as a focus for other schools both primary and secondary in their vicinity. Instructors, equipment and opportunities will be shared.

Marryatville, Brighton, Woodville and Fremont were selected as the sites for the special music schools because:

There are obvious geographical advantages. Each school either had or has features which attracted attention, e.g. all schools were either low on enrolments or have projected declines in enrolments. Each school's special music accommodation was associated with a planned upgrading of its existing accommodation, if any. It is worth noting that the establishment of a centre at Marryatville has assisted the school to retrieve its enrolment problem. At Brighton it is hoped the music centre will help to arrest a projected enrolment decline. It would be uneconomical to provide specialist facilities at all schools but it should be noted that special music schools have not been established at the expense of other schools.

(*c*) This is a very complex matter. In each case the school would have had significant upgrading of existing music accommodation or, as in the case of Brighton and Marryatville, new music accommodation. The costs are—

Brighton High School—$80 000.

Marryatville. Two wooden prefabricated buildings have been renovated. This was necessary as site restrictions prevented the provision of a standard Demac music suite. Cost $58 000 approximately. The old stables on the site are to be renovated at a cost of $366 000 (estimate). When this is completed the wooden buildings will be used as either classrooms or music rooms so that Further Education Department wooden buildings at the rear of the school can be removed as they are no longer needed.

Woodville—$20 000 approximately.

Fremont—At the planning stage.

Other costs involve:

Special equipment: varying amounts depending on the school. Approximately $20 000 per school to establish.

Staffing: each centre has a Head of Music School (Deputy Principal level) and either one or two additional full-time teachers. Part-time instruction and peripatetic instructor time is difficult to cost. Travel and other costs are small.

2. It is now policy to "air-condition" new schools and major additions to schools during construction. Obviously it is advantageous to provide air temperature control in areas where musical instruments are housed, but the special music centres are not singled out for particular treatment in this regard. All music suites now provided in schools are air-conditioned, and have been since Demac buildings were utilised for this purpose. In short "special" air-conditioning is not being incorporated in the schools which are music centres.

INSURANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation with the aim of preventing insurers under the terms of a house-owners and house-holders policy of insurance from excluding liability to an insured when goods have been stolen from a property which is unoccupied for any period and, if so, why and when?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government believes there are several matters relating to insurance which need to be considered to ensure adequate protection for consumers. As this matter is being considered by the Australian Law Reform Commission, the Government will withhold any action until it has had an opportunity to consider the report of the commission.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What are the specifications for filling for the South-Eastern Freeway and who was the successful contractor?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The specifications for placing and compaction of the filling used on the South-Eastern Freeway are complex technical standards dealing with types of materials, compactive effort, moisture contents, etc. and are too extensive to be included in an answer to the question. No tenders have been called for filling, and hence no contracts have been let.

FIRE UNITS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many fire units in operational condition are owned by the Woods and Forests Department and the National Parks and Wildlife section of the Environment Department respectively?

2. Where are these units stationed?

3. What is the total personnel available to operate these units?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to purchase more units and, if so, how many and when?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: As regards the Woods and Forests Department, the replies are as follows:

1. The Woods and Forests Department has 43 units of varying types in service.

	units
2. North and Western Regions	5
Central Region	10
South-East Region	28
	personnel
3. North and Western Regions	27
Central Region	75
South-East Region	96

4. Replacement of fire-fighting equipment is carried out continuously in Woods and Forests Department workshops and two units are expected to be replaced in 1977-78.

As regards the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment, the replies are as follows:

1. Fire Appliances (Major Units): two new units are to be delivered this week, when one existing machine which is obsolete will be disposed of, leaving five modern, efficient units (four of 1 820 litres and one of 910 litres).

Slip-on-Units: (455 litres) 24.

Trailer Units: (370 litres) 4.

2. Major Units: Belair, Para Wirra, Cleland, Morialta, Flinders Ranges (Wilpena).

Slip-on-Units (Toyota): Belair (3), Cleland (2), Morialta (2), Para Wirra (2), Flinders Ranges (2), Flinders Chase, Murray's Lagoon, Kelly Hill, Mount Gambier, Bool Lagoon, Danggali, Loxton, Naracoorte, Canunda, Mambray Creek, Alligator Gorge, Coffin Bay and Innes.

Trailer Units: Loxton, Leigh Creek, Coorong, Canunda.

3. 115—direct firefighting duties.
20—administration and other back-up staff.

4. Yes. Possibly four major units over the next three years, depending on availability of funds, plus additional slip-on units.

OVERSEA VISIT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport going overseas within the next four weeks, and, if so:
(*a*) what is the date of departure;
(*b*) what countries and cities will he visit;
(*c*) what is the mode of transport;
(*d*) what is the reason for the trip; and
(*e*) what is the estimated cost to the State of this trip?

2. How many visits overseas has the Minister made, and when, since becoming Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport?

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

1. Yes.
(*a*) December 4, 1976.
(*b*) Greece, Athens.
(*c*) Air.
(*d*) As a guest of Olympic Airways on an inaugural flight for a twice-weekly service between Melbourne and Athens.
(*e*) Nil.

2. Since assuming his portfolio in June, 1975, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport has made one overseas trip. On this trip the Minister travelled as a guest of Qantas on a Sydney/Hong Kong inaugural flight on August 14, 1976. Whilst in Hong Kong he attended the Convention of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents between August 16 and 21, 1976.

BOOKMAKERS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of bookmakers have either surrendered or otherwise lost their licences in each financial year since July 1, 1970?

2. Of those bookmakers who have been delicensed, what were the reasons for such loss?

3. How many persons since July 1, 1970, who were previously licensed as bookmakers and either surrendered the licence or were delicensed by the Betting Control Board, have been relicensed?

4. Have any either surrendered their licence or been delicensed for a second or subsequent time and, if so, how many?

5. What is the present complement of bookmakers in the several licence classifications and how are they designated in the individual classifications?

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

1 and 2. The number of bookmakers who have either surrendered or otherwise lost their licences in each financial year since July 1, 1970, and the reasons therefore are as follows:

Financial Year	No. of bookmakers licences terminated	Reasons for termination: Licences Surrendered	Bookmakers Deceased
1970-71	3	2	1
1971-72	10	10	—
1972-73	14	11	3
1973-74	5	3	2
1974-75	13	12	1
1975-76	14	13	1
1976-77 (to date)	6	3	3

3 and 4. Since July 1, 1970, the Betting Control Board has relicensed four bookmakers who had previously surrendered their licences. Of these, three are still licensed and one has died.

5. The present complement of bookmakers in the several licence classifications and the manner in which they are designated in the individual classifications are as follows:

A. Bookmakers' course licences	140
B. Bookmakers' town licences	6
(of which two hold course licences)	

The individual classifications of course licences are:

(*a*) (for metropolitan meetings):
Racing grandstand 34 (+four emergencies who are the holders of racing derbystand licences).
Racing derbystand 32 (+ four emergencies who are the holders of racing flat licences).
Racing flat 32 (+ four emergencies).
Trotting 39.
Dog-racing 23 (+ two emergencies).

(*b*) (for race, trotting and dog race meetings in "outer" country area and for inner "provincial" meetings if no meeting in their outer area):
Country course—western 6
Country course—north-western 5
Country course—northern 4
Country course—mid-northern 5
Country course—upper Murray 5
Country course—south-eastern 10

(*c*) (for race, trotting and dog race meetings in the "inner" country area, provincial courses):
Country course—central
i. for racing 55
ii. for trotting 40
iii. for dog racing 20

RESEARCH ASSISTANT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Did the Premier's Research Assistant, Miss Adele Koh, accompany him in an official capacity during any part of his oversea tour after leaving Malaysia and, if so, where?

2. Did Miss Koh commence annual leave after completing her official duties connected with the Malaysia visit and, if so, has all holiday leave due to her now been taken and, if not, how much accumulated leave is due to her?

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

1. No.

2. Yes. No. 14 days.

MASSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Have police officers gone into massage parlours and used entrapment procedures to obtain evidence of offences being committed therein, and, if so:

(*a*) why;
(*b*) on how many occasions;
(*c*) into which premises have police officers gone and used such procedures;
(*d*) how many prosecutions and convictions, respectively, have resulted; and
(*e*) is this practice to continue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:
(*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*): No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are police now acting as agents provocateurs in order to obtain evidence of offences committed in massage parlours and, if so, why has this practice been adopted in view of the Premier's answer of November 16 to my question on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why has each of Messrs. W. L. C. Davies, P. A. Bentley, I. R. McPhail, D. B. Hughes and Ms. D. E. J. McCulloch been declared a person to whom the Public Service Act shall not apply?

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: All contract officers have been excluded from the provisions of the Public Service Act, as their contract specifies their conditions of employment.

VICTORIA SQUARE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What land does the Government currently own on the western side of Victoria Square?

2. What land on the western side of Victoria Square, or in the near vicinity, has the Government purchased during the last 12 months, and what area is involved, who was the seller, and what prices were paid for the land?

3. Is the Government negotiating to purchase any futher land on the western side of Victoria Square and, if so, what areas are involved?

4. Does the Government intend to purchase additional land on the western side of Victoria Square and, if so, what areas are involved?

5. For what purpose has, or is, the Government purchasing this land?

6. Does the Government have a proposed site for an international hotel in the vicinity of Victoria Square and, if so, what is the proposed site?

7. Is the Government still carrying out negotiations for such an international hotel and, if so, at what stage are these negotiations?

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

1. The South Australian Government owned land in Victoria Square west is;
(1) the site of the Marine and Harbors building, and
(2) the area presently used as a car park at the corner between Charles Moores Limited and Grote Street.

2. The Government has not purchased any land on the western side of Victoria Square during the last 12 months.

3. No negotiations are proceeding to purchase any further land in that situation.

4. Not at this stage.

5. Not applicable.

6. Yes. The car park at the corner between Charles Moores Limited and Grote Street.

7. Yes. Discussions for a detailed feasibility study are well advanced.

EDUCATION BUILDING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What company supplied the furniture for the new Education Building?

2. Where is the head office of that company based?

3. What was the total value of the contract?

4. What items were purchased under the contract?

5. What South Australian based companies tendered for the supply of this furniture?

6. Why was the contract given to the successful company?

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

1. Moderntone Furniture Pty. Ltd.

2. Melbourne.

3. $780 000.

4. Office furniture.

5. Fricker Carrington Group, Brownbuilt Ltd., T. H. Brown Pty. Ltd.

6. Because it fulfilled the requirements of the performance specification more satisfactorily than the other tenderers in functional suitability, design appearances, supply aspects and costs. The successful tenderer undertook that portion of the work would be performed in South Australia by local firms.

FORENSIC SCIENCE BUILDING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Which company carried out the plastic ducting and fume cupboard work for the new Forensic Science Building, and where is the head office of this company situated?

2. What was the total value of the contract for this work?

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

1. Work is being undertaken by P.H.R. Pty. Ltd. of 399 Churchill Road, Kilburn, S.A., as part of that company's nominated subcontract with the contractor Hansen and Yuncken Pty. Ltd.

2. As the work is part of a subcontract, the subcontractor would need to volunteer the information.

FROZEN FOODS FACTORY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What are the names of the project architect and builders for the proposed frozen foods factory, and where are the head office locations for the companies involved?

2. What is the total value of the contracts let so far for this project, and what is the anticipated value of all contracts for the completed project?

3. When is this project due to be completed?

4. Did any South Australian companies apply for these contracts, and were any of these companies successful in obtaining contracts?

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

1. Austin Anderson (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., St. Leonards, N.S.W. 2065.

2. $5 800 000. The anticipated value of all contracts for the completed project is $6 000 000.

3. The anticipated completion date is July, 1977.

4. Yes.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COMPANIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For each of the last four years what contracts valued at $50 000 or more have been let by Government departments to companies which do not have operating or manufacturing facilities within South Australia?

2. For each such contract, what was the total value of the contract, what was the company involved, what service or goods were obtained, and what were the reasons for selecting an interstate or overseas operation in preference to a local operation?

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

1. and 2. The State Supply Division of the Services and Supply Department could produce certain of the information sought, but it would require a substantial amount of officers time which is not considered warranted. Nevertheless, the Supply and Tender Board rigorously observes the Government's policy of extending preference to material manufactured and distributed in this State.

GOVERNMENT CARS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many LTD Fords have been purchased by the South Australian Government during each of the last four financial years?

2. What is the total value of all such purchases?

3. How many of the latest model LTD Fords will be purchased during the current financial year, how many have already been purchased, and what is the cost of each vehicle?

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

1. 1972-73, nil; 1973-74, 8; 1974-75, 3; 1975-76, 7.

2. $122 249.

3. 3, 3, $9 476.

SPEECH THERAPISTS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many vacancies for speech therapists currently exist within the South Australian Education Department?

2. What action has been taken in an attempt to fill these vacancies?

3. On how many occasions have these vacancies been advertised, and how many applicants were there for the positions each time?

4. If any applicants were rejected, what is the general reason for the rejection?

5. Is there an urgent need for more speech therapists and, if so, what action is being taken to fill these vacancies?

6. How many cases of children requiring speech therapy are reported to the department annually?

7. How many children are under regular therapy for speech difficulties by officers of the department?

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

1. One vacancy for senior speech therapist. Five vacancies for speech therapist.

2. and 3. The positions have been advertised several times in the last two years. The most recent occasions were October, 1975, and January, 1976, when a general call for speech therapists was made in the *Public Service Board Notice*, the *Advertiser* and the *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders*, June, 1976. On all these occasions no applications were received. One additional person has been recruited in 1976; however, this appointment has been offset by a resignation. The senior speech therapist position was advertised in September 1976 (a newly created position). There was one applicant who has withdrawn the application.

4. Not applicable.

5. Yes:

(*a*) A review of salary and classifications is being undertaken by the Public Service Board. The positions of senior speech therapist and the five speech therapy positions will be re-advertised following this review; and

(*b*) at present, there are three cadetship and 16 undergraduate scholars in Speech Pathology, both interstate and at the Sturt College of Advanced Education. The first of these students will be available for appointment to the Education Department at the beginning of 1978.

6. No records are kept of the number of cases of children requiring speech therapy reported to the department annually.

7. For 1976—

Total children seen	457
Receiving regular assistance	133
Receiving assistance through help provided to a school	243

These statistics do not include children assisted in the South-East region for which statistics are not available.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Since the Sex Discrimination Act came into operation, how many letters have been sent by the Registrar to persons or companies who appear to be breaching the provisions of the Act?

2. What types of breach of the Act appear to be occurring and what are the proportions for each category of breaches?

3. How many specific complaints have been received by the Registrar for possible breaches of the Act, and what portion of these complaints appear to warrant further action?

4. Have any prosecutions occurred under the Act, and if so, what was the nature of each breach?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Since the Sex Discrimination Act came into operation the Registrar has sent out 120 letters.

2. The types of breach which appear to be occurring are advertising (115 possible breaches), employment (3 possible breaches), and under the provisions of goods and services (2 possible breaches).

3. Five complaints have been received, all of which have been referred to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity for further action.

4. No.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has an industrial democracy model for the South Australian Film Corporation been developed and, if so, what is the model involved.

2. Is it necessary for any employee representatives to be members of the appropriate union?

3. Did employees of the corporation object to a requirement that employee representatives must be members of the appropriate union?

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

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What Government departments have adopted worker participation schemes, and what is the extent of each scheme in each department?

2. What Government departments are considering the adoption of worker participation schemes, and when will these schemes be put into operation?

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

1. During the last three years, the following Government departments have established a joint consultative council or works council:

1. Labour and Industry
2. Libraries
3. Community Welfare
4. Premier's
5. Lands
6. Treasury
7. Marine and Harbors
8. Engineering and Water Supply
9. Correctional Services
10. Legal Services
11. Highways
12. Hospitals

The joint consultative councils of the first four of the abovementioned departments operate on a departmental-wide basis whilst the councils in the other departments operate within a division or section of the department. The terms of reference and powers of these councils vary considerably from department to department and this highlights the necessity to adopt a flexible and pragmatic approach to the question of industrial democracy. There also have been some job redesign projects within Government departments and one of these was in the medical records section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

2. In August of this year the Chairman of the Public Service Board issued an industrial democracy policy statement for the consideration of Government departments. Since that time, the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy along with the Chief of the Special Projects Branch of the Public Service Board have held discussions with the permanent heads of 25 Government departments. At present, employees within many of these departments are giving serious consideration to the industrial democracy strategies that may suit the needs of their own departments. Within the next year it is anticipated that some of the present councils will extend their role, that more councils will be established and that employees within some sections of departments may establish semi-autonomous work groups.

COMMUNITY WELFARE HOME

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Does the Community Welfare Department operate a home on the North-East Road as a placing-out facility for persons for correctional institutions and, if so:

(*a*) what is the address of this home;

(*b*) how many persons are resident at the home on average;

(*c*) what is the weekly cost of operating this home; and

(*d*) how many staff are employed at the home?

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

(*a*) Yes, 643 Main North-East Road, Gilles Plains.

(*b*) The number is eight.

(*c*) About $1 300 a week. A saving of $1 100 a week will be made at Brookway Park.

(*d*) The number is seven.

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation during the current sittings of Parliament to amend the

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and, if so, when will the legislation be introduced, and why has it taken so long?

2. Does the Government believe that the community, industries and unions should have ample opportunity to examine such legislation and express an opinion upon it?

3. Have draft copies of the legislation been circulated already to trade union officials and/or the United Trades and Labor Council?

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

1. No.

2 and 3. Vide No. 1.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government or the Unit for Industrial Democracy held the promised meeting with employees of the S.A. Housing Trust to hear objections and complaints concerning the proposed industrial democracy model for the trust and, if so, when was the meeting held and what was the outcome of the meeting?

2. Has the industrial democracy model for the S.A. Housing Trust been revised since the objections were raised earlier this year and, if so, what proposals are contained in the revised model, and when will these be put into operation?

3. Was a ballot of all employees of the trust promised before any industrial democracy model was to be adopted and, if so, has such a ballot been held, and what was the result?

4. If a ballot has not been held, why not?

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

1. During the last few months, a series of seminar programmes have been conducted in order to provide the employees of the South Australian Housing Trust with more information on the general question of industrial democracy. The decision to conduct the seminar programmes was a unanimous joint decision of senior management of the trust, union officials representing the four unions concerned and members of the Unit for Industrial Democracy. This seminar programme which is open to all employees of the trust is still proceeding.

2. The model sent out to employees of the trust earlier this year was sent for purposes of discussion and stimulating debate. It was never, at any stage, suggested that this was a model which employees had to accept. The seminar programme presently being conducted is providing staff with information so that they can consider what participation programme (if any) is appropriate to the trust. Any programme that may be introduced or any model that may be implemented will come into operation when employees of the trust decide.

3. Public Service Association members in the trust have decided that they will ascertain their members' views by means of a referendum when they believe an appropriate stage of discussions has been reached. Other employees within the trust have yet to determine how they shall voice their opinions.

4. See 3.

CEREAL CROPS

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (November 9).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Heavy rains in September, October and the opening days of November have transformed the seasonal outlook in much of the State. The areas in which the bulk of grazing livestock are located were substantially improved. Unfortunately, the rains came too late to provide any significant help for livestock in the lower rainfall districts of the cereal belt, especially on the Far West Coast, the Murray Mallee and the Murray Plains. In these areas, it is estimated that up to 50 per cent of sheep and cattle had earlier left the farms either for slaughter as unsaleable stock, or to a lesser extent for agistment. The late rains may now mean that the sheep population will not be greatly depleted by drought, even though numbers may fall by up to 1 500 000 compared with March, 1976 figures. The rate of growth in the cattle population is expected to drop sharply, and numbers in March, 1977, may not be much in advance of those of March, 1976. Some cattle have had to be disposed of as unsaleable, but an important source of loss to beef producers, even in the better placed areas such as the South-East, is the inability to "turn off" a sufficient proportion of prime cattle. This could amount to a potential loss of as much as $40 a beast, as the premium paid for prime cattle is considerably greater than that for under-finished beasts. The high stocking rates being maintained in the higher rainfall areas makes the finishing of cattle a none-too-easy task, while the stress imposed by drought conditions and high stocking rates is expected to have an adverse effect on the number of calves born in 1977. The late rains have not only increased the potential cereal harvest, but have meant that significant tonnages of hay can now be cut on Southern Eyre Peninsula, the Adelaide and Southern Hills, and the South-East. This has great significance for the cattle population, including the dairy industry. From the feed point of view, the rains have also given an excellent start to summer fodder crops. The Minister of Agriculture has provided the following table of anticipated cereal production and yields:

ANTICIPATED PRODUCTION AND YIELDS—CEREALS

	Production '000 t		Yield t/ha	
Crop	1976 (estimated)	Average for last 10 years	1976 (estimated)	Average for last 10 years
Wheat	627	1 353	0·79	1·16
Barley	590	750	0·83	1·17
Oats	77	136	0·66	0·80

The total grain production for wheat, barley and oats for the State is now expected to reach 46 per cent, 79 per cent and 56 per cent respectively of the average for the last 10 years. In summary, the late spring rains have been of tremendous significance in boosting anticipated cereal yields and in alleviating a potentially disastrous drought situation. For the livestock industries, they have given a three months respite, which could be short lived unless the opening to the 1977 season is early and is followed up by consolidating rains.

DORSET VALE COTTAGES

In reply to Mr. EVANS (October 12).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In my earlier answer concerning the Dorset Vale cottages, I undertook to provide further information on the old chimney stack of the Alamanda Mine. In 1868, the Alamanda Mine was developed with a smelter being built at the foot of the hill on section 1396 hundred of Noarlunga. The smelter housed a furnace which was connected by an arched stone flue running up inside the hill to the circular stone chimney. The flue and chimney still remain today. Section 1396 lies within the boundary of the proposed State Planning Authority Reserve 21—Scott Creek. As part of State Planning Authority acquisition programme within reserve

21, the Crown leasehold interests of Mr. P. C. Mitchell over sections 1396 and 1399 were vested in the South Australian Land Commission on June 26, 1975. Negotiations for settlement have been protracted. Conditional entry into possession was offered on October 19, 1976, by solicitors acting on behalf of Mr. Mitchell. The offer was unacceptable to the authority. On November 12, 1976, the Land Board, acting for the authority, again negotiated with Mr. Mitchell's legal representative for settlement and right of entry. An offer for settlement is now being considered by Mr. Mitchell. Once right of entry and settlement is finalised, the Land Commission will take steps to transfer management and eventual ownership to the authority. On gaining entry, the State Planning Authority, with co-operation of the National Parks and Wildlife Division, propose to establish a water point on section 1396 for fire fighting purposes. An underground source at present delivers water at a rate suitable for rapid emergency filling of fire fighting units. It is envisaged that the chimney, flue, shafts and tunnels could be incorporated in development of an historical park as a reminder of the mining days of the last century.

VIRGINIA SPEEDWAY

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (November 10).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Virginia residents most closely affected by the speedway proposal appealed to the Planning Appeal Board against the consent given by the District Council of Munno Para. In its decision (No. 134/76) of October 15, 1976, the board disallowed the residents' appeal. The period for lodging a further appeal to the Land and Valuation Court expired on November 15, 1976. No appeal was lodged by the residents. As indicated in my earlier reply, the limitation of rural land to strictly agricultural use would necessitate special legislation requiring declarations of what was primary producing land that should be retained in that form. It would need to impose special procedures before there could be a change of land away from primary producing activities. Though the desirability of this has been canvassed extensively, no legislation has so far been enacted. However, recently, district councils have increasingly become concerned with the intensive nature of some of the uses being established in rural areas. As a result, revised model zoning regulations for country areas have been drafted and consultation begun with district councils. These regulations provide for a range of rural zones, of increasing restrictive natures, where council consent will be required for many uses now permitted in existing rural zones. When adopted, the new country zoning regulations could give greater protection to good agricultural land.

BICYCLE TRACKS

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (October 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Consideration is currently being given to a number of alternative plans in the pursuit of finding a suitable answer to the provision of bicycle tracks and, at this stage, it is not possible to provide any information with regard to the roads mentioned by the honourable member.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (November 18).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The question was referred to the Minister of Labour and Industry for investigation by the Youth Work Unit. The unit has been set up under the Minister specifically to co-ordinate all State and Federal Governments and community activities related to youth and employment. There has been excellent co-operation between the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Job Hunters Clubs for some months now. The basis of co-operation is that the confidentiality of C.E.S. files must be maintained but that where it is considered appropriate, C.E.S. officers will refer or recommend an unemployed young person to a Job Hunters Club. C.E.S. officers have also assisted by calling groups of young people in for meetings with staff from the Job Hunters Club, sending out literature on the clubs to all young people registered, and making interview rooms available for young people to talk with job hunters staff. With specific reference to Whyalla, during the last few weeks the C.E.S. office has sent out 350 letters to the parents of unemployed young people, inviting them to attend a meeting with the son or daughter to hear about the purpose and operation of the Job Hunters Club. Arrangements have also been finalised for information on the activities of the club to be regularly sent out to all unemployed young people. Other methods of contacting unemployed youth have been carried out in Whyalla and other places, and a very high level of co-operation and collaboration exists between the two services. As a further example of the existing co-operation and an indicator of continuing collaboration, the South Australian Director of the Employment and Industrial Relations Department has accepted an invitation to attend meetings of the supervisory committee of the Youth Work Unit and, as a result, for several months he has been closely involved in the problems, planning and decisions related to all of the special programmes this Government is running to assist unemployed young people.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

In reply to Mr. VENNING (Appropriation Bill, October 6).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Coast Protection Board has to date received no request from Port Pirie to undertake work of any nature in the area of reclaimed land opposite Solomontown beach.

In reply to Mr. BECKER (Appropriation Bill, October 6).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Coast Protection Board has publicly stated, both to the press and to the local government body involved, that the purpose of constructing the northern Patawalonga groyne was not for solving the sand bar problem but to permit successful beach replenishment on the northern Glenelg beaches. However, the board has stated that, as a side benefit from the building of the northern groyne, concentration will occur in the waters flushed from the Patawalonga which in turn might well reduce the height of the sand bar and consequently the problem caused to small boats using facilities at the Patawalonga. This effect has been relatively successful. Unfortunately, the location of these boating facilities is within an active littoral zone of the metropolitan coast where any protrusion into the sea will result in problems such as a build-up or depletion of sand on either side of the structure, as has occurred at the southern groyne at Glenelg. The treatment of these problems is neither simple nor inexpensive and is without any guarantee of success. The method favoured by the board to reduce the problem

of the sand bar to small boats is regularly to remove surplus sand from along the breakwater; also to seek out locations, of which there are few, to establish boating facilities without the sorts of problem present at the Patawalonga.

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 6).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: In December of last year an amendment was approved to the financial provisions of the Coast Protection Act which allowed the Coast Protection Board to recommend a maximum subsidy of 80 per cent for the construction of a coast facility. A safe swimming enclosure comes within the definition of a coast facility and, in this respect, depending on the particular circumstances existing in a council area, the board is now able to recommend an 80 per cent grant to any seaside council in the State. For the information of the honourable member, two other safe swimming enclosures besides the one at Port Lincoln have been approved by the board. One is at Wallaroo, which is estimated to cost $120 000, including land acquisition and repairs to an existing structure forming part of this enclosure, and the other is at Port Le Hunte, which is estimated to cost $10 000. The Wallaroo enclosure has been suitably designed for competitive swimming and is complete with a small public spectators' platform and floodlighting. The board's financial contribution to the Wallaroo Corporation is $80 000, or 66 per cent. The total cost of the enclosure at Port Le Hunte will be met by the Government, as the proposed location of the enclosure is outside of the local government jurisdiction.

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 6).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Coast Protection Board undertook the design and organisation for the construction of the safe swimming enclosure at Port Lincoln. The total cost of constructing the enclosure was $18 180, and the board contributed 55 per cent of the cost to the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln. The enclosure, which is located alongside the town jetty, has been designed by the board to enable the nylon netting to be recovered during the winter months for the purpose of ease of maintenance and to avoid unnecessary damage resulting from winter storms.

In reply to Mr. VENNING (Appropriation Bill, October 6).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Coast Protection Board has assisted the District Council of Port Broughton both financially and technically. In this regard, work has been approved to a total cost of $50 632, to which the board has provided a subsidy of approximately 66 per cent. This work has included foreshore protection, beach replenishment and reclamation. The board has also contributed 80 per cent of the cost to purchase an area of land adjacent to the town of Port Broughton for the purpose of developing a new caravan park, the existing caravan area being too small and inappropriately located. The total cost of this acquisition was $18 612. In addition to the assistance provided by the board, the Port Broughton council has received further financial assistance from the South Australian boating industry and the Port Broughton Shack Owners Association. The board has no objection to councils receiving additional financial assistance, as such arrangements reduce the burden on councils in meeting their share of the cost of various projects.

UNION ALLEGATIONS

Dr. TONKIN: In the absence of the Premier, can the Deputy Premier say what action the Government is taking about a report in this morning's press that a Mr. Phillip Jackson, of Loxton, was kidnapped and tortured over a three-day period, and what information the Government has available to it at present about the circumstances surrounding Mr. Jackson's claims? Mr. Jackson, a local official of the Liquor Trades Employees' Union, opposes a proposed amalgamation of that union with the Storemen and Packers' Union. He earlier spoke out against taking part in the Medibank strike. Mr. Jackson is reported as saying that his abductors made a statement that he himself had made when speaking out publicly against the amalgamation. The statement was, "If we make them stronger by joining them (referring to the Storemen and Packers' Union), it's going to make our lives living hell."

He has also claimed publicly that nine out of 10 union officials are deported shop stewards from the United Kingdom, who are here to cause unrest among the working class. Mr. Jackson is reported as saying that he can see no reason for the kidnapping and attack, other than his union activity. The police have stated that they have no reason to doubt Mr. Jackson's claim at present. He is highly regarded by responsible members of the community. It is of extreme importance that Mr. Jackson's allegations are investigated fully. Any suggestion of violence or standover criminal activities in our community, in whatever sphere, must be condemned and dealt with immediately.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the outset, I strongly condemn the actions that have taken place, if Mr. Jackson's claims are true. No-one in his right senses would subscribe to that kind of tactic. The allegations are serious and will no doubt be investigated in the normal way. I hope that, if the allegations contain any truth, the people responsible will be brought to justice. Further than that, I can say little else, except that I understand the Minister of Labour and Industry has not been approached on the matter. Undoubtedly he is interested and will, I expect, make appropriate inquiries. However, I assure the Leader that the Government strongly condemns the type of action that has taken place, if the allegations are true.

HOUSE BUILDING

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister for Planning say what effect the proposal of the Federal Minister for Housing (Mr. Newman) that fewer new houses should be built will have on the building industry and on the thousands of young couples waiting for houses? A report in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading, "Build fewer homes—Government", under a Canberra dateline, states:

The Federal Minister for Housing (Mr. Newman) last night advocated that fewer new homes be built. The Government would like to see building of new dwellings fall by as much as 10 per cent to a yearly rate of between 135 000 and 140 000, he said. A fall of 10 per cent in new home building would mean a loss of more than $200 000 000 a year to the housing industry. Mr. Newman was commenting on the effects of devaluation on the housing sector.

Another report in the same paper states:

Housing writer, Grant Nihill, says the devaluation will increase house prices, make loans harder to get and more expensive, and curtail building activity in the residential and non-residential sectors.

An interesting comment was made by Mr. West of the Master Builders Association of South Australia who said that he expected a sharp cut-back in housing activities

because of the increased deposit gap and the greater difficulty people would have in borrowing money. He also said that the increase in new home prices could be higher in South Australia than in other States because South Australian builders used much more oregon timber. I am disgusted with the Federal Government's effort to create further unemploymet by its policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that he is now commenting.

Mr. WHITTEN: I ask the question of the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that most members are aware that, if a currency is devalued when inflation is still operating in a country, the consequences will be pretty well offset unless further credit restraint is imposed. No doubt following its decision to devalue by 17½ per cent, the Commonwealth Government is now in the process of imposing that further credit restraint. Presumably, the comments of the Federal Minister for Housing relating to a suggested cut-back in the production of houses are a consequence of that further policy of credit restraint.

Mr. Gunn: You yourself advocated devaluation in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I expected that interjection from the honourable member: previously, I have had to make a personal explanation in the House because of the untruthful interjections of the member for Eyre on this same subject. If the honourable member cares to check *Hansard,* he will find, as I have pointed out before, that I said that, if devaluation occurred, certain consequences would follow for the shipbuilding industry. At no stage did that statement amount to an advocacy of devaluation.

Mr. Dean Brown: Your whole argument was in favour of it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am well aware of the continuous misrepresentation by Opposition members, but I suppose we have to put up with it. It is a pity that they continue with their low standards and low tactics in this matter. However, whatever may be one's views on devaluation, one should certainly not support the kind of reduction in house building that is now proposed officially by the Federal Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We already have a situation in which the construction aspect of the building industry is suffering from its most serious setback for many years, more so in the Eastern States than is apparent in South Australia, but it is still true in this State. Some part of that setback for construction has been offset in this State by the continuation of house building at a high level. Indeed, one or two construction firms have expanded in the house-building sector in order to retain as many of their staff as they are able to. If the Federal Government's devaluation is associated with the kind of credit squeeze that has been forecast, this State Government will try to do the best it can to offset the effects on house building, but unfortunately a determined Federal Government, with its control over bank liquidity and interest rates, will undoubtedly have an impact. I do not see that such a cut-back in house building can have the kind of anti-inflationary consequence that the Federal Minister seems to desire, especially in circumstances in which a significant part of the building industry is already under-utilised. I oppose strongly the type of policies now being adopted by the Federal Government. We will pay a high price indeed if this is the result of the Federal Government's desire to support certain aspects of industry, which are being supported, as a consequence of devaluation, by the rest of the community at the price of those people who are waiting for housing. On behalf of the State Government I voice the strongest possible disapproval of the statement that has been made by the Federal Minister. Attempts that are being made by the Federal Government to remove concessional rates in any renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement indicate a completely reactionary policy in relation to housing and the problems of people generally, particularly younger people in our community.

Mr. Millhouse: What can be done about it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some compensatory action could be taken through the South Australian Housing Trust, where we have a degree of liquidity. That hopefully would enable some offset to be produced. If the Federal Government can operate through its control over the banking system in a restrictive fashion, anything we do at State level will only partially offset actions taken by the Federal Government. The Federal Government's policy in this respect is extremely dangerous and brooks ill for the future of the Australian economic system.

SCOPE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I intended to ask a question of the Premier, as spokesman for the Government, but in his absence I will direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Is he aware of a report in *Scope* (the trade union press) of November 18 that claims that the South Australian Government is trying to pull the authoritarian South Australian police into line and, if he is, will he either confirm or deny this allegation? The report states that several so-called progressive Ministers in the Labor Cabinet are concerned at the behaviour of the police and that the Attorney-General is particularly concerned about police repression regarding sexual offences and the treatment by the police of Flinders University student, Mr. David McPherson. The report also asserts that the Chief Secretary, as Minister in charge of police, is weak and has incurred the displeasure of his progressive Ministerial colleagues. In part, the report states:

> The police have set themselves up as a law unto themselves, and are especially defiant of the State's young Attorney-General, Mr. Peter Duncan. They have even made threats to "bust" Mr. Duncan on the basis of alleged offences . . . The police Minister has shown no inclination to do anything about the excesses of the force in a supposedly Liberal State social environment.

Scope claims to have a circulation of about 50 000 readers. Obviously, a slur on the police is implicit in that report. I therefore believe that this is a matter of some importance, and I hope that the Deputy Premier can confirm or deny the report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the outset, I deny the allegations made in that report. I have not seen the report although I am told that it is now available here. I believe that press belongs to the socialist left in Victoria. In the past it has libelled the Attorney-General of this State. I refute any statement that is made regarding standover tactics or semblance of authoritarian action on the part of this Government in relation to the Police Force. I use for my authority for saying that no less a person than the Commissioner of Police, Commissioner Salisbury, who spoke to a prominent person in this State about this matter. If the honourable member wishes to know who that person was I am prepared to tell him later. As recently as Thursday of last week the Commissioner of Police said that the police in South Australia suffered less interference from the Government than any other police force with which he had been involved throughout his career or any

force of which he knew. The honourable member can check with Commissioner Salisbury whether or not that statement is correct. In relation to the Government's attitude, I stand by what Commissioner Salisbury said as recently as Thursday last. I do not think I have to say anything else in defence of the Government or any Minister of this Government.

CRISIS CARE CENTRE

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Community Welfare report on the activities of the Crisis Care Centre? The centre has created much interest in my district since it was established about a year ago, and indications are that the services being provided are extremely valuable. Although the Police Force has just been mentioned in a derogatory manner, I have been told that the police officers in my district have been extremely helpful in relation to referrals they make to the Crisis Care Centre. I would like to know exactly what is happening at the centre.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In his usual kindly manner the honourable member told me that he would be asking this question and I have prepared accurate information for him. Since it began in mid-February the service has attended more than 1 400 calls, all of which presented emergency or crisis situations. It has also dealt with over 11 500 telephone calls, about 25 per cent of which required some further attention. The records of the centre show that a wide cross-section of the community is using the service.

There is a continuing variety in the work load, but two major problems with which crisis care has to cope are marital disputes, frequently involving violence, and emergency accommodation. As a result of the recent announcements by the Federal Government to reduce funding for housing I believe the work load in relation to emergency accommodation will increase. I am happy to say (and this has been pointed out by the member for Florey) that the co-operation with the Police Department is most satisfactory, and about 60 per cent of the work is initiated by police referrals.

Some consideration is being given to the possibility of providing a crisis care service in country centres. I might add that in recent months the police and welfare departments in N.S.W. and Queensland have sought information about the service here in South Australia. Apparently those States can learn something about co-operation between the Government and the Police Department from South Australia.

VICTORIA SQUARE LAND

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question to the Deputy Premier is subsequent to an earlier Question on Notice. Will he indicate whether the company Jones Lang Wootton is acting on behalf of the Government or any semi-Government authority as a purchaser of land on the western side of Victoria Square? If it is, to what use will the land be put? In answer to my earlier question the Premier acknowledged that the Government owned land immediately north of Charles Moore (Australia) Limited which is currently being used as a car park and which is proposed as the site for an international hotel. However, he denied that the Government was purchasing, or was in the process of purchasing, land from any other site adjacent to Victoria Square. I have it on reliable information that the company I have mentioned is currently negotiating for land all around the current site of the Marine and Harbors Department building and I understand that, in fact, one purchase has already been made by this company. The land already purchased is land in Grote Street immediately west of Morialta Street. I ask this question of the Government because I wonder whether, in fact, the land is simply being held in the name of the company until some later date when it will all be transferred to the Government. I understand that it is well known throughout this area that the land is eventually to be purchased for use by the Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Which land are you referring to?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to land around the Marine and Harbors Department building and all the adjacent blocks. The building I have said that has already been purchased is on the land which, I think, currently holds the National Bank immediately west of Morialta Street on Grote Street. If the Government is not purchasing this land for its own use, can the Minister indicate what other bodies are purchasing this land? I ask this question because this is a prime Adelaide site and the Government obviously has an interest in it. It is well known that the Government would like to purchase all land adjacent to Victoria Square if it is not currently held by the Federal Government. Perhaps the Minister can also indicate to the House whether or not that is Government policy that it hold all land, eventually, adjacent to Victoria Square.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as the Government policy is concerned about the ownership of all land adjacent to Victoria Square there has been, to my knowledge, no policy decision taken on that matter. Certainly the Government has displayed interest in the purchase of land, if it becomes available, in Victoria Square. So far as the specific question whether negotiations are proceeding with any company (and I think that is the question the honourable member posed)—

Mr. Dean Brown: I asked whether the company I named was acting on behalf of the Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot answer that question, because I do not know. So far as I am aware no current negotiations are proceeding with any company holding land in Victoria Square, and I think that was the purport of the reply given to the honourable member. Whether or not inquiries are being made by, I take it, a real estate firm acting for the Government, I will find out if it is and why it is. Regarding the property of Angliss's behind the site of the proposed international hotel, I think that there is an understanding that, if and when we require that land, it is interested in negotiating with the Government. That is a different question from that which the honourable member has proposed. There may be interest around the old Marine and Harbors Department building because, as the honourable member would know, we are currently involved in building a new headquarters for the department at Port Adelaide and, therefore, there are studies going on as to what will happen to the existing housing for the department in Victoria Square. There may be, as a result of that, some inquiries going on. So far as I am aware (and I am certain it is the case), there are no current negotiations going on with any company or persons holding land in the vicinity that the honourable member has referred to. I will examine the question.

Mr. Dean Brown: By the company?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Between the Government and the company. There may be inquiries being made on behalf of the Government. I do not deny that, although I am not certain of it, and I will check for the honourable

member. I shall be only too happy to tell him whether this firm is making inquiries on behalf of the Government. The point I am making is that, to my knowledge, no specific negotiations are being carried out at the moment between any owners of land in Victoria Square and the Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: Your answer already disagrees with what has been given to me on notice.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member has the answers in front of him, I have not. I am saying what I believe to the extent of my knowledge. If I am wrong, I will tell the honourable member. I will get the information for him and let him have it as soon as possible.

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION

Mr. SLATER: My question is directed to the Leader of the Opposition, but it is not the question I should like to ask him. I should like to ask whether he organised the defeat of the member for Glenelg, but I know, Mr. Speaker, that you would rule that out of order. What action does the Leader of the Opposition intend to take in view of his very vocal public statement yesterday that he was opposed to the Federal Government's interference with the Australian Broadcasting Commission and to that Government's budget cuts imposed on the A.B.C.?

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member for giving me an opportunity to raise this subject yet again. It was most kind of him. The matter which I had the good fortune to discuss further with the Prime Minister last night is quite clear. Budget cuts in all departments have become necessary because of the colossal deficit left by the Whitlam Government.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously, members opposite, having asked the question, do not like the answer. That is the basis of the budget cuts that have become necessary, and those cuts have applied to every Government department.

Mr. Slater: You didn't say that yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Dr. TONKIN: The question raised yesterday was whether or not the A.B.C. should cut back its programmes. I say categorically, and I place on record my belief, that the programme area is the last place in which cuts should be made in the A.B.C. If any cutback at all is needed, in my opinion it should be in administration.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you got anything specific to suggest?

Dr. TONKIN: In relation to the specific items to which the member for Mitcham refers (and although he was invited yesterday, he did not turn up), I believe that programmes such as *This Day Tonight, State of the Nation,* and *Today at One* should all be maintained and should continue. It seems that members opposite have lost sight of the fact that decisions to axe those programmes have been made by the commission itself. The Prime Minister himself tells me that he wishes those current affairs programmes to go on and he has made his wishes known.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Where a large bureaucracy supports the presentation of programmes, I believe that bureaucracy must be looked at; that is where cuts in administration should be made. That does not in any way interfere with the independence of the A.B.C., because the journalistic staff and the people who put current affairs programmes to air are the people who should be maintained at all costs. It is something of a paradox that those people are temporary staff, whereas the people in the bureaucratic administration are permanent staff; it is extremely difficult to rationalise the administration of the A.B.C. Let me make quite clear that that was the statement I made yesterday, and I hold by that statement: the programmes put to air are the last things that should be cut in any cuts in the staffing of the A.B.C. itself.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether geological investigations have been carried out in areas of the Flinders Range by persons other than Mines Department employees where it was stated originally that only the Mines Department would carry out geological investigations in areas that I understand were classified A? I have been approached by a group of people who are concerned that some companies have licences to carry out geological investigations in areas which are classified A, and in which, according to the plan, the Mines Department was to have been the only body to carry out geological investigations, either for the Government or for any other interested person or body. Is this facet of the plan not being carried out in accordance with the plan, and is the Mines Department being by-passed by other people who are carrying out their own geological investigations?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member should check on the wording of the plan. That is one matter I must bring to his attention. Before the adoption of the plan, previous licences existed in the Flinders Range class A areas, and those licences have continued. I am sure the honourable member would not support a policy of the Government's retreating from those previous licences that were issued. Any exploration activity that takes place under those licences is strictly supervised and is subject to stringent conditions requiring the closest co-operation between the licensee and the department. They require, for example, that no work relating to the establishment of tracks, or anything of that nature, should be undertaken without approval and without further checking with the Environment Department. I shall get a more detailed report on this matter and bring it down for the honourable member as soon as possible.

CAR BODIES

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister for the Environment consider assisting a salvage firm which I understand is called Northern Salvage, of Whyalla, by providing a freight subsidy? I am not sure of the name of the firm, because the dirt created by the job has made the name difficult to read. The Minister is probably aware of a firm in existence out of Whyalla which has built a portable crushing plant to crush old car bodies into cubes of about 1·2 metres x 60 centimetres, rendering them suitable for reprocessing. The firm is operating in Port Wakefield and has been operating on Yorke Peninsula, cleaning up all the rusty car bodies in the used car lots, in the paddocks, and everywhere else. The Minister would be aware that, for the most part, wreckers' yards in country districts are conducted on a part-time basis. The owners often have other jobs and they are unable, because

of the cost involved, to dispose of old car bodies. More importantly, there is nowhere for them to take the bodies. Councils no longer want them in the dumps and the councils themselves cannot do much with the bodies. Yesterday I saw at Port Wakefield what a harbor old car bodies can be for rats, mice, and other vermin. They are environmentally ugly, as I am sure members would agree. The firm is operating as a commercial venture so that, the further it is from the reprocessing plant, the less economically viable the undertaking becomes. I am sure that the Minister would agree that the actions of this crushing plant could be viewed only as improving the appearance of the State. Therefore, I ask him whether consideration could be given to freight assistance, because it would allow that company to operate over a much wider area of the State to the benefit of us all.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I believe that this was the company which made an approach to the Premier's Department for assistance some months ago. The matter was examined by technical officers in the Industries Development Branch, and there was a report against giving assistance. If it is the same body, I think that one of the objections was that the portable crushing plant was not sufficiently strong to justify continued assistance. I know that that firm has operated in the Whyalla and Port Augusta areas, but I am surprised that it operated down as far as Port Wakefield.

Mr. Boundy: It's also in Minlaton.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I understand that car bodies, which have become an eyesore for many years, have become valuable recently as scrap metal. I am pleased that the company has cleaned up that much of the State. I think the impression was given that, as the company got farther away from its base, its cost of operations would be much more substantial, and it would be preferable to have an organisation with stronger equipment than that company had, if we were to look at serving a much wider area of the State. That is a vague memory of some months ago, and I shall be pleased to examine the matter to see whether I can give any assistance.

NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government intends to legislate as regards heavy and noisy motor vehicles similar to the way in which the Noise Control Bill will operate? Several constituents have called at my office and have expressed their pleasure at the introduction of the Bill, which does not cover motor vehicles, and letters have been sent to the Editor of the *Advertiser* on this matter. Therefore, I should be pleased to hear of the Government's present intention in this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government intends to act in this direction. I was rather disappointed to see some comments, which ought to have been more informed, that we were not doing anything. Cabinet decided that, once the standard was established in the noise Bill, it would simply be mirrored into the Road Traffic Act so that the same conditions would apply in both areas.

DROUGHT

Mr. VENNING: My question to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, is apropos the Premier's announcement about a month ago regarding loans to drought affected farmers. Will the Deputy Premier announce to the House in clear terms the details of conditions to which applicants must subject themselves before being able to participate in the offer of long-term Government loans, as announced by the Premier a few days ago? I also ask the Deputy Premier whether, despite the improvement in seasonal conditions, the Government will continue, until the break of the season next year, concessions on freight for the movement of stock, and particularly on the cartage of fodder. Primary producers have already expressed concern at the severity of the situation with regard to being able to participate in long-term low interest finance. When I visited certain parts of the State a fortnight ago, I was surprised to find that certain areas of the State were still under drought conditions. Certain primary producers will have to buy their seed for next year, and others are still carting fodder for their stock.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not propose to try to state the conditions which primary producers are required to meet before being eligible for finance under the scheme the Premier has announced. However, I will refer the question to the responsible Minister, the Minister of Lands, and obtain a report for the honourable member. I was under the impression that the Lands Department or the Minister had widely publicised the steps to be taken by people who considered that they might be eligible for this type of assistance. In addition, I know that officers of the Lands Department keep under constant survey those parts of the State subject to drought and, if necessary, adjust the matter. I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible so that he may have the information he seeks.

HERPETOLOGY CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government has any plans to establish a herpetology centre in South Australia? My question is prompted by pictures of and a report on Modbury High School that appeared in the *News* of November 24. The article states, in part:

The snakes, including a lace monitor, a python, and an eastern water dragon, belong to a member of the South Australian Herpetology Group. The science students in grade 8 at Modbury are studying animals with backbones, and the person concerned brought along some of his 40 species of reptiles to give a live session. He wants a special herpetology centre established in South Australia so that all school students can study live reptiles.

I say, for the Minister's benefit, that the report interests me, because it is a matter that I have raised previously, the last time being on August 20, 1974, to which a reply was received on November 12, 1974, from the Minister's predecessor. I draw the Minister's attention to the contents of that reply.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to examine the matter. I believe that, in the interpretative centre currently being constructed at the Cleland Conservation Park at a cost of about $150 000, a special section will be devoted to reptiles, but whether or not that includes live reptiles I do not know. I will examine the matter and provide the honourable member with a reply.

GROUP THERAPY

Mr. BECKER: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will investigate the holding of group therapy sessions in Adelaide, and report whether or not they contravene the provisions of the Psychological Practices

Act? This question arises from the death of a woman, reported in the press recently, during a group therapy session at the weekend. It has been reported to me that there are several groups in Adelaide running group therapy sessions and that in some cases medical practitioners are invited to attend each session so they can bulk bill Medibank for the group therapy. The death of the woman is causing concern in the community, and I ask whether the Government will investigate the practice.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I imagine that the Minister of Health would be concerned at the press reports, both yesterday and today, and I imagine that he would already have asked for some inquiry to be made. However, I will confer with him to see whether or not he has done this and, in the light of the honourable member's question, decide whether or not we should do something.

BEE-LINE BUS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government has taken any further action to extend Bee-line bus service to areas other than those in which it currently operates and whether thought has been given to making a Bee-line type of operation available from Adelaide railway station to the vicinity of the Royal Adelaide Hospital so that the many pensioners who travel by rail and are required to proceed on foot or take a taxi may be accommodated? The Minister will appreciate that he said earlier that the Government was examining the possibility of a loop taking in, I believe, North Adelaide. Whether that is so or not, the Government has indicated that it is interested in extending the Bee-line operations. I am especially interested in whether the Government has considered or will consider extending the service from Adelaide railway station so that at prime times during the day opportunity will be given to pensioners to be transported from the station to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and return.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know how many times statements have been made that, as soon as the buses that have been on order for about three years are available, the east-west Bee-line service will be introduced, the circular service will be introduced, and the private sector service that now has below-standard time tables will be brought up to Bus and Tram Division standards. That statement has been made so often that I am amazed that the honourable member has not heard of it. In any case, whether he has heard it or not, "Yes", we have not only considered making this decision but there will be an east-west Bee-line service, and we are concerned not only with the Adelaide railway station and the Royal Adelaide Hospital but also with the Adelaide bus depot, which is another important aspect. The honourable member brought a little bit of emotion into his question, when he referred to pensioners who had come to town by train and then had to walk or catch a taxi. I remind the honourable member that about two years ago the Government introduced transfer tickets, so that pensioners who come off the train need walk about 100 yards to King William Street and can board a bus there.

Dr. Eastick: How many of them know about this?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Perhaps when the honourable member is next asked to ask a question of this sort, he will be able to tell the pensioners that the service that they are seeking is, in fact, available.

LEGAL COURSE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to continue its financial support of the legal course now being undertaken at the South Australian Institute of Technology? This course was commenced this year because of difficulties of law students in finding places as articled clerks in the legal profession, and I understand that it has proved to be a success. It has been financially supported by the Government this academic year. I believe that there is likely to be an increase in the number of students offering for this course and, as it is vital not only for the profession but also for the institute and for students for them to be able to qualify, does the Government intend next academic year to continue its financial support?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that it will not be necessary for the State Government to give further support to this course. The understanding that was arrived at with the institute and the Board of Advanced Education was that the Government would support the course for the first year on the understanding that the institute and the board would give the course a high priority in its triennial submission. This was done, and I understand that that submission was accepted by the commission and that henceforth the course will be funded in the normal way by the Board of Advanced Education through funds granted by the Commission of Advanced Education. However, I will check and obtain further details for the honourable member.

ELECTRO-MAGNET

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to consider supplying the Mount Gambier hospital with an electro-magnet for removing steel splinters from eyes of injured workmen and others? I understand that people who are injured in such a way have to travel either to Adelaide or Melbourne to the nearest electro-magnet if the splinters prove difficult to remove. It is possible that a lengthy delay in transport could cause an injured person to lose an eye. I appreciate that providing an electro-magnet may be rather expensive, but I consider that such equipment should, for example, have a much more important priority than the beautification of the hospital. I should like to think that the Minister would consider this question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am sure that my colleague will give this matter every consideration.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Education give further details of the proposed establishing by the Government of community school libraries in rural communities that, I believe, will cater especially for country areas? Recently, a report on this subject appeared in a local newspaper in my district, and the community is interested in it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A committee has been set up to review applications from country communities, with the bias going to isolated country communities that have no chance of being able to generate library facilities other than through such a scheme. I believe there have been three applications from country communities to the committee, where people are willing immediately to go into the scheme. The honourable member is probably aware,

since the matter arose from an institution in his own district, that a parallel committee was set up to consider the possibility of similar library facilities being established for communities in association with technical colleges and institutions of the Further Education Department. Because of the bias in the Government's instructions to the committee on community school libraries towards isolated country communities, it is probably more likely that the second committee will be able to satisfy the honourable member's constituents. I believe that Pinnaroo and Lock are two towns that have made specific application to the community school libraries committee, and the honourable member may recall that provision was made in the Estimates this year to satisfy at least some of these applications. I will try to get a more up-to-date report from the State Librarian, as it is some time since I discussed this matter.

Mr. Wotton: Are they basing these centres on population?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: One problem is in relation to the size of the council area, and another is whether or not there is an institute library somewhere near and whether that library would be willing to surrender its book stock to what would become a community school library. They are probably more critical aspects of the problem than the one to which the honourable member has referred. Concerning the first committee, isolation and the inability to generate library facilities in any other way are the most important factors.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER

Mr. RODDA: My question to the Minister of Transport relates to the transfer of some of the South Australian railways system to the Commonwealth. I understand that the Minister is still the custodian and guide and philosopher in the matter of railway transport. What is the current situation relating to people who join the Overland express at Bordertown to travel to Melbourne? Also, what is the current situation relating to sleeping cars on the Blue Lake trains travelling to Mount Gambier? I have been told that people joining the Overland at Bordertown to travel to either Adelaide or Melbourne are unable to obtain sleepers and they have to sit in second-class cars. They are often embarrassed by the activities of passengers who are under the influence of alcohol. Also, people in the South-East are anxiously awaiting a decision on sleeping car accommodation on the Blue Lake express train. People in the South-East use the railway system for the transport of goods as well as for their own travelling convenience.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of any change in circumstances from those prevailing before the railways were taken over by the Commonwealth. The Overland is the Adelaide to Melbourne express, and it was designed to cater for that traffic. Notwithstanding that, I find it difficult to accept that, if sleeping or first-class accommodation is available, it is not provided for people wanting it. I accept that it may not be economical or desirable to provide sleeping car accommodation for a person wanting to travel only between Bordertown and Melbourne to the exclusion of people wanting to travel between Adelaide and Melbourne, but I would think that, if accommodation was available, it would be provided for passengers embarking at Bordertown.

About two years ago we asked the railways to provide sleeping accommodation for pensioners who were exercising their just rights in having a reduced fare. Up to that time pensioners were entitled to a half second-class rail ticket and if they wanted to travel first class or to take a sleeper they had to buy a complete ticket, notwithstanding that empty first-class seats and sleeping car accommodation were available. We finally persuaded the then Railways Commissioner to allow that type of accommodation to be used by pensioners when it was available. I would have thought exactly the same conditions would apply in the case of persons travelling on the Overland between Bordertown and Adelaide or Melbourne. I will ask the State Transport Authority to give an up-to-date report on the matter.

FISH

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from Minister of Fisheries the present and future policy of the Government regarding net fishing in and about the Murray mouth? I have received two visits from a Mr. Kirby and a Mr. Clark of Victor Harbor, who have expressed concern about the extreme wastage of undersize fish, particularly carp and bream, whilst fishermen are catching mullet in that area. They have asked me to obtain specific information in relation to the following questions. How many class A and class B licence holders fish in the area mentioned? Is the department supplied with a catch return from both class A and class B licence holders? If so, over which period of the year do these licence holders supply returns? Do these returns classify the various fish species, and are those species identified in the return by volume or by weight? For example, where mulloway, bream and mullet are involved, by what system are the respective volumes measured? I realise that the question is complex but there is a section of the community which, whilst appreciative of the industry needs to have access to catch fish by nets, is concerned about the wastage by so doing. I will supply the figures about this wastage for the Minister if necessary, but I believe they relate specifically to young carp and young bream, which as a result of becoming enmeshed in the net, drown and/or become so distressed during the short time that the net is set that even if they are put back into the water they die. In the opinion of the persons I have mentioned, the fish resources in the area are being seriously depleted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague. I know the problem is not isolated to the area to which the honourable member has referred. I will obtain a report as soon as possible.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill proposes three disparate amendments to the principal Act—(*a*) it adds to the land comprised in the Fesival Centre, section 1188 in the hundred of Adelaide. This section is more particularly delineated in the proposed new third schedule to the principal Act; (*b*) it makes clear that the trust has power to enter into contracts operating outside the State; (*c*) it rationalises the situation relating to control of motor vehicles and parking in and about the Festival Centre.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by providing a definition of section 1188 which is self-explanatory. Clause 4 amends section 20 of the principal Act and clarifies the powers of the trust in relation to contracts and in the manner adverted to above. Clause 5 enacts a new section 29c in the principal Act and formally "conveys" section 1188 to the trust.

Clause 6 amends section 35 of the principal Act (*a*) by providing a power to make regulations relating to the fixing of fees for parking; and (*b*) by providing a form of "owner onus" in relation to offences relating to motor vehicles. Clause 7 inserts two new sections 36 and 37 in the principal Act, and for convenience these sections will be dealt with *seriatim*. Proposed new section 36 will enable the trust to collect "expiation fees", in amounts not exceeding $10, for parking offences. Proposed new section 37 vests in the Adelaide City Council the power to regulate traffic movement, parking and associated matters in and about the centre. This assumption of power by the council in this matter has been proposed following discussions with the trust and in all respects seems to be the most convenient arrangement. Clause 8 inserts a schedule in the principal Act delineating section 1188 in the hundred of Adelaide.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGIONAL CULTURAL CENTRES BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of regional cultural centres; to provide for their operation and management; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill provides the legislative framework within which regional cultural centres may be established as and when required in this State. Since of their nature the scope and functions of regional cultural centres may vary, this measure can do little more than establish a framework, leaving the precise functions of each cultural centre to be filled out by regulations, which are of course subject to disallowance in this House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure. Clause 4 provides that the Governor may by proclamation designate a place within the State in relation to which a regional cultural centre may be established. Clause 5 provides that, upon the designation of the place, a trust will be established by the Governor consisting of six trustees of whom two are to be appointed on the nomination of the local authority within whose area the regional cultural centre is to be established. A right of recall is provided at proposed subclause (4) for a council in relation to its nominated trustees.

Clause 6 merely deals with the situation where a regional cultural centre is proposed to be established outside the area of any council. Clause 7 provides that each trust will be a body corporate with all the usual incidents of such a body, and clause 8 sets out in broad terms the powers of the trust. Subclause (3) makes it clear that accommodation in the centre can be made available to libraries established or subsidised under a law of the State. Clause 9 provides for meetings of the trust, and is in the usual form. Clause 10 provides for the trustees to be remunerated out of the funds of the trust at such rates as are approved by the Governor. Clause 11 is a validating provision in the usual form. Clause 12 enables the trust to employ such people as it thinks necessary.

Clause 13 is commended to members' special attention, as it gives power to the trust to borrow against a Treasury guarantee. Clause 14 grants certain exemptions from stamp duty, succession duty, and gift duty on gifts or devises to a trust. Clause 15 provides machinery for the Governor to dissolve a trust in appropriate circumstances. Clause 16 is formal. Clause 17 provides what might seem in the circumstances to be a very wide regulation-making power, but is proposed because of the variation in the activities that will be stimulated by the various regional cultural centres.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 4)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1976-77 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 4), 1976.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending June 30, 1977, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

I submit for the consideration of the House Supplementary Estimates of $4 000 000. In the normal course, appropriation authority to supplement that approved by Parliament in the main Appropriation Act would be sought somewhat later in the financial year. In 1976-77, however, it is possible that Parliament may not reconvene after the present sittings until the latter months of the financial year. Accordingly, it is necessary to introduce Supplementary Estimates now to ensure that sufficient authority exists for payments to be made until then.

The year, 1976-77: I will give members some brief information about trends and prospects of Revenue Account but point out that, because seven months of the year have yet to run, any forecast now of a possible final result for 1976-77 should be taken as a broad estimate only. There is still plenty of time for unexpected factors to emerge and for trends to change. The Revenue Budget, presented to the House in September last, forecast a balanced result. Recent reviews have shown that both receipts and payments are running slightly in excess of budget. The net effect is expected to be fairly small and a balanced result is still a possibility. However, I am inclined to the view that a relatively small deficit is more likely. The major items of receipts which are running above budget are pay-roll tax and stamp duties, the latter being mainly on conveyances and on motor vehicle transfers. In total these could turn out to be from $5 000 000 to $7 000 000 above estimate. These increases in receipts are being matched in broad terms by higher payments, particularly in the areas of education and health care. The decision to give further support to the unemployment relief programme will add to the total of payments.

Appropriation: Turning now to the question of appropriation, members will be aware that early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by estimates of expenditure. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund and a further Appropriation Bill supported by supplementary estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from any award, order or determination of a wage fixing body, and to meet any unforseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage increases with the remainder being met either from within the original appropriations or by calling on the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: The second source of appropriation authority, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, established in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this amount one-third is available, if required, for purposes not previously authorised either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. The fund may be called on for appropriation to cover salary and wage determinations which do not fall strictly within the provisions of section 3 of the Appropriation Act.

Supplementary Estimates: The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations and this is the reason why only one line is included on these Supplementary Estimates. It is usual to seek appropriation only for larger amounts of excess expenditure by way of an Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates, the remainder being met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Depending on trends in departmental expenditures, it may be necesary for Parliament to consider a second set of Supplementary Estimates later in the year.

Details of the Supplementary Estimates: With these authorities in mind then, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates of $4 000 000 under the "Minister of Labour and Industry—Miscellaneous" section of the Budget. On August 2, Cabinet approved the establishment of a unit to administer the Unemployment Relief Scheme, including the Youth Unemployment Work Unit, within the Department of Labour and Industry. It follows then that appropriation authority for the grants to be made available under the scheme will be provided under "Minister for Labour and Industry—Miscellaneous". Appropriation authority of unemployment relief has been provided previously under "Minister of Lands—Miscellaneous".

Members will recall that the Supplementary Estimates I presented to the House in June included an amount of $10 000 000 to finance works aimed at providing jobs through the first seven or eight months of 1976-77. These funds were also used for the establishment of the Youth Unemployment Work Unit. The allocation will ensure employment for approximately 870 persons until February, 1977. In October, Cabinet approved a further allocation of $4 000 000 to continue the programme at about the same level until June, 1977. The estimates presented in August last did not include an amount for this purpose. Consequently the $4 000 000 is for a new purpose and will impact on the Governor's Appropriation Fund. As outlined earlier in my remarks, only one third of the fund may be used for new purposes. As the amount required for unemployment relief exceeds that figure, it is necessary to seek authority through these Supplementary Estimates.

As to the clauses of the Bill, they give the same kinds of authority as in the past. Clause 2 authorises the issue of a further $4 000 000 from the General Revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum for the purposes set out in the schedule. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorised by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Australian Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorised by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1976. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill to the House.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CREDIT UNION BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration, administration and control of Credit Unions and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The introduction of this Bill is of major significance to South Australians. It recognises for the first time the separate needs and entity of a rapidly growing credit union

movement. Just as the Building Societies Act of 1975 gave separate legislative foundation to building societies, this Credit Union Bill of 1976 answers a Government promise to provide similarly for credit unions in a manner that is more appropriate to their activities and services than the Industrial and Provident Societies Act which previously served both building societies and credit unions.

The introduction of this Bill comes at a time when most other States in Australia are seeking to introduce similar legislation. While New South Wales has a Credit Union Act, this Bill is unique in Australia in its provision, not only for the formation and registration of credit unions, but for a Credit Union Stabilisation Fund to assist their financial stability. In so doing, it draws largely upon the provisions of a model Bill prepared by the Australian Federation of Credit Union Leagues, and upon legislation passed in Canada, where the credit union movement has provided financial services to the community since the turn of the century. In its modern and comprehensive dealing with credit unions, this Bill is certain to serve as a precedent for other States.

While this Bill has only been sought by most credit unions for the past two or three years, credit unions have in fact been operating in South Australia since 1948. From this beginning credit unions have grown until 40 credit unions with assets of more than $42 000 000 now serve over 62 000 South Australians. Throughout Australia there are 738 credit unions serving 900 000 people. The first co-operative non-profit organisation of this kind was established to provide financial services for a group of drought striken farmers in Germany in 1850. The use of credit unions spread to North America in the early twentieth century, where every State and province of the United States and Canada now has legislation separately providing for their activities. Today, a World Council of Credit Unions presides over 58 000 credit unions operating in 72 countries and serving 52 000 000 people, and the communities in which they live.

Against such an international background, the reasons for this Bill are virtually self-explanatory—an inevitable step welcomed largely by credit unions as part of their growth and sophistication. It is also natural that this Government would support co-operative organisations of this kind: credit unions are established for the financial needs of their members, rather than for profits; members have equal voting rights; loans granted by credit unions to their members are generally small, designed to meet the personal needs of the average person; and credit unions often have a community, geographical or common bond base.

However, with such aims, the credit union movement itself has recognised that credit unions are often managed by people who are well-motivated but who lack expertise in financial matters. This has caused a few credit unions to flounder in recent times. This Bill therefore seeks to achieve a balance between encouragement of the activities of credit unions and regulations to ensure competent management and financial stability, so as to protect the interests of South Australians who belong to credit unions. It should in no way hinder the operations of a well-run, financially stable credit union. But, importantly, it provides for a Credit Union Stabilisation Board to have powers to supervise the activities of a credit union in financial trouble, and to assist that credit union financially from a fund established by the contributions of credit unions themselves. The self-help nature of a credit union is thereby reflected in the legislation itself, together with appropriate controls seen as necessary by the Government and most credit unions.

In addition to the provisions relating to the Stabilisation Board and its supervisory powers, the Bill therefore provides for a Registrar of Credit Unions who is to have administrative control over the formation and registration of credit unions, and to work and co-operate with the Board in matters affecting the financial stability of credit unions. The Bill also provides for directors' qualifications and duties, auditors' responsibilities, minimum levels of liquid funds and reserves, authorised investments, and potential controls of maximum loans and interest rates.

The Bill also recognises the existence of associations of credit unions, formed to promote the interests of their member credit unions rather than to trade as credit unions. In South Australia, at present, there are two such associations, the Credit Union League of South Australia which has 19 affiliated credit unions, and the Savings and Loans Association of South Australia. In relation to associations, the Bill provides more flexible and lenient regulation of their monetary policies in keeping with their greater financial strength, management expertise, and differing function.

This Bill is the culmination of six years' work to develop adequate legislation. The Government expresses its gratitude to the credit union movement for their contribution to the formulation of the new legislation, and particularly to the Australian Federation of Credit Union Leagues for its preparation of a model Bill. A similar model Bill prepared by a Working Committee of the State Registrars having responsibility for credit unions has also been of use.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill in detail. Part I deals with formal preliminary matters. In particular clause 4 deals with the transition of control of credit unions and associations of credit unions from the Industrial and Provident Societies Act to the new Act. Part II deals with the administration of the Act. Clause 6 provides that the Governor may appoint a Registrar of Credit Unions, who may seek advice from the Public Actuary, and may delegate his powers.

Clause 8 provides that the Registrar shall maintain a public office, where all documents registered under this Act shall be kept and may be inspected. Clause 10 empowers the Registrar to inspect any records relating to the affairs of a credit union or association, whether the records are in the custody or control of a liquidator or bank or any other institution. A similar provision is in the Building Societies Act. Part III includes clauses 12 to 26 and deals broadly with the formation and registration of credit unions. Clause 12 is intended to ensure that a body of persons that is carrying on the business of a credit union in South Australia registers under the Act unless it is a credit union formed elsewhere and is exempted by the Minister from registration requirements. A savings and loans society operating in South Australia will be required to register as a credit union under the Act.

Clause 14 requires 25 or more natural persons to form a credit union. This is aimed at ensuring substantial support for a credit union before it starts business. Clause 15 sets out registration requirements aimed at satisfying the Registrar that the credit union will be able to carry out its objects successfully upon registration. Upon registration a credit union is a body corporate. The rules of a credit union must be registered at the time that a credit union is registered. Clause 19 permits the rules to be altered by special resolution of the credit union, and clause 20 enables the Registrar to modify the rules where in his opinion a rule does not conform with the best interests of members of the credit union, the public interest

or the Act. (The regulation making power also provides for Model Rules to be prescribed to assist credit unions in their operations.)

Clause 20 provides an appeal to the Credit Tribunal against a modification of rules by the Registrar, as well as his refusal to register a credit union or its rules. Clause 22 follows a provision of the Business Names Act in allowing the rejection of a name used by a credit union which is undesirable or misleading. Clause 25 provides that credit unions may amalgamate by special resolution of each credit union that is a party to the amalgamation, after detailed advice of the proposal has been given to its members. Such an amalgamation must be approved by the Registrar who, with the consent of the Stabilisation Fund Board, may dispense with the special resolution requirement, where an amalgamation needs to be completed quickly. In this provision can be seen one of the basic concepts of the Act. The Registrar is given administrative responsibilities, and the role of protecting the financial stability of credit unions is given to the board. The board also has power in later provisions of the Bill to order the amalgamation of a credit union that is under supervision with another credit union.

Part IV deals with membership and share capital of credit unions. Each member of a credit union holds the same number of shares. Under clause 29, a corporate body can be a member of a credit union after its formation, but is subject to the same voting and shareholding rights and limitations as any natural member. This protects the interest of members of credit unions, in preventing corporate control. Clause 30 in dealing with share capital provides that shares are of equal value, that each member must hold the same number of shares, and that the full nominal value hereof must be paid before allotment. (This normally is an amount of approximately $10.)

Part V (clauses 33 to 46) is concerned with the monetary policies of credit unions. Division I deals with raising funds, either by accepting deposits from members, or by borrowing. Clause 34 ensures that a credit union cannot borrow more than an amount exceeding 25 per centum of the aggregate of the total amount of its deposits held, its total paid up share capital, and its reserves, unless the Registrar, upon the recommendation of the Board, approves otherwise. Division II deals with loans, and provides that a credit union may make loans only to its members. Clauses 36 and 38 provide for the Minister to declare maximum interest rates and the maximum amount that may be loaned in any case by a credit union. In the case of loans the maximum amount so declared may vary from one credit union to another. (A Public Service Savings and Loans Society may well be able to make loans up to $10 000, while a smaller credit union may need to be limited to a lesser amount. $4 000 is the general self-imposed limit of many credit unions at the present time.)

Division III provides for liquid funds and reserves. It has been the failure of building societies and credit unions alike to maintain an adequate proportion of assets in liquid funds, and of surpluses in reserve, that has caused those institutions to flounder when public confidence for various reasons has waned. The Government considers that there is an urgent need to require credit unions to hold a minimum proportion of their assets in liquid form.

Clause 41 therefore requires a credit union to maintain as liquid funds a sum not less than a prescribed percentage of the total of paid up share capital, the amount held by way of deposit, and the amount of outstanding principal of any loan made to the credit union. Clause 42 aims to ensure that a credit union plans for its future financial stability by transferring at the end of each financial year to a reserve account a prescribed percentage of the surplus arising in that financial year from the ordinary business of the credit union.

Division IV defines the manner in which a credit union may acquire property and invest its funds. Clause 43 ensures that a credit union has the consent of the Registrar upon the recommendation of the Board for the purchase of real property. Clause 44 outlines the investment policy of credit unions registered under this Act and requires investment in relatively safe investments. Clause 46 deals with the problem of dormant accounts.

Part VI deals with associations in a similar manner to credit unions, but without the same strict requirements as to monetary policies. Clause 47 provides that associations of credit unions must register under this Act. Clause 48 stipulates that four or more credit unions are necessary to form an association, to avoid a proliferation of associations. Clause 51 indicates that shareholding and therefore voting in an association may be proportional in accordance with its rules, provided that no member credit union may hold more than one-fifth of the share capital of the association. Clause 54 applies several Parts of the Act relating to credit unions to associations *mutatis mutandis,* subject to such modifications as are prescribed. In particular, the provisions relating to rules and the Registrar's powers to modify them, appeals, name and office, amalgamation, reserve accounts, management, winding up and offences are so applied.

Part VII provides for the internal management of a credit union. Clause 55 vests the management and control of a credit union in a board of directors, which is subject to regulation by a general meeting of members. Clauses 57 and 58 deal with appointment and eligibility of directors for office, and the circumstances in which such office becomes vacant. Clause 59 is important to proper management in providing for disclosure by a director of contractual interest with the credit union of which he is a director. Clause 60 is similarly important in preventing a director from engaging in activities which may conflict with the interests of his credit union and its members. Clause 65 sets out the duties and liabilities of directors.

Division II of Part VII provides for meetings of members and voting. Clause 66 ensures the annual general meeting of a credit union must be held within four months after the close of the credit union's financial year. Clause 67 explains that each member has one vote and that a decision shall be made by a majority of those persons entitled to vote who are personally present at a meeting. Clause 68: a special resolution shall only be effective if supported by not less than two-thirds of the votes cast and if registered with the Registrar. A special resolution is, for instance, necessary for a credit union to alter its rules.

Division III deals with registers and accounts. Clause 70 sets out the registers to be kept which include registers of loans made. Clause 73 requires the directors to keep certain accounts aimed at accurately recording the financial position of a credit union. Clause 74 requires the directors to cause a profit and loss account and a balance sheet to be laid before each annual general meeting. It is anticipated that the regulations under this Act will follow provisions of the Companies Act in stipulating the manner in which such accounts will be prepared and presented.

Clause 75 prescribes penalties of up to $1 000 for non-compliance with the provisions of Division III. Where fraud is involved the penalty is $2 000 or six months' imprisonment. Division IV deals with audit and largely follows Companies Act requirements. Clause 77 again

anticipates regulations based on the Companies Act provisions to ensure that an auditor cannot readily be removed by a credit union. The Government sees the need to ensure that an auditor is free to act independently. In addition to the accounts to be laid before a general meeting by directors, the auditor under clause 79 must also report at that meeting as to whether the accounts are properly drawn up. Clause 79 also gives an auditor powers of inspection of the books of a credit union, and requires the auditor to report breaches of the Act to the Registrar where he thinks it necessary.

Division V stipulates the returns to be transmitted by a credit union to the Registrar. Part VIII in providing for the Credit Union Stabilization Board, its fund to assist credit unions, and its supervisory powers of credit unions is perhaps the most important Part of the Act. It relies largely upon the provisions of the British Columbia Credit Union Act, 1975. Clause 81 deals with the formal establishment of the Board as a body corporate. Clauses 82 and 83 provide for the constitution of the Board, with five members, not less than two being representatives of credit unions or associations, and the terms on which they hold office. Clause 84 provides for allowances and expenses of members to be paid out of the Fund. Clause 87 indicates the functions of the Board which are to establish and administer the Fund, to encourage and promote financial stability of credit unions by supervision and advice, and to advance the interests of credit unions. Clause 89 provides for staff to be appointed by the Board with the approval of the Minister and allows public servants to be borrowed for that purpose with the consent of the Minister administering that department.

Division II provides for the establishment of the fund. Clauses 90 and 91 basically envisage three concepts:

(*a*) a credit union is to keep on deposit with the fund an amount equal to 2 per cent or other prescribed percentage of its share capital and deposits;

(*b*) this will involve an annual payment to the fund to maintain such a percentage;

(*c*) a levy may also be imposed on occasion by the board upon credit unions where the fund needs extra funds urgently.

The amount kept on deposit can be seen as an investment and the levy as an occasional expense. The provisions of clauses 90 and 91 also allow the board to relieve a credit union of these obligations wholly or partially where it thinks such action is proper. It is likely that the board may exercise this power while the fund is being established in order to relieve credit unions from the burden of providing large sums immediately for the fund.

Clause 92 provides for the transfer of assets and liabilities of any existing stabilisation funds administered by an association to the board for the purposes of the fund, and any assets so transferred will be taken into account when the board is determining the obligation of a credit union to contribute to the fund. Clause 93 stipulates the manner in which the fund may be used for the financial assistance to a credit union, whether by way of direct grants or by loans. Under clause 94, a member of a credit union which fails to satisfy its liabilities to the member may claim against the fund. Such a claim by a member would be strong grounds for placing the credit union itself under supervision.

Clause 95 is an important provision in supporting the stability of the fund and therefore, credit unions generally. The board may borrow from the Treasurer or from another source, with the consent of the Treasurer, and that loan will be guaranteed by the Treasurer. Clause 96 provides for investment by the board with the approval of the Minister. This opens the way for joint Government and credit union involvement in investments likely to assist the community. Division III provides for the board to supervise credit unions in financial trouble. In particular, clause 102 empowers the board to take certain actions in relation to a credit union placed under supervision, including prohibiting lending, appointing an administratior and removing a director. An administrator so appointed has, under clause 103, all the powers of the board of directors during his administration.

Part IX in dealing with winding up essentially applies provisions used in the Companies Act and the Building Societies Act to credit unions. Part X contains evidentiary provisions and prescribes certain offences. An important provision of this Part is clause 113 under which a board may require a credit union to insure against all risks—a provision similarly stressed in the British Columbia Act. Clause 120 allows the Registrar upon the application of not less than one-third of the members, or of his own volition, to hold a special meeting of a credit union, and inquire into its affairs. This power will be important in assisting the board to determine whether a credit union should be placed under supervision.

Clause 122 provides for the making of regulations on a number of matters. They include provision for model rules for credit unions or associations—an efficient means of implementing the policies of the Registrar, the board and the Act generally, advisory committees (already used in New South Wales), procedures for appeals to the Credit Tribunal, procedures for the board, and for modifications to the provisions of the Act in their application to associations. The first schedule to the Bill lists the various bodies previously registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act which are to be registered as credit unions under the Act upon its commencement. The second schedule specifies the body that is to be registered as an association upon the commencement of the Act.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 14 (clause 6)—Leave out the clause.

No. 2. Page 4, line 35 (clause 12)—After "of a person" insert "having professional qualifications in accountancy".

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

I have no option but to accept the amendment on behalf of the Government. I do so reluctantly, because I still believe that the Government's original proposition was the correct one. However, I do not intend to canvass all of the matters raised previously in the original debate in this Chamber, as they have now been dealt with by both Chambers and have been deleted from the Bill. I make the point that, in the debate in this Chamber, the member for Davenport accused me of reneguing on my word (he made great play about this) in relation to the pro rata provisions in the Long Service Leave Bill; it was also reiterated by the Hon. Mr. Burdett in another place.

Although I refuted it at the time, I was unable to turn up *Hansard* quickly. I will now place on record, as my refutation of the accusations made by both members, that, at page 2439 of *Hansard* of February 17, 1976, I said:

I admit that the present legislation still contains a misconduct provision, but it has caused much trouble over the years and it is intended to delete it from the Long Service Leave Act when it is amended later in the year. It seems futile to place a misconduct provision in this Bill when it is intended to delete it from the principal legislation.

The member for Torrens interjected:

The Committee does not know that.

He was referring to the Select Committee. I then said:

I am telling members now. I do not believe there is an argument to refrain from paying long service leave, after it has been approved, because of misconduct because I believe the man has earned it, is entitled to it and should be paid it, irrespective of the way in which he leaves his employment. It is the same as any other right: it becomes an entitlement.

I will not belabour this matter, because there is agreement regarding these amendments, but that is irrefutable proof that I have not reneged on my word: on the contrary, I gave notice to the House on that occasion of what I intended to do.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

This amendment provides that the appointee should have professional qualifications in accountancy and, as the Government considers this a good idea, I commend the Legislative Council for introducing it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment and am delighted that the Minister has had the common sense to accept both amendments, which will bring about a vast improvement in the operation of appeals.

Motion carried.

DEFECTIVE PREMISES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 3 (clause 1)—Leave out "Premises" and insert "Houses".

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 3)—After line 11 insert new definition as follows:

"'prospective occupier' in relation to a house means a person who proposes to occupy the house as a place of residence:"

No. 3. Page 1, lines 14 and 15 (clause 4)—Leave out "a person who proposed to occupy the house as a place of residence" and insert "a prospective occupier of the house".

No. 4. Page 1, line 20 (clause 4)—After "that" insert "good and".

No. 5. Page 2, lines 1 and 2 (clause 4)—Leave out "(being a contract to which a person who proposes to occupy the house as a place of residence is a party)" and insert in lieu thereof the passage "(being a contract to which a prospective occupier of the house is a party)".

No. 6. Page 2, line 7 (clause 4)—After "that" insert "good and".

No. 7. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—After "purchases" insert "or otherwise acquires".

No. 8. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—Leave out "five" and insert "two".

No. 9. Page 2, line 15 (clause 4)—Leave out "warranties under this section" and insert "statutory warranties".

No. 10. Page 2, line 17 (clause 4)—Leave out "proves" and insert "alleges".

No. 11. Page 2, line 18 (clause 4)—After "(*a*)" insert "not more than two years".

No. 12. Page 2, line 26 (clause 4)—After "result" insert ", wholly or in part,".

No. 13. Page 2, line 28 (clause 4)—Leave out "shall" and insert "may".

No. 14. Page 2, line 30 (clause 4)—After "may" insert ", upon proof of the allegation,".

No. 15. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 31 insert new subclause (4a) as follows:

"(4a) In any proceedings against a builder for breach of a statutory warranty it shall be a defence for the builder to prove—

(*a*) that the deficiencies alleged by the plaintiff do not result from any failure on the part of the builder—

(i) to carry out building work, or to supply materials, in accordance with the express terms of the contract;

or

(ii) to exercise due care in carrying out the building work stipulated by the express terms of the contract;

(*b*) that before completion of the building work stipulated in the contract the builder, by notice in writing, recommended to the prospective occupier for whom he undertook to build the house that—

(i) building work should be carried out, or materials supplied, otherwise than as stipulated in the contract; or

(ii) building work should be carried out, or materials supplied, in addition to the building work or materials stipulated in the contract;

and

(*c*) that if the recommendation of the builder had been carried into effect the deficiencies alleged by the plaintiff would not have existed;

unless the court is satisfied—

(*d*) that the builder was in fact instructed to carry the relevant recommendation into effect;

and

(*e*) that it was, in all the circumstances of the case reasonable that the builder should carry the recommendation into effect."

No. 16. Page 2, lines 38 and 39 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (*b*) and insert new paragraph (*b*) as follows:

"(*b*) offered him a reasonable opportunity—

(i) to inspect the premises to which the proceedings are to relate;

and

(ii) to make good any deficiencies in those premises."

No. 17. Page 3, line 1 (clause 4)—Leave out "The" and insert "Subject to subsection (7a) of this Act, the".

No. 18. Page 3 (clause 4)—After line 2 insert new subclause (7a) as follows:

"(7a) A builder is entitled to exclude or limit by contract his liability under this Act for deficiencies in the construction of a house where—

(*a*) those deficiencies result from reliance upon advice (not being gratuitous advice) tendered to the builder by a person holding himself out as being qualified or competent to give the advice;

and

(*b*) by virtue of an agreement or waiver made or granted before the commencement of this Act the builder has no right to indemnify himself in respect of that liability by action against the person by whom the advice was tendered."

Amendments Nos. 1 *to* 7:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs) moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 7 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 8:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

Its intention is to limit the protection of the Bill to a period of two years. The Government believes, on the advice it has received, that the desirable period for which

to provide protection would be five years, and I think that it is important that protection should be provided for that time.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 9 and 10 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 11:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 11 be disagreed to.

This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 8 and because that has been disagreed to, we should disagree to this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 12 to 18:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 12 to 18 be agreed to.

Mr. BOUNDY: I am pleased that, generally, the Government has accepted these amendments, but I am disappointed that it did not see the wisdom of accepting the period of two years instead of five years.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 8 and 11 was adopted:

Because the amendments seriously and substantially limit the effectiveness of the Bill.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1, lines 20 to 23 (clause 3)—Leave out the clause.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 2373.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This legislation was introduced by the Premier a short time ago with a relatively brief explanation, considering the impact that it will have on the community. The Bill contains four major parts: the first changes the amount of stamp duty payable in consideration of conveyances. The second change is in the provision for the use of adhesive stamps on mortgages and other securities that secure the repayment of sums between $400 and $4 000. There is an exemption for transactions other than credit and rental transactions involving sums less than $400 and those transactions are dutiable at present. The Premier then went on to say:

The opportunity is also taken to make some other fairly minor amendments to the principal Act.

He referred to the credit and rental provisions of the principal Act and the present definition of "credit arrangement". He then talked about authorising the Commissioner to authorise banks to issue cheque books on which stamp duty has been paid. This power was formerly exercised by the Treasurer. An amendment is made, almost as an afterthought, to section 66ab of the principal Act designed to tighten the provisions which prevent avoidance of duty by splitting land transfers. The Premier described the foregoing amendments as being fairly minor amendments but they will have far-reaching effects on the community of South Australia. Stamp duty charges, together with other State taxes and charges, have increased greatly since 1970. In 1970 the Government collected about $21 000 000 in stamp duties and the estimate for this year is $73 700 000, which is an increase of about 250 per cent.

Mr. Becker: That's not a bad rip-off.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and it is taking advantage of inflation in the best possible way. If last year is any guide the actual collections this year will be greater than the estimated $73 700 000. Last year the Government collected $10 000 000 more than it estimated. Even with the concessions embodied in this Bill, which the Premier has costed as $3 200 000 for a full year, the Government will still receive $8 700 000 more in stamp duties than it did last year. Stamp duties are providing a welcome bonus to this Government and it is pushing up its reserves to an even greater extent.

To put this matter into perspective and see what a rip-off it is and how the Government has actively used inflation to increase its own income, one has only to look at some comparative costs of stamp duties in conveyancing of property. I have been provided with these figures by people in the business. In May, 1973, they conveyanced cottages at Ingle Farm valued on average at $16 750 on which stamp duties payable were $278. At present, comparable cottages at Salisbury and Salisbury North are valued at $31 700 (nearly twice as much) on which the stamp duties payable are $711. The difference is considerable at that level. There has obviously been a considerable increase in the amount of stamp duties payable. It is obvious that those increases are exorbitant and out of proportion with the actual increase in the value of the properties. The Premier is on record as admitting that conveyancing transactions on modest sums are presently taxed more severely in South Australia than they are in Victoria or New South Wales. Although concessions are made in the present legislation they do not go far enough. They are welcome as far as they go, but much more should be done to bring them into parity with the concessions applicable some years ago.

It seems that retail stores will be effected by the provisions relating to consumer credit in the Bill. This matter is giving considerable concern to retail stores and it is far from being a minor amendment. The definition leaves a possible loophole. Many retail stores have different types of account: monthly accounts, No. 2 accounts and budget accounts to which customers may charge items, which cost considerable sums, and pay a monthly repayment and interest. Under the terms of the credit arrangement made in 1968 the retail stores obtained a written undertaking from the Premier to enable the credit arrangement for a specific customer to be calculated on each of the accounts separately. Under the terms of the legislation as introduced, these accounts could be calculated together. If the accounts are amalgamated the sum of $400 will be reached far more easily and at an earlier stage, and duty will be paid on a far wider range of customer accounts.

As I understand it, the Commissioner did not intend this to happen, and the situation to change, and hopefully in the case of major retailers the arrangement will not be changed. One firm has entered into a separate agreement for each

transaction to avoid this sort of amalgamation. An assurance is required that the same situation will apply as has applied since 1968, and that duty will be assessed in exactly the same way. I understand considerable discussions have taken place between the Commissioner and the legal advisers to certain retail traders. If the letter of the law is to be changed as it is set out in the Bill the interpretation could be such that no assurance would be worth while anyway. It is hard to make any reasonable amendment to this clause. It has been looked at by several people, but it is not possible really to come to any satisfactory conclusion and I understand the Commissioner is aware of this situation and is concerned about it. I would like an assurance from the Deputy Premier that the situation regarding retail stores will not be changed. That is the only reasonable and fair assurance to give.

Clause 4 seeks to amend section 66ab of the principal Act and concern has been expressed about this, that section was included in the Act in August, 1975. It was intended to stipulate that when conveyances arose from the one transaction the consideration was to be aggregated for stamp duty purposes. It was designed to close a loophole, and in many cases it has. I think that was fair enough, but with the increasing development within the Adelaide metropolitan area, with the South Australian Land Commission becoming the major source of subdivided land for residential building purposes, an increasing number of builders will rely on the commission for a continuing supply of allotments on which to construct houses for sale to the general public, so that the proposed amendments to the principal Act as we are considering them now will have a considerable effect. It will increase the ultimate cost of housing because most builders of any volume will be required to pay stamp duty at the maximum rate on virtually all land purchased because they will be buying allotments from the Land Commission. Therefore there will be a whole series of transactions between the one purchaser and the one vendor. This will significantly escalate the cost of subdivided land and houses erected on that land.

Mr. Nankivell: It will aggregate all the sales.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, between the two parties. I sincerely hope that that was not the Government's intention when it introduced this measure. When there is a deliberate attempt to hide a major purchase and to pay duties at a lower rate, the loophole that exists in present legislation should be closed. I cannot see the point of actively increasing still further the cost of housing in this State by Government action to rip off (which is what it is again) more duty from builders and ultimately from young people who wish to buy houses.

The situation will apply also to subdivided land marketed by the few remaining private land developers engaged in land subdivision in the metropolitan area. In the field of construction and the marketing of speculative housing, it is not uncommon for a builder to buy a small number of allotments from a vendor in an area and, subject to the success of the initial marketing programme of the completed houses, continue to buy small numbers of allotments from the same vendor or separate and distinct transactions on which to maintain building operations. From the experience of companies involved, it would seem that the Land Commission is encouraging actively this form of land marketing on its various subdivisions. The effect of the proposed amendment to section 66ab of the principal Act will mean that any purchase by a builder from the same vendor, irrespective of any widely separated location of the land purchased (another factor not taken into account), will increase effectively stamp duties applicable to any purchase from the same vendor for a total period of two years; that is, 12 months before and 12 months after the transaction.

The cost effect of this method of assessing stamp duties payable on any such series of transactions, which may not have been remotely considered at the time at which the initial purchase of allotments was made, can be illustrated by many mathematical exercises based on any series of transactions over a given period and the proposed amended rates of stamp duties. It is sufficient to say that the arithmetical progressions that could be involved are mind boggling. The sums are potentially astronomical.

Mr. Allison: Dearer than the land.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. What a ridiculous situation! A company would be obliged to pay a sum dearer in stamp duties for the transfer than the original purchase price of blocks. That is absolutely ridiculous, and I am certain that the Government could not sit and contemplate it with any degree of satisfaction. Obviously, someone has made a mistake. Where a company buys a block of land at the beginning of a period and must pay stamp duties equivalent to the cost or more of the land that is not a fair proposition: it is another rip off. I sincerely hope that this time it is an unintentional rip off that has arisen because someone has not considered adequately this legislation.

Mr. Allison: It's the retrospectivity angle.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and increased costs after aggregation; they are the factors that will apply. Inevitably, in the long term, the increased cost of stamp duties to builders on any succession of land purchases from the same vendor will increase effectively the cost of a house to the ultimate purchaser by an amount significantly greater than the proposed reduction of $80, which the Premier referred to in his second reading explanation. The crunch comes when one considers the proposed reduction in stamp duties of $80 and realises exactly what that concession is worth. It will be worth nothing compared to the increased sums that will be paid by speculative builders and builders working on small numbers of allotments at a time and buying them from the same vendor, probably in this case the Land Commission. That is a clear anomaly that must be cleared up before this Bill is passed. It is absolutely impossible to justify that situation and it will put home ownership still further out of the reach of many young people in this State.

It is obvious that clause 4 must be amended if we are to prevent a further increase in housing costs in South Australia, especially as our housing costs are now the second highest in Australia. We have the unenviable record of having the highest building costs in many areas, particularly in the labour-intensive areas, of any State in the Commonwealth. We cannot be proud of that, either. I will give the Government the benefit of the doubt and believe that this effect of the Bill was not foreseen when it was drafted and that the anomaly has arisen as an oversight. By the same token, we shall see, by the Government's attitude, whether or not this is a deliberate policy. I hope sincerely that that is not right, because it seems to me that it is a colossal rip off.

In January of this year a prominent building company in South Australia entered into an agreement with the Land Commission to buy 15 allotments in stage 1 of a subdivision. In stamping the transfer, the Commissioner of Stamps applied section 66ab of the Stamp Duties Act, as a result of which the firm had to pay an additional $680

stamp duties. In a letter to the firm the Stamp Duties Division indicated that the basis of the assessment was that the transfer of 60 allotments (that is stages 1 to 4) together form or arise from substantially one transaction. In August of this year the company through its solicitors lodged a formal notice of objection to the assessment. The grounds of appeal are listed as follows:

1. That the abovementioned conveyance arises solely from one *bona fide* separate and independent contract dated the 27th day of January, 1976.

2. That the abovementioned conveyance by itself forms one independent transaction.

3. The Commissioner wrongfully claims that three future conveyances (such future conveyances being instruments yet to come into existence to give effect to three other contracts separately and independently negotiated between the parties) together with the said conveyance form or arise from substantially one transaction.

4. The Commissioner has wrongfully applied section 66ab in the circumstances.

5. That the abovementioned conveyance should not be treated as forming substantially one transaction with the said future conveyances.

6. The abovementioned conveyance should not be treated as arising from substantially one transaction with the said future conveyances.

In November of this year the firm was notified that its objection had been allowed, which of course it should have been. It would have been totally against every principle of justice if the company's objection had not been allowed. It is clear that the Government had discovered that existing section 66ab did not allow it to apply duties in this way. What concerns me deeply is that this Bill, under the provisions of clause 4, will allow the Government to increase the stamp duties payable on such a transaction. That is totally unjust, unreasonable and unfair. How on earth can any company, with the Land Commission of this State virtually building up the biggest monopoly of all time, be expected to pay stamp duties over a two-year period for existing stage 1 development and future and nebulous stages 2, 3 and 4 developments, and therefore pay stamp duties at the aggregated rate? I cannot see the justice of that. If that was the Government's intention, I will strongly oppose the provision, which is totally inequitable.

The overall effect of this Bill in providing small concessions in stamp duties to home buyers in the first instance is a sprat to catch a mackerel; that is the sugar coating of a very bitter pill. By increasing the stamp duties payable by builders in some circumstances and hitting the home buyer by increased home costs, and once again increased stamp duties on those negotiations, is negating the whole principle of the original intent of the Bill. I find clause 4 objectionable and obnoxious; I believe some change should be made to it. I believe it is right that loopholes should be closed but they should not be closed in such a way that the ordinary land and house buyer is penalised because of a blanket provision to stop every loophole, justly or unjustly. That is exactly what this Bill does.

I think it is entirely proper that in these circumstances we must amend clause 4 and provide that the Commissioner should have some say in whether or not a transaction of this nature can constitute one transaction, one conveyance. I think the best way of dealing with this is by putting in a provision that the Commissioner should be satisfied that the conveyances arose out of one transaction or one series of transactions, not that that should be automatically taken for granted. If we can make that change to the Bill, I am prepared to accept it, because it will make the original concessions worthwhile. Without it, I totally oppose the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support the comments of the Leader. Stamp duties as a form of collecting revenue are part of the Dunstan piracy of the people's purse in South Australia. One only has to look at the figures to see the extent to which the Premier has pirated the purse of the people through stamp duties. I go back to 1970-71 when the Dunstan Government initially collected in its first year of office, $20 500 000. The estimated amount for the current year, 1976-77, is $73 700 000. That is an increase of 270 per cent in six years. Now the Premier is offering a meagre $80 refund on an average transaction. The Premier in his second reading explanation on the Appropriation Bill (No. 4), which has just been circulated to the House, states:

The major items of receipt which are running above budget are pay-roll tax and stamp duties, the latter being mainly on conveyances and on motor vehicle transactions. In total these could turn out to be from $5 000 000 to $7 000 000 above estimate.

In other words, the Premier is offering in the current Bill to refund $3 200 000, yet he is openly admitting that because of increases in conveyances and pay-roll tax his Budget is likely to be up by $5 000 000 to $7 000 000. We see the extent to which the Bill before us is no more than a token effort. I refer to some figures to show how extensive the increase has been in the past three years. I mentioned the total increase between 1970 and 1977 but, to take a specific case, in 1973 the stamp duties on a property worth $16 000 were $270. The stamp duties today on a similar home in an outer suburb would be $711, an increase in three years of $441, or about 180 per cent. The reduction of $80 offered by the Premier is quite meaningless.

I make a comparison between South Australia and the other States, because the Premier is continually disowning the claim made by members of the Opposition that South Australia has now become one of the highest-taxed States in Australia. I stand by that statement. The Opposition has presented figures the Premier has not been able to refute. He produced some figures in an attempt to refute our figures, but when examining those figures we found them to be two years old. What a shabby trick, to produce figures two years old and claim that the Opposition was making false claims. Let us turn to where the Premier stands in relation to stamp duties. South Australia has the highest conveyance cost through stamp duties of any State in Australia. As an example, I take a conveyance valued at $40 000. The cost in South Australia, before this minor reduction, was $960; in New South Wales, $700; in Victoria, $800; in Western Australia $575; in Queensland, $700; and in Tasmania, $700.

Even when we allow for this $80 reduction, which will apply to all conveyances valued at more than $20 000, we see that the South Australian figure is reduced only to $880, which is still by far the highest of any State in Australia. The next highest figure is for Victoria at $800, and the average for the other States is about $675. It can be seen for an average conveyance of $40 000 that, even after the so-called grand concession from the Premier, the conveyance in South Australia through stamp duties collected will still be $200 higher than any other State in Australia except New South Wales, which has a Labor Government as well. The figure is 25 per cent higher than that of any other State. Yet the Premier still tries to claim that this is not a high-tax State. This is a high-tax State as the figures show. One area in which the Premier rips off more money than any other is the area of conveyances and stamp duties.

I support the proposed amendments outlined by the Leader. There is an urgent need to amend this Bill. If it is passed in its present form one can see the Premier collecting even greater amounts overall than he has collected in the past. This will happen because of the large number of blocks of land sold by the South Australian Land Commission to specific builders. Another anomaly in clause 4 is that, if land was transferred from person A to person B and person B transferred some quite different land back to person A (and that is conceivable where land is conveyed between agents or an agent and the Land Commission), one can see that in the aggregation under the new definition in clause 4 all that land conveyed would be lumped together. Therefore, not only would it collect in the net people who had been trying to dodge paying the necessary stamp duties by breaking their conveyance up into smaller conveyances but it would also now collect through this net because it is so broad people who genuinely transfer property from one party to another, and quite different property from the purchaser of the initial property to the seller of the initial property. One would hope that this legislation was not designed to catch such a transaction.

The Bill needs severe amendment. I do not believe that the Government has given adequate attention to it. I am disappointed that the Premier is not here, because I understand representations have been made to him for major amendments to be made to the Bill before it passes through this House. I should have liked to ask him whether he has received such recommendations and, if so, from whom, and whether he will take action to make sure that suitable amendments are made. If the Deputy Premier has not got the information, perhaps he will get it before the Bill is put through. It is important that we should know who has made representations to the Government and the nature of those representations. If the Government has found major weaknesses in the Bill, or if it has been told of them, this House should be made aware of it. I challenge the Deputy Premier and Acting Treasurer to come forward with that specific information.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Computation of duty in case of certain real property transactions."

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

Page 2, lines 7 to 12—Leave out subsection (1a) and insert subsection as follows:

(1a) Where—

(*a*) land or interests in land is or are conveyed between the same parties by separate conveyances;

and

(*b*) the conveyances have been, or appear to have been, executed within twelve months of each other;

it shall be presumed, unless the Commissioner is satisfied to the contrary, that the conveyances arose out of one transaction, or one series of transactions.

The situation as it was spelt out in the Bill was quite impossible. As I understand it, the Government has considered the situation and, in fact, has agreed that this is the best way out. It would have been impossible if the Commissioner did not have some degree of control in deciding whether such transactions should be regarded as one or a series. Inevitably there would have been escalating costs out of all proportion. My faith in the Government has been restored to some extent, provided the Minister accepts the amendment. It seems that the situation arose from an oversight and was not deliberate. I am grateful that the Minister will accept the amendment, which will make it possible for people, who have been caught under this blanket provision and who have every reason to prove that transactions were separate transactions and should not be aggregated, to satisfy the Commissioner of the position. It will vastly improve the legislation, taking away the inequity and the injustice which otherwise would have been perpetrated on many people. It will take away the cost escalation and pressure which would have been passed on in the cost of housing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Government has no objection to the amendment. I am sure everyone appreciates that, if we have any doubts, we can report progress while the matter is looked at, and that we can be big enough to accept that problems may have arisen if the amendment had not been agreed to. I am sure the Leader will realise how difficult it is, in drawing legislation of this nature, to tax those who should be taxed or those whom we wish to tax. Sometimes, a situation arises similar to the one that has arisen here. Clearly, it was not the intention of the Government to do this, and I appreciate the action of the Leader in drawing the matter to my attention. The advice of my officers is that we should accept the amendment. We have no hesitation in doing so, and I hope it will achieve what the Leader is setting out to achieve.

Dr. TONKIN: I pay a tribute to the Commissioner and his officers, who exercise their duties in an exemplary fashion. Their tasks are not easy at times, and they do not get a great deal of thanks from the community.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9) and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased to see the Bill in its present form but, perhaps because of the difficulties we were having in relation to the amendment, I omitted, in relation to clause 2, to bring to the attention of the Deputy Premier the situation I outlined in the second reading debate regarding the effect of this clause on multiple accounts of retail stores and retail traders. I think he understands the position, and I shall be glad to have his assurance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can give the assurance the Leader seeks. I think he knows that, generally, it has been accepted that in one case a little trouble arose.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 2516.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am most impressed by the willingness of the Government to take the advice of members on this side; debate obviously is well worth while. This Bill increases the amount of annual deduction from a pay-roll liable to pay-roll tax from a maximum of $41 600 and a minimum of $20 800 applying from January 1, 1976, to a maximum of $48 000 and a minimum of $24 000 applying from January 1, 1977. It represents an increase of about 15 per cent, and we are told that it is designed to allow for expected increases in wage levels for next year.

Pay-roll tax is a growth tax. It has become a growth tax and, once again, as in the case of the Bill debated immedately before this one, it has largely relied on inflation. The peculiar situation exists that pay-roll tax is a disincentive to employment, because it is not a tax on turnover or profit; it is a tax on nothing other than the pay-roll itself. It will depend entirely on the size of the work force. It affects all businesses, particularly medium to small businesses, and it is, I believe, seriously hampering the activities of many small business concerns in private enterprise.

In the succession duties legislation, allowance was made last year for inflation, and that matter has been discussed very recently. It virtually allows for the effect of inflation on the scale of duties payable in succession duties. The effect of this legislation in pay-roll tax is virtually to allow for the effect of inflation on pay-rolls; unfortunately, however, it applies only in this 12-month period. It does not change the fundamental proposition that, because of inflation in the past, pay-roll tax is effectively much more severe. When the exemption was last changed, in 1957, it was meant to allow for the average weekly earnings of 10 people. The figure now allows for fewer than five people.

The Premier has said that the move has been made to allow for inflation and wage increases. Certainly, as far as it goes, it is a welcome move, but it does not bring the exemption to anything like the level, in real terms, that applied in 1957 or in 1970. It is not indexation. The Premier will have to bring in similar legislation every year if he wishes to allow for inflationary trends. In any event, he should put a reasonable exemption level into the legislation if he really wants to make the concession worth while. I said last year in a similar debate that $75 000 as an exemption was not an unreasonable figure if we were to take 10 employees on the pay-roll as representing a reasonable exemption. The figure is much higher now, and if we are to allow for 10 people it could well be $90 000, or even more.

No real allowance is made for inflation. In 1971-72, the Government collected $23 400 000, and in 1975-76 it collected $119 500 000. That was more than five times the amount it collected in 1971-72; the sum had increased by five times over a period of four years. This year it is expected that the Government will collect $136 000 000 from pay-roll tax. The exemption in no way has kept up with inflation. The distressing thing is that it has been generally recognised that the recovery of the private sector is essential for the recovery of the economy of this State and of this country, and for the relief of unemployment. Once again, the Government is doing nothing more than paying lip service to the recognised problem. Obviously, the Government recognises the existence of such a problem. It must do so, or it would not have made this exemption, but the exemption is not worth much when we consider what is happening with unemployment in South Australia.

Pay-roll tax could be used to provide a far greater stimulus to employment, as well as to decentralisation of industry. Although I need not do so, I point out again to members the debacle that has come about with pay-roll tax concessions offered for development in the green triangle and the iron triangle. The less said about Monarto, the better. Recently, in reply to a question in this Chamber, we were told that, although three or four applications were being looked at, after nearly 12 months not one firm had received any benefit from the pay-roll tax concessions announced in November last; not one cent had been paid out. Once again, we see, as was the case with the Bill discussed before this one, an example of the Government's making announcements of concessions but, when it comes to the point, doing nothing basically worth while, when it has the potential to do so much by using pay-roll tax concessions. There are two things we could do. We could increase the exemption, but I do not believe that it is possible or wise to increase it to an equivalent level in one bite. Let us put ourselves in the Treasurer's position of having to look for the funds.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You wouldn't be talking like you are now.

Dr. TONKIN: That is where the Deputy Premier is wrong, because we believe strongly that these disincentives to industrial development and employment are not in South Australia's best interests. Obviously the Deputy Premier does not think that it matters, but I assure him that there are many people in the community who would like to have the stimulus to create more jobs so that they would have the dignity of earning a living again instead of having to rely on unemployment relief. I think that the whole question should be solved by phasing in the concessions over three or four years. Undoubtedly, it is a matter for discussion between the States, but I believe that a reasonable case could be put forward. If one examines the meaningful and effective pay-roll tax provisions that apply in Victoria, for example, in respect of decentralisation in industrial development, one can see that this can be a real weapon in the fight against unemployment.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Victoria's percentage of unemployment is higher than ours.

Dr. TONKIN: That is even more reason why, if we put a firm case to the other States, we would get a very real response. I believe that the exemption could well start at $60 000, which is nowhere near the $90 000 originally in the Act; that would come down to a minimum of $30 000 but it is a matter for discussion and debate. I believe without doubt that we have in our hands now one of the most effective weapons against unemployment and in the fight for industrial development that we have been given in this State. In the present circumstances, I believe that the Government is paying no more than lip service. As with other State taxes (and the member for Davenport referred to these matters earlier this afternoon), the Government has been prepared to do the minimum possible in succession duties, land tax and, now, pay-roll tax to be able to say that it has done something, but that is all it has done: it has made a token gesture only. Until it does something more positive and meaningful, we will continue in what I very much regret to have to say is a stagnating South Australia.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support again the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on the Bill, which I will approach from the angle of unemployment. Australia, as we all realise, has a high level of unemployment, and South Australia faces exactly the same problem as other Australian States face in the unemployment area. True, South Australia has a lower unemployment percentage figure than have the other States. However, when one analyses the effect of the unemployment relief scheme in South Australia, one sees that the only reason for that is the large sum being spent on that scheme. I have congratulated the Government previously on spending money to create employment, and I will do so again. The State Government has already spent $4 000 000 in that area. An additional Appropriation Bill has been placed before us this afternoon to supply an additional $4 000 000.

Pay-roll tax is the basic disincentive for employers to employ extra labour, and the reasons for this are obvious: it is an additional cost of 5 per cent over and above existing wages, and it does not contribute to consumer demand. When one listens to statements currently being made by Mr. Hawke, urging Governments, particularly the Federal Government, to increase consumer demand, one hears him speak in favour of reducing pay-roll tax, because that would be one way of increasing consumer demand by increasing employment. There is a basic fault in Mr. Hawke's argument, as President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, because the 30 per cent increase in wages during the past 12 months has resulted in only a 1 per cent increase in consumer demand. Mr. Hawke's argument has always been that the Federal Government should allow full wage indexation to flow on in all circumstances, as that would increase the pay packet and in turn increase consumer demand. However, the figures of the past 12 months show that there has been a substantial increase in the pay packet, but there has been virtually no increase in consumer demand: the increase has been only 1 per cent.

As a major step towards tackling the unemployment problem at State level, I believe that the State Government should make major reductions in pay-roll tax. The New South Wales Premier advocated over the weekend, as part of his economic package, reduction in pay-roll tax. It is one of the few proposals in the package which I believe would be worth adopting and which would be in line with current Federal Government policy. I urge the Premier of South Australia to adopt that one part of the New South Wales Premier's proposal or economic package. The Premier continually uses the argument, however, that in South Australia we must have uniformity with the other States. Events of the past 12 months have already shot a hole in the Premier's argument. He used it last about 18 months ago but, on that occasion, there was not uniformity between the States, and there is still not uniformity between them.

Mr. Langley: There never will be.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The different States have different exemptions. I was pleased to hear the member for Unley say that there will never be uniformity between the States on pay-roll tax. He may have used his great insight on this matter, but I am pleased that he is prepared to come out and shoot down his own Premier's defence of this issue. It is his Premier who has continually claimed that there must be uniformity between the States, but there is no need for that. I suggest and put forward after examining the figures involved that, by granting a $18 000 000 concession in pay-roll tax, the South Australian Government would stimulate employment here by a greater number than just the number of people employed under the State unemployment relief scheme. I selected $18 000 000, because that is the sum it is proposing to spend under the scheme. I believe that it would be better to spend that money in granting reductions in pay-roll tax than it would be to collect the additional money through pay-roll tax and put it into a State unemployment relief scheme. I also believe that it would be a far more genuine stimulation to the economy.

Under the scheme, we see money being put into labour-intensive activities that are not stimulating national productivity in any way. It is money being spent, in many cases almost being wasted, because of the nature of the expenditure. There is a requirement that anyone applying for grants must guarantee that at least 50 per cent of the money is allocated to wages. I understand that councils have not been adopting accepted procedures for carrying out work with mechanical equipment, but rather are having human labour carry out tasks that could be carried out more efficiently with equipment. They have been doing this because they had to bring up the labour cost to 50 per cent of the money obtained under the relief scheme. I urge the Premier and the Government to reduce pay-roll tax by at least $18 000 000 in this half of this financial year and to stimulate employment in South Australia by this means rather than by collecting the additional tax and handing it back under the unemployment relief scheme. This year the State Government will collect more money in pay-roll tax than it estimated in the Budget it would collect; that is, an additional amount of between $5 000 000 and $7 000 000 in pay-roll tax and stamp duties. The minor concessions handed out by the Government under this Bill are almost meaningless, and a forward and hard-hitting Government policy is required to reduce drastically pay-roll tax, so that there is an incentive for employers to employ the many young unemployed people.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Deductions from taxable wages after January 1, 1976."

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

Page 1, line 24—After "thousand" insert "five hundred".

In 1957, when the exemption was set, it was specifically stated that it was intended to cover the amount of average weekly earnings of 10 employees, but that principle has been further lost sight of during the past years as inflation has taken its toll. This is a test amendment that provides for a maximum monthly deduction of $5 000 from a pay-roll and a minimum monthly deduction of $2 500, which would amount to an annual maximum deduction of $60 000 and a minimum deduction of $30 000. This is the first clause in which such a monetary sum is referred to and, if the amendment is successful, it will bring into effect sums that in no way will be anywhere near the average weekly earnings of 10 employees. However, it is better than the $48 000. If the amendment is successful, we should consider further action in subsequent legislation. Also, we should ask that progress be reported in order to be able to prepare a series of amendments to give effect to the overall intention, that is, to bring in the maximum deduction of $60 000.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not accept the amendment. The Premier made clear how far the Government was willing to go, and the amendment would affect the deductions. The member for Davenport said that the Premier had used the argument that all States were involved. When this tax was handed back to the States by, I think, Prime Minister McMahon, all States decided to act in concert. Since then, Queensland has departed from that principle, but the other States have agreed with South Australia about these deductions. We provide for an increase of about 15 per cent in the maximum and minimum annual deductions to come into effect from January 1, 1977, and these increases should reflect the increases in wage levels in the intervening year. The member for Davenport referred to incentives provided to industry in Victoria to enable them to decentralise, and that that Government is providing a better avenue for employment than is provided in this State. I refer the honourable member to the unemployment figures for each State, because they speak for themselves.

The member for Davenport said that we should reduce the collection of pay-roll tax by $18 000 000 so that more people would obtain employment, rather than spend the money on unemployment relief schemes, which no other State has done. Unemployment is not the sole responsibility of the State Government: it is the Federal Government's fiscal policies that have the greatest bearing on unemployment figures. If the State gave away all its taxes, there may be some incentive to industry to expand and employ more people, but this Government, with its responsibilities, is not willing to go further than has been provided in the Bill, and we will not accept this amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Queensland was not the only State to break away from the agreement between the States on pay-roll tax. At one stage last year, three States adopted certain exemptions and three other States adopted other exemptions.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am speaking about this provision.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to pay-roll tax generally, and the Deputy Premier knows that. We are talking about an agreement between the States on all areas of pay-roll tax. He knows there were great differences between the States, and South Australia gave the least exemption of any State. The Deputy Premier argued that it was not the responsibility of the State Government to solve the unemployment problem—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I said "not entirely".

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I accept that. The State Government has obligated itself to the extent of $18 000 000 to try to solve the unemployment problem. All I am suggesting is that it has obligated itself in the wrong way: it should have obligated itself by making a reduction of $18 000 000 in pay-roll tax rather than collecting an additional $18 000 000 through pay-roll tax and handing it out by another means.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What happens next year when we—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am suggesting it will apply not next year but in the last six months of this year, when much of the money has not been spent. The Deputy Premier must admit that there is legislation before the House to add another $4 00 000 to this scheme, and I suggest that the Government give additional reductions in pay-roll tax rather than hand out money through the unemployment relief scheme. It will not hold the Government responsible for spending any further money on creating employment opportunities in this State: all it will do is redirect the money already allocated to the State unemployment relief scheme. The arguments of the Deputy Premier do not hold water. They fall apart under close examination.

The Committee divided on the amendment.

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran (teller), Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Gunn. Noes—Messrs. Broomhill and Dunstan.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

170

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As I have said before, the Bill as it has come out of Committee does not provide any major concession. It is a concession as far as it goes that will be welcome, but it is a drop in the ocean compared to what could have been done. Once again the Government of this State has lost a magnificent opportunity to add something of its own to relieve the unemployment problem. It is not enough for the Deputy Premier to say that unemployment is a Federal problem only. In this instance this Bill, as it is now, will do little indeed to stimulate further employment and relieve the situation. I am disappointed indeed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 2448.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This is a relatively short and straightforward Bill. It gives effect to one aspect of the agreement reached some considerable time ago between the Commonwealth and the State in relation to the transfer of the country rail services to the Commonwealth. Part of the discussions that took place at that time included the possible loss of superannuation rights by members of the South Australian Railways who joined the Australian National Railways Commission because of their position. This was something no member could accept. It was one of the terms of the conditions that nobody should be disadvantaged by this transfer. This Bill gives effect to provisions which will provide those people who wish to do so to remain with the State superannuation scheme, and this gives them quite considerable advantages. The Commonwealth will meet the greater part of the employer liability for the pensions of those employees, and again that was inevitable.

It is interesting to compare the benefits obtainable. Under the Commonwealth superannuation scheme, contributors pay 5 per cent of their salary and at age 60 qualify for 45 per cent of their salary by way of pension. At age 65 they qualify for 50 per cent of their salary by way of pension. Compared to the State superannuation scheme, that is not as good. Contributors to the State scheme pay 6 per cent of their salary in contributions (1 per cent more than the Commonwealth contribution), but at age 60 receive 66⅔ per cent of their salary by way of pension. At age 65 they receive 73 per cent of their salary by way of pension, compared to 45 per cent and 50 per cent by the Commonwealth. There is no doubt at all that the State superannuation scheme is most generous, even allowing for additional payment.

Mr. Keneally: Not necessarily "generous".

Dr. TONKIN: Contributors to the State scheme are certainly much better off. In furtherance of the agreement that no-one should suffer or be disadvantaged by this transfer of the country railway services from South Australian Railways to the Australian National Railways Commission, this legislation has now been introduced. I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to one aspect of the Bill. I believe that the State has a real advantage now because superannuation funds will be held in this

State and not in the Federal sphere, so I believe that another advantage has been gained for South Australia. I am not attacking that, but I think we should realise that that advantage has been gained for South Australia and that the money held here will be available for use within the State. I think the House should take note that the Federal Government has made another concession towards this State.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

MOBIL LUBRICATING OIL REFINERY (INDENTURE) BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) brought up the report of the Select Committee recommending an amendment, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence. Report received.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD moved:

That the report be noted.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The Select Committee found great difficulty in ascertaining re-establishment costs for refineries in Australia. The argument centred around the cost of the industry, as an established industry in the Port Noarlunga council area, and drawing a comparison with that cost as against the cost of refineries in the Eastern States. The report sets out in paragraph (4) that the Select Committee concluded that the figure in the Bill of $190 000 was neither excessive nor discriminatory when compared with local government rates levied on similar refineries in other States, but that the figure was high when compared with local government rates levied on other industries in the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga area.

There is no doubt that, if a comparison is drawn between the rates of $190 000 for the operation considered by the committee for a certain industry as compared with the rates of refineries in the Eastern States, the difference may not be great, but no member of the Select Committee was confident of what the establishment costs would be for Eastern States refineries if they were to be rebuilt at the present time. The lube plant in South Australia has been established recently, so that there is an opportunity to ascertain reasonably accurate costs of establishment for this new venture. However, when we compare the rates for the Chrysler organisation (and my colleague, the member for Mallee, will have the figures that can be used more accurately for industry in other areas, such as Elizabeth, and in the Eastern States), that organisation is paying a low rate in the Port Noarlunga area as compared with the $190 000 mentioned here. There is much discrimination in the amount asked for rates.

Paragraph (5) of the report sets out that the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga also submitted in evidence that it was the desire of the Fire Brigades Board to establish in the Christies Beach area and that that establishment, with its attendant cost to local ratepayers, would be necessary predominantly because of the presence of the two refineries. I believe that subsequent evidence given by Fire Brigades Board members, particularly the Chairman, showed that this was not the main reason, if even a significant reason, why the board was moving into the Noarlunga council area.

In other information given to the Select Committee, in evidence first, it was stated that it would cost more than $1 000 000 to take the brigade's service to Port Noarlunga, and subsequently by a letter made available that, in all probability it would be nearer $2 000 000, and that it would increase fire insurance for property holders of private dwellings by 25 per cent and for commercial enterprises by at least 45 per cent. Therefore, to use the lube plant and refinery as an excuse or reason for taking the brigade into that area is wrong. I think that the evidence proved that it was wrong, and that the residents in that area would not have to pay higher fire protection premiums because of the refinery: they will pay it because the board has decided to move into the area, and I think that that point should be made. The people of the Port Noarlunga council area will have to find about $2 000 000 a year. In its evidence, the council said that the Emergency Fire Services was providing an efficient and satisfactory fire-protection service to the district, and I think that it needs to be shown that the council is satisfied that the E.F.S. is providing a satisfactory service to the area.

We can destroy the argument, beyond all doubt now, that the refinery is to be blamed for the $2 000 000 burden that the people of the Port Noarlunga district will have to carry if the board moves in. A fire broke out in the refinery recently, and we were told that it was only coincidence that the board's intention to move into the area was formulated just after that fire occurred. That fire lasted for only 20 minutes, and it is doubtful whether the brigade could have reached the site of the fire within that 20 minutes. The company also gave evidence, which I do not think is challenged, of its satisfactory fire-fighting equipment. One board witness (Mr. Eve) made the point that, in a fire in England, the company concerned thought that it had satisfactory equipment, but the fire ended up being a major disaster. We are talking about two different types of refinery and types of construction, and a different ability for fire protection and control.

Undoubtedly, the letter sent by the Premier's Department in the early days (I think it was in 1974), stating that the original indenture Act would apply, was misleading to some degree, if it was never intended that it would apply. Officers of the Premier's Department thought it would apply only in some respects—to such things as wharfage. That was not stated in the letter sent to the company. Paragraph (*a*) of that letter was clear in stating that it was intended that the indenture Act relating to the original establishment would apply also to the lube plant. I am convinced that the company believed that it was protected at that time by the original indenture Act, but whether it was right in its belief is a matter of judgment. I believe that it thought it was protected, and evidence was given that, if it had known all the facts, more consideration would have been given to going to Singapore to establish operations, and that was the other site considered. The largest part of the company's market is not necessarily in Australia, as has been stated on other occasions.

We need industry in South Australia, and I think that, in the figures of comparisons between other types of industry and the rates they pay in the Eastern States as against those paid by industries in the Noarlunga area, other than the refinery, there is a big difference. This Parliament should be conscious of that difference. If we want industry to come here, we should do nothing misleading. If the Noarlunga council is disadvantaged by accepting the Valuer-General's valuations as against a private valuer's valuations, that matter needs to be cleared up. If the council's legal opinion is right, the Valuer-General is wrong, and that matter also needs to be cleared up. In view of these areas of doubt, members

would realise that the committee could not accept that all the evidence was factual, because so much of it was conflicting. For this reason, I do not believe that any committee member could clearly understand what was involved.

Because of the shortage of time, as Parliament is to adjourn soon and it was necessary that the indenture Act be ratified, the committee brought down the report that we are now considering. I believe that the $190 000 is too high to begin with and, if I were in the company's position, and if it were possible to get out of the agreement, I would get out of it. I believe that the company would be a fool to go on with the agreement now that this $190 000 is involved. It has only the wharfage benefits until the mid-1980's, and the council rates, if challenged compared to other industries in the district, would be low—a maximum of $4 000 or $5 000 on present valuations. The advantages it gets from that area on a continuing basis, past the mid-1980's, will be of much greater benefit than the benefits it gains from wharfage concessions or from any kind of guarantee that the Government will give regarding preference in acquiring products.

It is a pity that the company went as far as it did in signing the agreements, because it would have been in no worse position today by going in as a normal business. I do not think that it has been given anything significant in the long term. The base sum from which the rates should commence should be about $100 000, and we should have in the Bill a clause to protect the council to the effect that, if the rate as fixed by the Bill ever falls below the ruling council rate on valuation of a property of that size, the company should pay the ruling rate for the council area. At the same time, I believe that the base figure should be $100 000, and then both parties will be protected. If not, by the mid-1980's this company will be asked to pay about $500 000 in council rates and, if the system does not change, neighbouring industries in the area will still pay less than $50 000. That situation is discriminatory and shows an excessive difference between the companies, and it is unfair. We should start at a lower figure but also protect the council if at any time its rate structure changes so that the rate it receives from normal rating goes above that which is set down in the Bill, starting at $100 000. In future, if this sort of matter is brought before the House, we should try to give the committee more time to gain evidence so that we will have a more responsible answer to the problem than we may have at present.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I concur with the remarks of my colleague, because the committee was faced with an almost impossible task, although it did what it could in the time available. The difficulty was in establishing the value of a refinery. The problem in establishing that value was that most of the existing refineries in Australia were completed before 1965. The lube refinery, to which we were directing our inquiries, was completed and came onstream at the beginning of this year. It was easily established what the value of the present lube refinery would be, but the committee's problem was in establishing the replacement cost of any one of the other refineries in other States for which the rate revenue figures were given to us as a basis of comparison. I quote one instance of confusion: in the paper presented to us by the Noarlunga council, it was suggested that the petrol refinery at Altona, which is not a lube refinery but a normal refinery a little larger than the refinery at Port Stanvac and which has a capacity of 100 000 barrels a day compared to the Port Stanvac capacity of 72 000 a day, had a council valuation of $38 000 000. Presumably, this would be the figure used by the Corio council.

The evidence given by those on behalf of the lube refinery was that the replacement cost, that is, the value for an assessment basis of that refinery, was about $210 000 000. When one is given these conflicting figures and asked to judge what is a fair rate on the argument that the value should be the replacement value, one realises the predicament that faced the committee. We sought other information with respect to the rating of other industrial property near the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. I was also given information that related to industrial land and premises near the refinery we were using as a comparison in the Port Melbourne and Corio areas. We found that the rating of industrial land at Port Stanvac, using the Valuer-General's assessment, which allows the value to be placed only on the land and the structure and not taking into account the value of the contents, showed that a factory like Chrysler's paid $23 000 a year in rates on an estimated value of its property of about $32 000 000.

Let us be fair and say that on that basis of valuation that company is being favourably treated, because one could say that the refinery is made up of pipes and other structures none of which are fixtures and which could be as easily removed as are the contents of a factory. One can get into an argument on how one goes about valuing a refinery in comparison with another form of industrial site. When we examined the Victorian figures, it was apparent that refineries were receiving concessional rating compared to other premises. I have already referred to the Altona refinery which had a council value of $38 000 000 and which paid council rates of $287 280. The information given about the Ford Motor Company at Corio showed that the assessed value of the premises was $27 000 000, and it paid rates of $352 364, which means that it pays a higher rate than does the refinery.

I have pointed out the great difficulties facing the committee in arriving at a decision in this matter. I have also been told that General-Motors Holden's at Elizabeth with its structures, based on a private valuation and not a valuation by the Valuer-General, pays about $200 000, and the rate paid to the Woodville council for its Woodville branch is about $98 000. These are major structures when one considers the structure of the refinery to which we are referring, as it is not a complete refinery but only a modest one. What we are asking in the Bill is that it be rated on the basis of $190 000 a year at June, 1977, and that there would be an escalating factor written into clause 5 of the Bill that would allow for a progressive upward adjustment on a compounding basis. No-one would know what the refinery may pay in council rates in the next 10 years.

I do not believe any concession should be provided by the council: concessions to companies of this nature should be provided by the Government. In this instance substantial concessions have been provided to the parent company, Mobil Oil Australia Limited, which is a 76 per cent owner of Port Stanvac. The wharfage concessions apply basically to the major refinery, and we were unable to establish any true figure as to what the advantage may be to the lube refinery. A figure of $12 000 to $15 000 a year was suggested by one witness. I believe that there should be no special concessions provided to the refinery: on the other hand, it should not be asked to provide the major source of industrial rate revenue for the Noarlunga council.

This, I believe, it is being asked to do by the nature of the clause in the Bill which is providing that, by arrangement

between the Government (not the council) and Mobil Oil Australia Limited, as borne out by the signing of the indenture attached to the Bill, there be an acceptance of a figure of $190 000, which cannot be substantiated on the normal basis of council valuation. It is a sum in lieu of council rates, not an assessment. This is where I agree with the member for Fisher in saying that the chances are that, whatever concessions this company is receiving by way of wharfage and other concessions through Government channels, they are modest compared to the sum the company will contribute under this Bill to the Noarlunga council in lieu of rates. The sum of $190 000 was arrived at by a system of valuation that is totally contrary to that applying to the general industrial rating of the area. I believe that the committee did what it could in this argument; members of the committee fully discussed the matter and gave due consideration to all the arguments put.

The Select Committee could have had more time to substantiate the valuation figures, which were the real basis of any conflict that existed between members. In future, if a Bill of this kind is to be referred to a Select Committee, the committee should be given more time than this committee was given in order to deliberate properly on all aspects of the investigation and to advise the House, as I believe all members would want to do, responsibly and in a well-formed manner, so that the committee's recommendations are given with a full knowledge of all the relevant and comparative facts necessary to make a proper assessment. I will certainly support the motion that the report of the Select Committee be accepted. The points that I have made indicate my reservations about this matter. In general terms, I am not pleased with the agreement that has been entered into, but I will accept the decision of the Select Committee in this matter.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion. As both members who have already spoken have said, the committee was faced with a difficult task. It was presented with conflicting figures by both the major parties, the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga and Mobil Oil Australia Limited. The committee had to determine what sum should be paid in lieu of (as the member for Mallee has said) the rate set by council. The Bill and the indenture are before Parliament because the argument between Noarlunga council and Mobil relates to the amount of rates to be paid. Some members of the committee, including me, were concerned about the escalation system set out in clause 5(1)(b). That system causes future concern, as escalation could in future be fairly substantial.

The indenture gives Mobil concessions, one of which is a considerable concession in wharfage. The concessions given to Mobil were substantiated by evidence given by various witnesses. The committee had to assess the $225 000 rating by Noarlunga council and the offer that was made by Mobil of $80 000 for payment of those rates. The committee finally determined that $190 000 should be recommended for payment in the first year and that the formula for escalation contained in clause 5(1)(*b*) should be used. The member for Fisher referred to the lack of fire services by the South Australian Fire Brigades Board in the Noarlunga area. Members of that board appeared before the committee and gave evidence. The Noarlunga council stated that moves had already been made regarding the establishment of Fire Brigades Board services in the southern districts of Adelaide. True, the oil refinery has its own fire-fighting system, which it claims is adequate. The company contended that the presence of the refinery was not the main reason behind the board's decision to establish fire services in the area, which is intended soon. In view of all the evidence that was presented to the committee, I support the motion.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I take this opportunity, in commending the motion to the House, to thank the members of the Select Committee for the time and consideration they gave to what I would agree was an extremely complex job. As members will note from the report, certain obvious matters had to be considered. One matter was the comparison of rates paid by Mobil with rates paid by refineries in other States. Another matter was a comparison of rates paid by industries of possibly comparable size in the Noarlunga area and other council areas of South Australia. The evidence given in relation to these matters was, to say the least, somewhat conflicting. I finally came down on the basis of the comparison with refineries in other States, because there seemed to be no other hard evidence available to the committee to select a different figure, which would simply have been plucked out of the air.

Originally, Noarlunga council asked for $225 000 as a base figure for rates, and, because no agreement could be reached between Noarlunga council and the refinery, the matter was referred to the Government, which, after all, was charged with the responsibility of putting a figure in the Bill. The sum of $190 000 was estimated by officers of the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department on figures provided to them by Mobil back in 1974. In evidence to the Select Committee, Mobil took issue with some of these figures, which it had previously supplied to the Government. The committee was not sufficiently impressed that the figures were wrong to consider that it should resile from what was contained in the Bill.

Regarding fire services, the committee established beyond reasonable doubt that the decision by the Fire Brigades Board to extend the southern fire district was not determined predominantly by the existence of the two refineries, but was arrived at by considering the enormous extent of housing development that has occurred in recent years in the southern areas. Although it is not strictly relevant to the Bill, that decision has not been given effect to. Only the Governor in Council can proclaim a fire district, and he has not yet been asked to do so.

Finally, in relation to the reference made to a letter sent by the Premier to Mobil some years ago when consideration was being given, my belief is that, where there was a misunderstanding, it arose from the fact that it was being made clear that the sort of indenture which was originally negotiated so many years ago by the Playford Government in relation to what was then the Vacuum refinery would similarly be negotiated in this case. It is a neat point what is meant by "indenture": whether one means the document signed by both parties or whether one also means the enabling legislation and whether one is extending either the spirit or letter of the original indenture or of the original enabling legislation.

What has happened is basically what happened originally, that is that the local government rates are part of the enabling legislation rather than of the indenture itself, the difference being that originally £10 000 was written into the 1959 Act with the concurrence of all parties, whereas in this case no agreement could be arrived at. I again thank members of the committee and the staff of the House, who have been put to considerable inconvenience, because the committee arrived at its decision to make this recommendation at 1.30 p.m. today. I thank the House for the

consideration it has given to the report, and I commend it to honourable members.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Local government rates."

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

Page 2, after line 38—Insert:

(3a) The rates payable pursuant to this section shall—

(*a*) in the case of rates payable for the year ending June 30, 1977, be due and payable at the expiration of the second month next following the commencement of this Act; and

(*b*) in the case of rates payable for any subsequent year be due and payable on the 1st day of February in that year,

and any such rates due and payable may be sued for and recovered by the council as a debt due to it.

There is something in this amendment for both the City of Noarlunga and Mobil. Regarding the City of Noarlunga, it is made clear in the last two lines that the rates that are due and payable, either the base rates as set out elsewhere in this clause, or the escalated rates in future years according to the formula in the clause, can be sued for and recovered by the council as a debt due to it. What is in it for Mobil is that, in fact, payment does not have to be made until February 1 in that year, although the normal procedure in the City of Noarlunga is that that date would be November 30. The effect of this is that, if the Mobil company wanted to take advantage of that part of the Local Government Act which allows ratepayers, with the concurrence of the local government authority, to pay in monthly instalments from the time of the amount being due, in effect that can happen. The committee had before it two decisions: whether it should provide this sort of concession (if one likes to use that word) and, secondly, if it should provide it, whether it should do so by incorporating the relevant part of the Local Government Act into this Bill or whether it should do it simply by moving the date from that originally considered to the date being recommended. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. I agree with the Minister that there is something in the amendment for both parties. I think it was an afterthought that perhaps we should give power to the council to recover the rate due to it under the Bill if it becomes operative. At the same time, as the company may lose the right to pay on the instalment basis, as other ratepayers may do, it was considered that we should give it the opportunity to have a slightly longer period to pay. That is why we chose the date suggested in the amendment. Members of the committee considered the council's situation and strengthened its cause, and we supported that because we did not believe the people of Port Noarlunga should carry any burden. If there is any burden, the State Government and the State as a whole should carry it, and the amendment is another step in that direction.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 11), schedules and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I was caught off guard when clause 5 went through. It was my intention to attempt to amend it to read $100 000, because it was my view that that was the figure that should have been accepted. I am sorry that I missed the opportunity to test the House on that matter. I believe that the Council is placed in an impossible situation, and so was the Select Committee, but I am firmly convinced that $190 000 is too high a figure to use as a starting base.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 2448.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this Bill, as it formalises the transfer of the Port Lincoln abattoir to the South Australian Meat Corporation. The Bill affords one the opportunity of making some general remarks about the operation of Samcor, which was set up in 1972 when the Government decided to abolish the old export abattoirs. When this corporation was set up by the then Minister (Mr. Casey), he described the proposal in glowing terms. Unfortunately, it has not lived up to the aims then expounded by Mr. Casey. Most of us realise that, when the corporation was set up and took over the administration of the Gepps Cross establishment, many problems had to be faced in relation to the run-down in operation, labour, lack of efficiency, and so on.

When that debate took place in 1972, there was much discussion about the composition of the new board. Several members on this side of the House were concerned that no members on that board represented primary producers. They took the view that the people who produced the product to be processed at Samcor should have some say on the board. We did not want it to be dominated by them but we believed that those people had the right to be represented. If we do not have viable producers, we will not have a product produced and we will lose a valuable employment base.

This Bill repeals the Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, 1937, which was introduced in this House by the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Blesing). Its aim was that facilities should be provided on Eyre Peninsula so that the stock which was produced in that vast agricultural area could have a base or centre where the products could be processed. One of the problems which the people on Eyre Peninsula have always faced is that owing to the distance from Adelaide there are serious freight disadvantages. It was hoped that when this establishment began operations some of these difficulties would be overcome. Unfortunately, except for those people near Eyre Peninsula, the abattoir has not attracted a great deal of stock from Upper Eyre Peninsula.

I believe that it is the responsibility of the Government to create the conditions so that the people on Eyre Peninsula will be able to send their stock for processing at the Samcor installation, knowing that they will not be disadvantaged by the price they receive. At present, in many cases people are loath to have their stock transported to Port Lincoln because there is no guarantee that they will receive the same return as they would if their stock was sold locally by private treaty through their own stock agent, or if the stock was sent to Adelaide and sold at the weekly markets.

As most members will know, on Eyre Peninsula there is an area of about 4 000 000 hectares of agricultural

land. Eyre Peninsula has a tremendous potential for future development, not only in grain growing but in the production of livestock—sheep, cattle and pigs. I believe that it is important for the welfare of South Australia that those producers are able to reduce some of their costs by reducing the freight burden which they have to carry at present. Unfortunately, until a few years ago, the management at the Port Lincoln abattoir left something to be desired. I do not wish to cast any aspersions on those involved; I suppose they did the best they could. However, I believe that under the management of Mr. Stroud, who has been in that position for some time now, there has been a great improvement in the efficiency of the operations of that organisation. I believe that he has received the co-operation of the stock agents operating in the area who are keen to see this enterprise develop so that it can provide an efficient outlet for Eyre Peninsula.

People who live within 150 to 300 kilometres of Port Lincoln can be advantaged in relation to freight charges if they can have their stock processed at Port Lincoln and not transported to Adelaide. A considerable sum has been spent on the Samcor operation at Port Lincoln over the past three years. I understand that about $650 000 of Regional Employment Development scheme money has been spent there. More than $2 000 000 has been spent there in the past three years. One significant action was taken when the administration block was moved from its old location within the town of Port Lincoln and put on site. That was long overdue because it is important that the management can be on call so that it can oversee the day-to-day operations on the spot.

In my opinion, there is a need to increase the capacity of the works. I understand that improvements have been made to the chilling facilities so that some 120 bodies of beef a day can be handled. I think it would be in the interests of all concerned if that figure could be increased to about 200 cattle a day. There is a capacity for 1 800 sheep a day to be handled on the chain and for about 2 000 lambs. I think it is essential that that be lifted to about 2 500 sheep and about 3 000 lambs a day so that during the flush time of the year the abattoir can handle all the stock available.

One of the problems brought to my attention is that people have transported their stock to Port Lincoln, and the stock has been purchased by one of the numerous buyers who operate in that area, but those buyers have sometimes had to wait a week before they could get their stock processed. That depresses the market and makes other buyers unwilling to involve themselves in the market, because they are not confident that their products can be processed. The person who misses out is the producer who, having transported his stock himself or through a carrier to Port Lincoln, is not able to bring it home again unless he lives near the town.

I believe that this move will be beneficial. I hope that the expertise of Samcor will be utilised to maximum advantage; I hope that the expertise that Samcor has gained in the operation of the Gepps Cross abattoir will be put to good use at the Port Lincoln establishment. On July 28, we had tabled in this House a report prepared by P.A. Consulting Services for the South Australian Minister of Agriculture. This is a result of a requirement of the original Act, which was passed in 1972. It was stated in that Act that the Government should have a review of the activities of Samcor after three years. Although this report has been tabled in both Houses of Parliament, only two copies are available. From information I received in reply to a Question on Notice today, it is not expected that the report will be printed and available to the public before the early part of next year. This is most unfortunate, because all members will be aware that some sections of the industry have criticised the Samcor operation.

The report deals with many of the problem areas of the organisation. I had intended to circulate copies of it to interested parties so that we could have had discussions in the hope that, when we were speaking to this Bill, I would have been able to put forward constructive criticism and suggestions to improve the operation. I do not wish simply to launch an attack on the organisation. That would serve no real purpose unless I was able to make constructive suggestions about improvements. The report is lengthy and needs some study before one can come up with any positive conclusions. It is essential that the views of the sections of the industry selling stock to Samcor should be considered, as well as those of people who have stock processed there, the Stock Salesmen's Association, the Master Butchers Association, and other people who have commented to me about it. I quote from page 14 of the report, as follows:

The main criticisms which can be made are: The development of the southern works has involved a learning process which has resulted in significant delay and expense. Having said that, it is also true that many of the specific points of criticism can only be made with the wisdom of hindsight.

Anyone can be wise after the event. From information I have received, certain decisions have been made regarding the construction of the new southern works that would not have been made if the people involved had had experience in running an abattoir. This clearly indicates the need for someone from the industry on the board. The report continues:

The marketing function has been given inadequate attention. In particular, not enough has been done to build close relations with Samcor's main customers or to meet their reasonable needs. We believe that this is an area which will require a high priority in the future.

That is certainly so. It continues:

Not enough has been done to formalise and publicise the objectives and corporate plan of Samcor. This results in some unnecessary misunderstandings and tensions with suppliers, customers and the public. Costs remain unnacceptably high. However, it is difficult to see what could be done to improve this significantly in the short term, until the southern works are fully commissioned.

Had we been able to have the report circulated, it would have been possible to have meaningful discussions with those sections of the industry that have been critical, and a worthwhile result could have been achieved. Turning to the cost problem, the report states, at page 38:

During the three-year period April 4, 1973, to March 17, 1976, the price of slaughtering an "average" sheep at Samcor has increased from $1·55 to $3·40, a 119 per cent increase (see Appendix VIII).

I seek leave to have Appendix VIII inserted in *Hansard*. It contains a list of figures, and would be difficult to quote in the House.

The SPEAKER: Is it purely statistical?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Leave granted.

APPENDIX VIII

INCREASES IN CHARGES FROM 4/4/73 TO 17/3/76

	From 4/4/73 $	From 17/3/76 $	plus per cent
Slaughtering:			
Beef (154·1-204 kg)	14·00	26·10	86
Mutton and Lamb	1·55	3·40	119
Pigs	3·75	7·40	97
Calves (45-68 kg)	4·20	8·45	101

Distribution:			
Beef (91-113 kg)	1·85	3·45	86
Mutton and Lamb	0·26	0·48	85
Licence to sell in market: . .	10·50	50·00	376
	(Dec '72)	(Dec '75)	
C.P.I. (Adelaide):	124·3	188·6	52
	(Dec '72)	(Dec '75)	
Average Earnings (S.A.): . .	91·60	160·50	75
	(April '73)	(Mar '76)	
Slaughterman's Award: . . . . (plus O/Award)	89·24	181·49	103

Mr. GUNN: Many people who have visited the Samcor works will have noticed the building work that is taking place, but they may not be aware that much money has been spent there. On page 71, under the heading "Finance", the report states:

During the six-year period to April, 1976, the corporation's borrowings have increased from $1 900 000 to $16 050 000. The majority of these borrowings have been incurred during the last three years to finance the construction of the southern works and improvements in the northern works. The financial burden of $16 050 000 is naturally significant. At an average cost of capital of 9·3 per cent this will produce an interest cost of $1 490 000 a year. Despite the magnitude of this cost two points are worth bearing in mind:

> All of the capital works undertaken over the last three years have been economically justified mainly through labour-cost savings.
>
> The interest cost is relatively small in comparison to the cost of wages and salaries. The estimated total cost of wages and salaries in 1975-76, including directly associated on-costs, is approximately $14 000 000. Thus the interest burden is likely to be less than 10 per cent of total operation costs, and the percentage will almost certainly reduce over future years.

The question has been raised during several of our discussions with interested parties whether a public body such as Samcor should pay such a high cost for its capital. We believe the answer to this question is outside our brief; however, we would suggest that the imposition of realistic commercial interest rates on capital used by bodies such as Samcor tends to promote sound financial management and avoids the misallocation of public moneys.

This amount of $16 000 000 should not be brushed over lightly. I am concerned that the taxpayers of South Australia one day may find themselves responsible for this money. Perhaps the Minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that the money is borrowed on the guarantee of the Minister of Agriculture or the Treasurer. It is essential that we have a service abattoir in South Australia and that it be located in the metropolitan area. However, in having such a service abattoir we must not deny country centres in South Australia the opportunity to establish such an industry where it can be justified economically and where the stock is available for slaughter. My colleagues and I are concerned about what has taken place in Naracoorte. Having inspected the works there, I believe everything possible should be done to make sure that that abattoir is once again got off the ground.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: When did you look at it?

Mr. GUNN: It was about 12 months ago. In company with my good friend the member for Victoria, I met the committee. I realised the problems involved with the set-up, and I have studied reports on it. Obviously, the abattoir was under-capitalised when it was first built. That was a real problem. Some of the things that were done created difficulties when operations commenced. Some of the $16 000 000 invested at the Samcor works at Gepps Cross may have been better directed to Naracoorte, creating local employment. In any country town of reasonable size, difficulties are always experienced in finding employment. Such an abattoir produces more business in the community and would be in the interests of Naracoorte. It would be the aim of my colleagues and myself in Government to do everything possible to get that organisation under way. We believe in decentralisation and the existing establishments should be assisted; probably extra assistance by way of pay-roll tax concessions would help the Naracoorte abattoirs. I quote from page 95 of the report, as follows:

Suppliers and customers, rightly or wrongly, have strongly held adverse views of Samcor's services. These are forcefully, even emotionally expressed, as can be seen from Appendix XIV E. 5. . . . Each of the points of criticism made is worthy of further examination and discussion with the relevant groups.

I sincerely hope that the Minister of Agriculture has considered the views expressed and that he will endeavour to act on these criticisms. From my brief discussions with members of the organisations that have made this criticism, I believe that what they say is relevant and in the interests of Samcor's own image. If there are misunderstandings, and if it has problems that are difficult to solve, Samcor should at least discuss them with these people. The following five major user groups were interviewed to obtain the data: stock agents, meat wholesalers in the Adelaide metropolitan area, retailer butchers in the Adelaide metropolitan area, skin and hide merchants, and meat exporters. Page 96 of the report states:

Stock sale facilities: Sellers of stock are generally of the opinion that the cost of sales facilities at Samcor are too high, and that costs escalate too rapidly, in support of the first proposition above, stock agents referred to the specific charges levied by Samcor in relation to the charges of other works. They also drew attention to the tendency of producers to sell at locations other than Gepps Cross. One stock agent reported that the number of private sales handled by his firm had increased considerably in the last few years because of the desire of growers to avoid Samcor charges.

This brings me to a point which, I think, is pertinent to raise now in relation to producer representation on the board. I believe it essential that, if we wish to avoid some of those criticisms and to get confidence back into the organisation, those people at the beginning of the process should be represented. I have discussed the matter today with the Stockowners Association and the United Farmers and Graziers, and I intend to move an amendment, at an appropriate time, to give them representation on the board. I have received the following letter, dated November 30, from Mr. D. H. Kelly, the Executive Officer of the Stockowners Association of South Australia, 63 Waymouth Street, Adelaide:

I refer to our telephone conversation earlier today in relation to the composition of the Samcor board. I would be personally in favour of meat producer representation on the board and although the association does not have a specific policy on this question, from recent comments of members of my executive and others, I am sure this concept would have the support of the organisation. You will recall that the old M.E.A.B. included three producer members:

> 1 to represent breeders of sheep and cattle. (Nominated by the association).
>
> 1 to represent breeders of lambs for export. (Nominated by the A.S.B.B.S. and U.F. & G.)
>
> 1 to represent breeders of pigs for export. (Nominated by the S.A. Branch of the Australia Pig Society).

It may be necessary to have more than one producer member to represent all these classes of stock. This raises the question of the size of the board, and the possibility of pressure from other sections of the industry, particularly the meat trade and stock salesmen for representation. However, I feel that both the board and the industry as a whole could benefit from the inclusion of a practical meat producer which would create better liason with our section of the industry, apart from putting the producers viewpoint continually before the board.

I have received the following letter, dated November 30, from Mr. Grant Andrews, General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers:

As requested by you, I wish to advise that the policy of U.F.G. concerning representation on the Samcor board has remained unaltered since it was restructured subsequent to the Gray report.

Members will recall that Mr. Ian Gray, now Chairman of Samcor, was given the job by the then Minister (Hon. Mr. Casey) to report on the operation of the old abattoir and, as a result of that report, Samcor was established. The letter continues:

In effect, it means that to provide the liaison necessary between the operations of Samcor and the producer, there should be at least one, and possibly two, persons nominated to the board by grower organisations. It is fair to point out that initially we were prepared to accept the creation of a Samcor advisory committee, comprising rural producers and those involved with livestock selling, wholesaling, retailing and exporting. Indeed, both the President, Mr. John Kerin, and I, in a meeting with the then Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. T. M. Casey, suggested that this committee be created, in view of Mr. Casey advising that he had no intention of calling for nominations of rural producers, or any other sectors of the trade, in implementing the Gray recommendations.

Incidentally, Mr. Casey did promise Mr. Kerin and I that the advisory committee, as suggested, would be set up. In summary, therefore, we make it clear that we have never foregone our policy of direct representation on to the Samcor board, and indeed this has been supplemented further with the suggestion for an advisory committee as well.

The advisory committee, which the Government undertook would be set up, has never seen the light of day. That is unfortunate, and it was wrong of the Minister to go back on a firm undertaking. A committee of this kind would be valuable and would make suggestions worthy of consideration not only by the board but also by the Government of the day and by Parliament. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has had to guarantee the $16 000 000 that Samcor has borrowed. In that way, Parliament and the taxpayers have been called on to guarantee that money. Page 97 of the report states:

Complaints as to the rapid escalation of fees were based on the perceived increase of fees by 150 per cent in four years. Stock agents say that their own fees and commission rates have only increased by 10 to 15 per cent during the same period. Samcor is seen as able to pass on immediately the effects of any increase in wage levels. For instance, following the recent 6·4 per cent increase in the basic wage the cost of yarding stock increased approximately 5 per cent. Despite increases in their own costs, stock agents have been unable to increase their fees because of the competitiveness of their market and the depressed price for stock.

It is the view of stock agents that the high killing costs at Samcor are a factor depressing the price to the local grower. In support of this view, South Australian stock prices are compared unfavourably with those available elsewhere. Specific comments from stock agents regarding Samcor facilities are as follows:

> Facilities for the sale of pigs and calves are regarded as satisfactory.
>
> Cattle sale facilities are regarded as inadequate. This is due to the insufficient capacity of pens for cattle sales resulting in two rounds of selling. Growers who draw places in the second round are prejudiced as their stock has not been on view since the commencement of the sale.

Page 98 of the report states:

Wholesalers and retailers invariably stated that they preferred to use Samcor because of its proximity to the saleyards and the Adelaide market. In fact, it appears that at least 80 per cent of their kill for Adelaide is processed by Samcor. However, they are of the opinion that slaughtering and processing activities at Samcor at the present time are too expensive, and inefficient.

I could go on at length and bring forward other points of criticism. Page 100 of the report states:

Samcor delivery policies drew much criticism from both wholesalers and retailers. For wholesalers, the main faults in the delivery system are seen as: poor scheduling, high costs, and disincentives to wholesalers.

Page 101 of the report states:

The high costs noted by wholesalers apply in comparison with the costs of alternative delivery systems. Most wholesalers have used taxi trucks and other alternatives to Samcor for meat delivery at some time or other and have found these considerably cheaper. Disincentives to wholesalers are seen to result from the lack of adequate rebates for full loads and the relative lack of labour accompanying Samcor deliveries to wholesalers compared to retailers. The $2·50 rebate for a full load (which can cost in the vicinity of $130 to $140 for delivery) is seen as insignificant and not sufficient to cover the costs of on-delivery to retailers.

Page 108 of the report (and it is interesting that it discusses the Port Lincoln operation) states:

It is clear that charges at other South Australian and Western Victorian abattoirs are lower than at Samcor. For instance, the cost of slaughtering a sheep at Port Lincoln is approximately 30c per head lower than at Samcor. The operator of a country abattoir who would prefer to use that facility for processing stock for consumption in the Adelaide metropolitan area, but is unable to because of the quota system, estimates that his costs of slaughtering are 40 per cent lower than the charges levied by Samcor.

The effect of these lower charges elsewhere appears to encourage the drift of stock interstate for slaughter. This is most pronounced in the South-East where a considerable portion of stock sold at saleyards in the area are shipped to Victoria for slaughter. Victoria has always been a significant market for stock produced in the South-East; however, respondents are of the view that its importance has increased in recent years because of the high cost of Samcor's processing. The carcasses which are processed in Victoria and then shipped back into South Australia for consumption represent "value added" lost permanently to South Australia. This loss accrues from the non-use of the South Australian labour and resources in transport and processing and the unavailability of skins and hides to South Australian merchants and exporters.

Members of the industry at large are concerned about two other quite contentious matters; one relating to the metropolitan inspection levy and the other to quotas placed on country works. I believe, and I understand that Samcor shares the same view, that we have reached a stage where we should consider seriously phasing out, if at all possible, the inspection levy, because it is, in effect, a tax: all carcasses are not inspected. Regarding quotas at country works, it is essential that we do everything possible to ensure that existing country abattoirs are operating at their maximum capacity. I have already referred to freight problems faced by producers. Not only do freight problems cause concern but also there is a loss to producers, because if the stock has to travel a considerable distance it does not have the same good appearance at the saleyards as does stock that travels only a few kilometres. I support the Bill, as do my colleagues, and I make clear that we are not satisfied with the current operation of Samcor. At the appropriate time I intend to move an amendment to new section 93*d*, which now provides:

(1) The Port Lincoln abattoirs area shall, subject to subsection (2) of this section, consist of the municipality of Port Lincoln.

(2) The Governor may be proclamation add any area specified in the proclamation to the Port Lincoln area.

This matter causes me concern because, as members would be aware, last year the Minister of Agriculture circulated a document setting out plans he had to force local country butchers who operate their own slaughterhouses to upgrade them to a standard to be set by the department. Those

plans generated much discussion in country areas. From discussions I have had with local butchers, I believe that the plans could put them out of business. New section 93*d* could be used to extend the Port Lincoln abattoirs area to the whole of Eyre Peninsula, and Parliament could do nothing about it. "Proclamation" should be deleted from this new section and "regulation" inserted so that Parliament would be in a position to disallow a regulation. If the Government set out to destroy country slaughterhouses, the move would not only be unpopular but it would also be unrealistic and would increase the cost of meat in those areas. Also the plan would need an army of inspectors to police it. In addition, it would deny producers a valuable local market.

Where a producer runs only one or two head of stock, he can sell them to a local butcher, but if he must send his stock to Port Lincoln the situation is unsatisfactory. The amendments I have standing in my name will give producers and retailers in this State some say on the board. I hope that the Government will accept the amendments.

In conclusion, I hope sincerely that, when the report about which I have spoken is made available, the Government will listen to the views of those sections of the industry that have had an oportunity to consider the matter. In view of the importance of these facilities to Eyre Peninsula, it is important to consider the number of stock available for slaughter on the peninsula. I had the Parliamentary Library staff prepare for me some figures in this regard. Briefly, Eyre Peninsula holds about 120 000 head of cattle, which is about 7 per cent of the cattle in South Australia. I seek leave to have the figures to which I have referred inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them, because it would be most difficult to read them individually.

Leave granted.

LIVESTOCK ON EYRE PENINSULA AS AT MARCH 31, 1976
(figures compiled by Australian Bureau of Statistics)

The number of livestock are given according to county.

The counties of Way, Kintore and Hopetoun are not on Eyre Peninsula proper, but are in that part of the State generally known as the West Coast. Also included is the number of ewes to be mated in 1976, which provides a fair indication of sheep numbers in 1977.

County	Cattle		Pigs	Sheep		Ewes to be mated in 1976
	Meat	Milk		Lambs	Total	
Bosanquet	878	10	20	8 336	45 866	21 925
Buxton	8 069	86	4 456	32 246	156 948	70 340
Dufferin	2 308	58	387	20 777	107 346	40 942
Flinders	36 450	1 332	10 649	123 714	609 383	222 981
Hopetoun	597	12	160	9 709	44 067	16 885
Hore-Ruthven	1 857	—	—	21 415	86 936	35 100
Jervois	27 768	604	7 533	152 271	659 742	325 618
Kintore	720	83	367	10 513	50 941	18 356
Le Hunte	11 105	182	10 510	45 395	192 349	89 557
Manchester	1 189	2	30	10 353	69 153	27 579
Musgrave	14 866	200	2 562	68 528	351 623	121 273
Robinson	9 808	255	3 098	57 025	272 187	99 633
Way	3 472	69	1 794	25 143	108 618	46 403
York	570	445	854	7 316	46 908	15 456
Total	119 657	3 338	42 420	592 741	2 802 067	1 152 048
State-wide Totals	1 682 566	208 675	325 924	3 990 826	17 278 897	7 949 493
Eyre Peninsula Total as percentage of State-wide Total	7·1	1·6	13·0	14·8	16·2	14·5

I support the Bill and look forward to the Committee stage.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): In supporting the Bill, I bear in mind that we are talking about Samcor, as it is known universally throughout the State. Samcor is dear to the hearts of many people in South Australia. In my area the emphasis is on the production of livestock. As good South Australians we have a preference for marketing stock in South Australia; however, living as we do on the border of South Australia and Victoria, and perhaps because of the closed markets in Adelaide, I am sorry to say that about 80 per cent of livestock produced in the South-East is sold in Victoria. The grizzle is about the high killing charges at the Samcor works. It must be borne in mind that Samcor runs a service abattoir. One could pose the question, "Can we afford a service abattoir?" It is a question that must be considered in some depth before one can understand the workings and ramifications of these works and what they stand for.

For the most part, the Bill provides for the transfer of the Port Lincoln abattoir to the South Australian Meat Corporation. Growing up as I did on Eyre Peninsula, I well remember the meetings that my father attended to obtain a freezing works in the area. The Port Lincoln meatworks, as it is now known, has had a checkered career and has served very well the growers on Eyre Peninsula over the years. It has had its good and bad times. Now it is to be taken over by Samcor. The member for Eyre, a shadow Minister of Agriculture, has dealt extensively with the Bill and has made constructive criticism about it. I do not need to reiterate his remarks. The Bill will give an exclusive franchise to the Port Lincoln area the same as applies in the fair city of Adelaide. Meat producers will be able to sell meat only at Port Lincoln under the same conditions as producers or processors of meat must bring their meat into the metropolitan area. Clause 93 (*g*) confers a monopoly on the selling, slaughtering and sale of meat in the Port Lincoln abattoir area. I wonder whether, in this day and age, that is not something that concerns people in this State.

There are pros and cons to the question. The Government has the responsibility to see that all meat slaughtered for human consumption complies with health regulations. I think that slaughtering works do, in the main, comply with the regulations. There are a number of these works in the South-East. At Mount Schank what was formerly a

milk factory was taken over by a young man with a lot of initiative (Mr. Maney), who has developed, with his own intiative and with the assistance of an able team of butchers and processors, a meat works that has an extensive kill and is providing an excellent service, not only to the lower South-East but also to western Victoria. Latterly, Mr. Ken McPherson has taken over what was the North Ridge works at Mount Gambier. The bulk of that kill, apart from supplying Mount Gambier, is going, under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution to the State of Victoria. This is South Australian production that is debarred from coming into Adelaide, and it points up the white elephant area that surrounds this service abattoir in Adelaide, which is to be extended to Port Lincoln.

The other works I must say something about (and I am not chiding the Government about this, because it cannot do anything about the matter) is the Naracoorte meat works. To establish that works, many of the local people, at a time when money was hard to come by and when the minimum shareholding was $200, pooled their funds, forming syndicates to take up a minimum shareholding to get that meat works off the ground. The Government gave some $300 000, or $400 000 to that meat works, which is not now being used. There is a trial arrangement between two companies and the reopening of this meat works has been talked about.

We have seen this meat works stop and start twice but, to be fair to the companies concerned, before it starts again they have to be sure that it will be a success. I am not privy to the negotiations that have gone on or are going on. The killing works situated in the South-East and throughout South Australia are doing a good job. The member for Eyre hit the nail on the head when he said that the right place to slaughter animals was where they grazed. We have many hundreds of thousands of prime cattle, fat lambs and sheep in the South-East in that category. Despite what has been an extremely bad season for the first half of 1976 (and it was not until after the Adelaide show that the main heavy rains fell in the South-East), I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier will agree with me that the general condition of stock has never been better.

Unfortunately, most of those animals are going to Victoria. There are several reasons for that: first, the two works operating in Mount Gambier cannot cope, and the Naracoorte works is not functioning. Because of the high killing charges, there is a tendency to shy away from the Adelaide works. This Bill will allow Samcor to take over the Port Lincoln works. I am not quibbling about that, but what concerns the producers of meat in South Australia is whether we can afford a service abattoir in the dress it wears in 1976. I think, to be fair to the board, that it has made great changes at great expense. It was an interesting balance sheet that the board brought down this year, and it showed a considerable improvement. The thing that concerns producers is the high cost of killing, but I know that that is part and parcel of a service works.

The criticism made by the producers I represent, has always been of rises in killing charges, which is something over which the board had little or no control, because we are living in times of inflation. A short time ago I met with the member for Eyre and a number of master butchers. They said that they were able to buy stock at the Adelaide abattoirs, send it to Melbourne, have it processed, bring it back, pay the meat levy and get it into their shops at a cheaper rate than that at which they could by having it slaughtered here. When that sort of thing happens it behoves the Government, and indeed the Opposition, to look closely to see what can be done about it. Having been associated with war service settlements for a number of years, I have some sympathy for the Minister, as one cannot just wipe off the very large debts that those settlers have. The money has to be serviced, so there is a problem there.

The member for Eyre spoke about the advisory committee. We heard a lot about that committee during the birth of the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, but it has not seen the light of day. I do not say that producers are the most wonderful people in the world. However, there is a need for the appointment of an advisory committee. As a producer, a country representative, and one who comes from an area where much of the prime meat is produced in this State (some of the choicest cuts come off the lush South-East pastures), I have something to advertise. Despite our modesty, it will stand up to the best test one can put it to. The other matter that raises much ire among people is the inspection of meat levy, which is very much part and parcel of the introduction of meat into the Adelaide abattoir. If meat is inspected in Melbourne, I have doubts whether a rule is run over every carcass and every kilogram of meat, but the charge is considerable, because on a bullock weighing about 550 kg it is $12. That cost is passed on to the consumer, but it does not seem to reach the grower. That amount is always taken off when the buyer is looking at sheep in the paddock or buying them at the country markets. This Bill is necessary at this stage of development in this State. The member for Eyre has covered the ground and put the viewpoint of this Party. With those observations I have made, I support the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support this Bill. There has been a gradual build-up towards this take-over by Samcor of the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln, and I think this has not taken anyone by surprise. There has been a manager of Samcor in Port Lincoln for some time, and there has been a gradual phasing in of the Samcor policies at the new complex. The Samcor management of the Gepps Cross works has been viewed with suspicion. Producers on Eyre Peninsula have been somewhat apprehensive of the take-over of the local Government Produce Department works by Samcor because of the high escalating costs. This is an aspect about which we are all apprehensive, because if these costs are carried through to the Port Lincoln works they will seriously affect the domestic market within the Port Lincoln area and will place at a disadvantage the producers who service that works. This is why there is some apprehension.

On Friday, I had some members of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated in my office, some of whom were adamant that the Samcor management had not been living up to expectations. In spite of their apprehension, the transfer of the Government Produce Department to Samcor is a must. It is a progression from the old Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, and is a transfer from the Government Produce Department to the management of Samcor. In the time that the present manager, Mr. Ralph Stroud, has been there, there has been a considerable upgrading of the works. Hopefully, that will prove that there is a better throughput and a higher capacity in terms of numbers a day, and hopefully we will retain our oversea export licence. For any meat works to operate effectively, an export licence is essential. The complex is at least 50 years old. It is an old works that has served the State and Eyre Peninsula well.

Some three or four years ago it was being considered whether to upgrade the works or to demolish the lot and build again. The decision was made that the works be upgraded. There has been massive expenditure in upgrading not only the killing chains but also all the freezing rooms and chilling rooms. The freezing and chilling rooms were all wood lined and condemned by the Department of Primary Industry, because they were unacceptable in relation to an export licence. In many cases, every carcass within the chiller had to be covered with a calico bag, which had to be changed and laundered every day. One need not think about that for long to realise that massive expenditure is involved to carry that out to maintain the carcasses in any reasonable condition.

In many areas, the Bill with which we are dealing resembles the old Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, 1937. There are some aspects of it which need commenting upon, because they do not necessarily have the same effect today as was originally intended. One aspect is the association of the Samcor works with the Eyre Peninsula Stock Marketing Company, which was originally set up in 1954 as operational yards on Government Produce Department land for the purpose of carrying out regular markets and having ready accessibility to the abattoir.

The present site of the yards was negotiated by Mr. Moodie with Mr. Arthur Christian, Minister of Agriculture in 1954. Those yards have served the Government Produce Department well, but now money has to be spent on them. Those yards are constructed on Government Produce Department land, but they are only leased on a weekly tenancy, and this tenancy is of some concern to the producers of the area. No member of the stock marketing company is prepared to spend additional moneys on upgrading the yards unless a longer tenancy can be agreed upon.

The stock marketing company owns land adjacent to the Government Produce Department land, and it would be possible for those yards to be established on the company's land. I say it would be possible but not practical, because the land adjacent to the Government Produce Department land which would be used for those yards is across two sets of railway lines. As a result, each head of stock sold in the stock marketing yards would have to traverse two sets of railway lines to get to the forcing pens of the slaughterhouse. That is the dilemma that the stock marketing company is in. We could say that Samcor would be prepared to put up yards of its own, but I think it would be fair to say that, if Samcor could get out of putting up its own yards, it most certainly would do so.

I understand that the yarding complex at the Gepps Cross works is unprofitable and to a certain extent is a liability to the management of Samcor. From these comments, one could be reasonably assured that Samcor would not be interested in building a saleyard complex of its own to service the Government Produce works. Therefore, it would fall back on the stock marketing company. The yards are seriously eroded. In wet weather there is deep mud and slush, and in summer they become a dust bowl. No-one is happy with the yards, but they continue to be used. The stock marketing company is not prepared to spend money on them, for good reasons. With a weekly tenancy, how could one be expected to put large sums of money into yards such as these?

As I pointed out, the impracticalities of servicing the works across two sets of railway lines would ideally mean an over-pass or under-pass of the railway line. Needless to say, the economics of that project would cause serious doubt about its practicality. In my assessment of the Bill, I contacted the Manager of the Gepps Cross works (Mr. Ralph Stroud), who was quite happy with this proposal. He believes it will bring benefits to the area and he sees little difficulty in the changeover. Probably that is understandable from a manager's point of view, but from the assessment I have made the people involved in the industry can see that Mr. Stroud's views will be carried through. Another aspect of the Bill concerns the employees. The Bill contains a provision dealing with the Public Service. That at first worried me. In his second reading explanation, the Minister stated:

> Regarding the employees at the Port Lincoln abattoir, the Government has agreed that no employee is to be disadvantaged by the transfer. The Bill provides that any public servant engaged in duties at the abattoir may continue that work as a public servant for 12 months after the transfer, during which period he may obtain a transfer to other duties as a public servant or elect to become an employee of the corporation.

That does not involve many people—I believe only about half a dozen. Although that is not an exact figure, certainly not many are involved. One of the works foremen is a public servant, as are some of the office staff, but generally speaking the men engaged on the chains and in the works are not public servants but are engaged by the Government Produce Department; their employer will be Samcor.

In inquiring about the effects of the Bill, one of the greatest concerns and anomalies that became apparent was in the distribution of meat within the Port Lincoln abattoir area. Some weeks ago, I was approached by representatives of the butchers operating in Port Lincoln who were gravely concerned about the trade in illegal meat within the Port Lincoln area. Under the old Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, the Port Lincoln abattoir area related to the municipality of Port Lincoln as it was at that time, which means now that many residential areas of Port Lincoln are no longer in the Port Lincoln abattoir area. Only certain areas of the town are controlled for the purpose of meat distribution, and the anomaly existing can be exploited by people living outside the city area and delivering meat for sale, illegally or otherwise, to the outer residential areas of the city.

There is no provision in any Act under which such a person can be prosecuted. As a result, there have been suggestions of a large illegal meat trade developing in the area. It is reasonable to expect that, with this legislation, we should try to enlarge the Port Lincoln abattoir area to encompass the residential areas of the city of Port Lincoln. The problem has been that not all the residential area of Port Lincoln is under the control of the corporation. Outer areas of the residential part of the city are under the jurisdiction of the District Council of Lincoln, with its headquarters at Cummins. To include in the legislation a provision that the Port Lincoln abattoir area shall consist of the municipality of Port Lincoln in no way covers the objective to which we should be looking.

On September 15, I asked a question of the Minister regarding the meat trade and whose responsibility it was to police any illegal meat trade. The point raised concerned a case where the person involved had been slaughtering meat and selling it to fishermen on the wharf. It is difficult to apprehend such an offender, but it appears that the person was taking meat to the wharf and selling large quantities to the fishermen. It has been reported to me that the quantity of meat involved was up to half a tonne. As a result, some disquiet was evident among the butchers in the town who were losing trade because of this illegal meat trafficking. The butchers believe that,

if they are obliged to maintain health standards under local government and health legislation, all suppliers of meat within the area should have a similar obligation. That is fair enough. In reply to the question I asked on September 15, I received the other day the following reply from the Minister of Works:

Section 6 of the Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act 1937, prohibits the slaughter elsewhere than at the Port Lincoln abattoirs of stock for sale for human consumption within the Port Lincoln abattoirs area, except under permit issued by the Minister of Agriculture. Recent investigations indicate that increasing quantities of meat reasonably suspected of having been killed and/or processed at works other than the Port Lincoln abattoirs are being offered for sale or sold within the Port Lincoln abattoirs area. However, under the present interim arrangement for operation of the Port Lincoln works, it is difficult to discover and prove breaches of this section, particularly as the boundaries of the abattoirs area as defined in the Act exclude some portions of the Port Lincoln residential area. It is proposed to transfer operation and control of the Port Lincoln abattoirs to the South Australia Meat Corporation, for which purpose legislation has been drafted and is expected to be introduced into Parliament shortly. The draft Bill, which seeks to amend the Samcor Act and provides for the repeal of the Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, contains provisions which will enable the redefinition of the Port Lincoln abattoirs area, and will prohibit the slaughter and processing at places other than the Port Lincoln abattoirs of meat for sale for human consumption within the abattoirs area, except under permit. It is anticipated that, when the new legislation becomes operative and Samcor takes over the Port Lincoln works, the present unsatisfactory situation will be rectified.

Hopefully, that will be the case. Nevertheless, I have grave doubts that the situation will be rectified, because I do not believe the Bill gives the necessary teeth or authority to any corporation or authority for the policing of the legislation. The problem is whether the Port Lincoln abattoir area, as defined in the draft Bill, will cover sufficient areas of the Port Lincoln city to warrant or justify the employment of an inspector. I understand that, if all areas of the residential area and perhaps even neighbouring communities of the city were included in the Port Lincoln abattoir area, that would give sufficient justification to engage an inspector who at least would be an authority who could act to prosecute in the event of illegal meat trading.

That inspector would be charged not only with the responsibility of the abattoir and the sale of meat in butcher shops, but also at hotels, cafes, and so on. Much of that area is covered at present under the Health Act, although not necessarily to the extent we would wish. If we extend the Port Lincoln abattoir area to enable it to be treated as one single authority, we would achieve the desired effect, at least in restricting the alleged illegal meat trade.

In my discussions on the Bill, I contacted the Corporation of Lincoln, and its officers were happy to have the Port Lincoln abattoir area boundaries extended. I contacted the District Council of Lincoln, and it was suggested that the Port Lincoln abattoir area should be extended for a radius of 40 kilometres from the Port Lincoln Post Office. This, in turn, ran contrary to some of the beliefs of the District Council of Tumby Bay. I think the general principle is accepted that, if a 20 kilometre radius of the Port Lincoln Post Office were accepted, it would meet with the approval of all local government authorities in the area.

The part of the Bill that has most effect is the part that takes over from the old Port Lincoln Abattoirs Act, 1937, particularly new Part IVA, dealing with the Port Lincoln abattoirs. The transfer is one which, I believe, most people in the community have accepted. The Manager has been working towards this end for some time. I believe that his efforts have met with the approval of many people in the community, particularly those sections that deal with the meat trade. The abattoir employees are pleased with the proposal and they, in turn, are pleased with the results. The employees, naturally enough, are sharing in the benefits of a new amenities block, built at a cost of about $600 000, of which they are naturally proud.

There are problems, however, about the stockyards that service the slaughterhouse. I have already referred to the sheep yards that are on corporation land. I refer now to the cattle yards on stock-marketing company land, which have met with the same problem regarding whether they should be obliged to work across the railway line. They are obliged to work across railway lines and, if that became a general practice with sheep, it would be highly undesirable. The present complex is being upgraded; the killing chain is being upgraded to the extent that the daily beef kill is being increased from 55 head each day to 114 head each day, but any future expansion would require a considerable amount of redevelopment within the Samcor complex. To that extent, I understand that walls have to be removed and that a new plan of the chain will have to be made to handle the additional rails and equipment that will be necessary to handle that throughput.

I was somewhat dubious about a reply I received last week to a question I asked relating to the official weighing of stock sold over-hooks at the meatworks; this probably relates to Samcor in general. I think it would be highly desirable that, if Samcor were to process meat on this basis, with the buyers purchasing stock on an over-hooks basis, the weighing should be carried out by officially licensed weighers, in much the same way as it is carried out in the wool stores, where it is done by sworn weighers who are directly responsible not to the marketing company but to the warden of trade measures. We should encourage that aspect within the Samcor works, so that we would have an independent authority acting to ensure that both the buyer and the seller were guaranteed accurate weights in the trading of their stock.

I support the Bill, which we have been expecting for some time. There are some aspects on which I will comment in Committee, after foreshadowed amendments have been moved. I am concerned that the penalty for illegally trading in meat is listed in the Bill at $100. On checking the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, I find that the penalty for illegally trading in meat is only $20. I believe that the penalty should be considerably increased, although I admit that the opportunities available for the introduction of farm-killed meat into the Port Lincoln area are far greater than they are in the metropolitan area. I suggest that the penalty be increased to act as a deterrent to those who would venture into such a trade. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an instruction without notice.

The reason I have so moved is so that I can move an amendment which, I think, will greatly improve Samcor's operations, particularly its image in the community. As I pointed out earlier, I have the support of the two major producer organisations in the State, both of which support the amendment I seek to move. I believe that Samcor has had long enough to prove itself. The experimental stage should have been completed. I believe that it has not been as satisfactory as it should have been, and the amendment I seek to move could only improve Samcor's operations and

efficiency; it will give people directly involved with the products processed at Gepps Cross abattoir an opportunity to have some say on the board. Although they will not be in a majority, they will be able to make a valuable contribution. This course of action is long overdue. It was requested when the initial legislation was before the House, but the Government failed to put it into effect. It also failed to set up an advisory committee, as it previously indicated that it would. I therefore ask members, for the reasons I have outlined in my second reading speech, to support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I oppose the motion. As the honourable member has pointed out, the reason for the suspension is in order to move an amendment that would alter the composition of the board that would control the Port Lincoln meatworks, as it is now known. The Government is not willing to accept the amendment. I therefore see no reason for the suspension. I do not wish to canvass the matter any further, and I would not be in order in doing so. The Government sees no need for the proposition put forward by the honourable member, so there is no need for the suspension.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Broomhill.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to advise the Committee that on members' files are proposed amendments to clause 4 in the names of the honourable member for Flinders and the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable member for Flinders seeks to leave out all words in lines 6 to 8 on page 2, with a view to inserting a new definition in lieu thereof, and the honourable member for Eyre seeks to amend the definition now in the Bill by leaving out the word "proclamation", in line 7 on page 2, with a view to inserting the word "regulation" in lieu thereof. To protect the amendment of the honourable member for Eyre I will therefore put only for decision by the Committee a part of the amendment of the honourable member for Flinders. I will put before the Committee the question that, in lines 6 and 7 on page 2, the following words be left out:

"Port Lincoln abattoirs area" means the municipality of Port Lincoln and any area added thereto.

If the Committee agrees to leave out these words I will proceed with the remainder of the amendment of the honourable member for Flinders, and the amendment of the honourable member for Eyre will lapse. However, should the Committee decide against leaving these words out of the Bill, I will consider the whole of the amendment of the honourable member for Flinders to be negatived and will proceed with the amendment of the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. BLACKER: I move:

Page 2, lines 6 to 8—Leave out all words in these lines and insert definition as follows: "The Port Lincoln abattoirs area" means the hundreds of Louth, Lincoln, Flinders, Uley and Sleaford: ;

During my second reading speech I canvassed why I would introduce this amendment. In the Bill "Port Lincoln abattoirs area" means the municipality of Port Lincoln and any area added thereto by proclamation. The present municipality of Port Lincoln does not include all residential areas of the city of Port Lincoln. For one to refer only to the abattoirs area as being the municipality of Port Lincoln one really refers only to portion of the residential area of Port Lincoln. The purpose of my amendment is to enlarge the definition of "Port Lincoln abattoirs area" to include all of the residential areas of Port Lincoln. The five hundreds referred to in my amendment are those surrounding the city of Port Lincoln; they include all the residential areas and all the areas reasonably expected to be serviced by the Port Lincoln abattoir. This overcomes the difficulty experienced by the butchers in the area, who are obliged under health regulations and local government regulations to maintain certain health standards, but who are facing stiff competition from outside would-be butchers who are introducing meat into the outer areas of Port Lincoln city, that is, those areas outside the jurisdiction of the Corporation of Port Lincoln and in the jurisdiction of the District Council of Lincoln.

The wording of the definition of the Port Lincoln abattoirs area contained in the Bill does not cover a wide enough scope to prevent that anomaly. I have suggested the five hundreds mentioned in this amendment because that seems to be the most easily definable method of doing this. Through my contact with the Corporation of Port Lincoln, the District Council of Lincoln, and the District Council of Tumby Bay, I have established that they are all happy that the area should be extended, and various suggestions have been made as to what areas should be proposed. It has been suggested that the Corporation of Port Lincoln be named, together with the proclaimed townships of Boston and Stanford. That is very similar to the area suggested under the Eyre development plan, and I considered that proposal. It has been suggested by the District Council of Lincoln that there be a 15 km radius from the post office at Port Lincoln, but that ran into conflict with the officers of the Tumby Bay District Council, which has a licensed premises on the lower end of its district council area that could possibly come within that radius. It is quite aparent that a 20-kilometre radius from the post office at Port Lincoln would serve the purpose. In discussions with my legal advisers, I found that the hundreds of Louth, Lincoln, Flinders, Uley, and Sleaford adequately met the desires and proposals that would, hopefully, solve this problem. I tender this amendment to the Minister for his consideration, because it would overcome an anomaly which we are experiencing and which, I believe, has been brought to the Minister's notice on previous occasions. I ask for the support of honourable members for this amendment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Whilst I appreciate the point made by the honourable member, my advice is that if the amendment was accepted it would lead to inflexibility. As I understand it, this does not apply to any other Act relevant to Samcor and, therefore, would create a problem. The honourable member is seeking to name certain hundreds in the Act. My advice is that it is desirable to leave it more open so that more flexibility can be had, which would not be the case if the

amendment was accepted. There is no more objection to the amendment than that. My advice is to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLACKER: I have contacted all of the local government authorities involved in this matter. I have also spoken with the manager of Samcor. He agrees with this principle, because it would give him just reason to engage an inspector to operate it that area. The wording of the proposal as it appears in the Bill does not give him sufficient justification to engage an inspector to deal with just part of Port Lincoln. The other point relates to the nominating of hundreds. Under the principal Act, the Adelaide metropolitan area is clearly defined; it contains reference to the municipalities of Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, and other municipalities, and I see no reason why the Port Lincoln abattoirs area cannot be defined so as to give the inspection powers desirable to police the meat trade adequately.

Mr. Coumbe: You would like the Minister to be consistent.

Mr. BLACKER: It is a matter of practicalities. I fear that, unless my amendment is accepted, there will be insufficient justification for the management of Samcor to engage an inspector for two-thirds of the Port Lincoln area, whereas if the whole of the area is included that would be sufficient justification and would give the manager just cause for making that appointment. Consequently, there would be somebody responsible for policing the meat trade. At present nobody will accept that responsibility.

The Committe divided on the amendment:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker (teller), Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran (teller), Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Broomhill.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GUNN: I move:

Page 2, line 7—Leave out "proclamation" and insert "regulation".

This simple amendment will give this House the opportunity to scrutinise any decision made in relation to varying the size of the restricted area. It needs little explanation. I understand that the Minister will accept it. If he does, I appreciate that course of action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has no objection to the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Enactment of Part IVA of principal Act."

Mr. GUNN: I move:

Page 5—Line 3—Leave out "proclamation" and insert "regulation".

Line 4—Leave out "proclamation" and insert "regulation".

Lines 5 and 6—Leave out all words in these lines.

These amendments are consequential on the amendment already carried in another clause.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They are acceptable.

Amendments carried.

Mr. BLACKER: I move:

Page 5, line 36—Leave out "one" and insert "two".

This effectively increases the penalty for a breach of the Act for illegally trading in meat in the proclaimed Port Lincoln abattoirs area from $100 to $200. I have been informed that the $200 would be a maximum of $200 under the Acts Interpretation Act, so it is not a definite $200 for a conviction. I am concerned that the penalty which relates to the Adelaide metropolitan area under Samcor is only $20. I believe that that should be dramatically increased so as to act as a deterrent. A maximum of $20 for the Adelaide metropolitan area is only a small deterrent to anyone who is considering the illegal meat trade or introducing meat killed in unapproved abattoirs in the residential area. I do not believe that the suggested $200 penalty is in any way excessive. This is a serious offence and places many butchers in some jeopardy, because they are obliged to operate under local government and health requirements whereas those operating in the illegal trade are not so scrupulous. I think it is desirable and practical that the matters should be reconsidered to enable the metropolitan area fine to be increased. I would support that move, and suggest a similar figure.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am happy to accept the amendment. I note that the other Act to which the honourable member refers contains a penalty of only $20. Something should be done about that.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 2530.)

The SPEAKER: I wish to remind honourable members that, on Thursday last, the House granted leave for the scope of the debate on this Bill and the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act Amendment Bill to be extended to include both Bills, as they deal with the same subject matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This is one of those unusual occasions when we discuss two Bills in the one debate. This is the first time I have been called upon to speak to two Bills simultaneously, but it is entirely appropriate, as they are supplementary, dealing in effect with the same subject matter. I came to consider this question without having made up my mind on the right thing to do about it. Having read the Minister's second reading explanation and having looked at the Bills, I concluded that it was appropriate that they should be supported.

The legislation impinges on what is probably the major social problem facing developed societies in the modern age. I refer, of course, to the whole question of alcoholism and the abuse of alcohol and, to a lesser extent at present, the abuse of other drugs. I have been quite staggered by some of the press reports on this matter. One worrying report in recent times points out that the habits of young people in this country are changing markedly. As a result of the affluent society and the relaxation of drinking laws, we are fast approaching a difficult situation in relation to alcoholism among young people. On September 21, 1976, the *News* published a report of a survey of the drinking habits of young Australian people. The report states:

More than 9 per cent of children aged between 12 and 17 years get drunk more than once a month, and another 2 per cent admit to regularly passing out from the effects of alcohol. These are just some of the shock results of a survey commissioned by the New South Wales Health Education Advisory Council. Teenage alcholism is on the increase to the point where people younger than the legal drinking age are even turning up at meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous.

The report goes on at some length to highlight this increasingly serious problem. I can recall the days before the Second World War when we were not so affluent and when drinking laws were more stringent. This problem then was virtually unheard of.

Another major area of concern relates to the drinking habits of Aborigines. The Aboriginal people are susceptible to the ravages of alcohol because of their life style, living, as many of them do, on the fringe of our white society. A recent report of activities in the Northern Territory stated that Aborigines were chartering aircraft, paid for by some of the money they were getting from the Federal Government, to bring alcohol to their reserves. The Aboriginal community has had some criticism of this Bill. I understand the Aboriginal people are complaining that they have not been consulted. In some of our country areas, with grants from the Federal Govenment, they are setting up centres to help their own people who have alcohol problems. The report states:

The South Australian Government was criticised yesterday for not consulting the Aboriginal community over plans to establish "sobering-up centres" in country towns. The plans were announced on Thursday by the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) as part of a plan to abolish the offence of public drunkenness. Mr. Duncan told the Assembly the Government believed "sobering-up" units should be established in the metropolitan area and in country areas such as Port Augusta, Coober Pedy, Ceduna, and Oodnadatta which were major problem areas.

The president of the National Aboriginal Congress (Mr. J. Stanley) said yesterday the Aboriginal community had been tackling the problem of drunkenness in these towns for almost two years. "Through the WOMA committee we have set up a centre at Coober Pedy and two at Ceduna and Port Augusta are almost ready to be opened," he said. Mr. Stanley said the Government should now help the WOMA centres. They were funded and run by the Aboriginal community with help from the Federal Government.

I hope that, in reply, the Minister will comment on that reference, which is the only adverse reference I have seen. My research has been fairly hurried, because the Bill was not to have been debated until tomorrow. I had done little more than read the Minister's explanation and look at the Mitchell committee report, but that was sufficient to convince me that the legislation should be supported. However, there may be other references critical of the legislation that I have not yet seen.

I have not seen many teenagers on the streets who have been taken away and charged with drunkenness. I do not know what the statistics show, but alcohol is being abused by more and more young people. Perhaps they have motor cars and homes: indeed, this aspect was mentioned by the Attorney-General when he differentiated between classes of drunks. The more affluent are less likely to come before the courts, but the habitual drunk, who is destitute, who has no home, and no-one to care for him, comes before the courts. The teenagers, with homes to go to, do not come before the courts. Nevertheless there is a real problem. It seems to me that this Bill will not solve that problem; other measures will need to be taken to solve it. Some of the statistics are indeed staggering, and I will quote from newspaper reports that are a matter of considerable concern. I read in a recent report from Melbourne that over 1 000 000 drinkers in Australia drink 22 glasses of beer a day and spend more than $30 a week on alcohol. That is a colossal deduction from anyone's pay packet. A million people approximates 8 per cent of our total population. Forgetting infants and children too young to drink, that means there is a colossal problem. I think that the latest statistics show that the average Australian drinks 22 glasses of beer a week.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think people realise the magnitude of the problem.

Mr. KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it appropriate for the honourable member to be addressing the House with his back to the Speaker all the time?

The SPEAKER: That is a matter for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: One of my colleagues interjected, and I turned around to see who it was. We know that some Government members speak to the gallery when it is full.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring the honourable member back to the subject under debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney-General, in his second reading explanation, quoted statistics attributed in the first instance to a former Federal colleague. They appear in a press report of July 2, 1976, and I will refer to it. Under a headline "Abolish 'drunk' law—Welfare report", the report gives an idea of the magnitude of the problem Australia-wide. The report states:

The average number of weekly arrests for public drunkenness is 57 fewer than it was in 1973. A Community Welfare Department report—

a South Australian report—

says there were 8 500 arrests in 1972-73 but the figure for 1975-76 is likely to be about 5 500.

That is more than 100 arrests a week. A fair amount of police activity is being taken up by such arrests. The report further states:

Police arrests were probably only the tip of the iceberg.

The report refers to the Mitchell committee, and then states:

It says alcoholism has been accepted by society as a social problem or illness and quotes from Federal statistics which show alcohol abuse to be the direct cause of—

and this was quoted in the Minister's second reading explanation (but it was not read to the House)—

one in five hospital beds being occupied; one in five battered children; one of five drownings and submersion cases; two in five divorces and judicial separations; about 50 per cent of the serious crimes in the whole community; 50 per cent of the deaths from road accidents;—

some might put the statistics even higher than that, but this is a conservative estimate of alcoholism—

50 per cent of deaths from pancreatic disease and two of three deaths from cirrhosis of the liver (one in 40 of all deaths); reduced resistance to a wide range of illnesses; and a loss of 50 per cent of the working hours of the "alcoholic" group after the age of 45.

The implication of those statistics are horrific. The more one examines this matter, the more one realises that alcohol is a major problem facing modern society in a developed world. Other drug abuse is getting headlines and is a matter of grave concern, but alcohol is an established drug and has been so for centuries.

Mr. Nankivell: It's a commercial drug.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but as society has become more affluent, the abuse of alcohol and its social ramifications have increased tremendously.

Mr. Keneally: If an alcoholic is dressed in a suit and tie, that is acceptable, but at the lower end of the scale it's objectionable.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not agree, but I suppose that the honourable member says that, having in mind abolishing the offence. I agree that the offence of drunkenness should be abolished, if we can do something positive to help these people. All the honouarble member is saying, as is explained in the Minister's second reading explanation, is that if people are affluent and habitually drunk they can sleep it off in a hotel room or go home, whereas a destitute living on a welfare cheque drinks what the cheque buys and has no means of support. Such people are charged at the rate of 100 a week. We are serving little purpose in charging them with a crime.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: And we're not treating them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No. The point I make, as a result of the interjection, is that we need to go much further in tackling this problem than is envisaged by the second of the Bills. It may not seem to be a very strong point, but putting a drunk in gaol for three months may do nothing for him as a punishment, because drunkenness is a social problem. However, it is acknowledged that he has good nutrition and must abstain from alcohol for three months, thus increasing his weight and improving his general health. He gets some respite.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Almost no-one is put in for three months—two weeks.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was quoting the Mitchell report, which makes the point that there is some benefit physically to the alcoholic in being forced to abstain. I have read through the legislation once, because I did not think I would have to debate it today, and through the appropriate sections of the Mitchell report. I do not believe that we have gone far enough yet in solving this major problem. Other States are aware of the problem. Queensland intends to do something about it. A recent newspaper report headed "War on alcohol" states:

Queensland is hotting up its war against alcohol. The State Government has begun to recruit 100 experts to fight alcoholism. They are expected to be the front-line troops in the biggest anti-liquor campaign ever mounted in Australia. The programme will cost millions of dollars, starting with $2 000 000 for a detoxication centre now under construction in the centre of Brisbane. The Government thinks expenditure is worthwhile—only a drop in the glass compared with the $250 000 000 lost to industry each year.

That is one State in Australia that is doing something about the problem. Queensland loses $250 000 000 a year as a result of alcoholism.

Mr. Keneally: That's more than is lost on strikes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not have figures regarding strikes, but I know that they cost us plenty. I suppose that if we were to take out figures for the cost to South Australian industry of alcoholism the cost would be great. We are dealing with a tremendous social and financial problem. I have considered the Bill and what is recommended for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, but they will only touch on the problem. At page 141 of the report of the committee of inquiry into health services in South Australia reference is made to this problem as follows:

> 10.27 The extent of drug misuse in our society makes it necessary to have a comprehensive plan to minimise the likelihood of harmful dependence or other damage—and to deal with them when they do occur. A single, comprehensive Government policy should take account of all facets of drug control, and the prevention and treatment of drug misuse. The efforts of all its departments and organisations should be channelled towards achieving the same ends. This requires long-term objectives, not just liaison between departments. It also requires the provision and co-ordination of a full range of treatment facilities and continuing research into all aspects of the problem and its solution as an aid to the formation, application and assessment of policy.
>
> 10.28 The primary step in a co-ordinated policy is the modification of the social environment so that people do not need to abuse drugs. The utilisation of strategies to strengthen the stability and security of the family.—

and I stress what follows—

> and an education system more oriented towards education for living should be accompanied by measures such as imaginative housing policy, the extension of community social worker and counselling services and child minding centres.

The suggestions continue on page 142 as follows:

> 10.29 A related step is to minimise, through legislation and law enforcement, the exposure of susceptible persons to drugs which they may abuse. Sufficient knowledge is now available to justify an argument for control by social engineering. The amount of illness and death caused by alcohol, cigarette, analgesic and sedative consumption is directly related to the amount consumed by the individual. It is true that only a minority of heavy smokers will develop cancer of the lung, but the number increases with increase in cigarette consumption. The number of traffic accident deaths will increase as alcohol consumption by individuals increases. Kidney disease is more likely the more analgesic pills are consumed. The number of people consuming excessive quantities of alcohol or taking excessive quantities of sedative or other pills is directly related to the average level of consumption in the community. It follows that control of illness and deaths from excessive use can be achieved by diminishing the average level of consumption in the community.

I would direct those remarks particularly to the consumption of alcohol because it is a major problem. Recent research in Sydney has shown a problem with kidney disease particularly in middle-aged women who have induced the disease by the use of analgesic drugs. Statistically, the problem is minor when compared to the Australian and world-wide problem in the affluent society in relation to the use of alcohol. I applaud the legislation. Although I do not believe that it is foreseen that this measure will solve the problem, it seems to be a step in the right direction.

The question of civil liberties has arisen in debate on this Bill, but that is not a major question when one considers the welfare of these people. We infringe on the civil liberties of people when we make them wear seat belts. We know that statistically it can be shown that seat belts save lives, so we pass legislation providing that people must wear a seat belt. In relation to civil liberty, we could argue that if they wish to drive a car without the restraint of a seat belt that they should be able to do so. Conclusive scientific and statistical proof is available that, if people are forced to attend a rehabilitation centre and are kept there to undergo a course of treatment, that treatment will benefit them. Civil liberty is a touchy subject, but we seem justified to legislate, where we know without a shadow of doubt, as we do in this area, that by forcing people to remain in treatment facilities they will benefit.

Mr. Keneally: The community pays for alcoholism so that it has the right to demand that it be reduced in some way or another.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That argument supports what I am saying. The problem is not peculiar to Australia. Sweden is trying to come to grips with the problem, too. A report from Stockholm headed "Stamp out alcoholism!" states:

Sweden may have prosperity and high living standards, but its Government is worried that it could become a nation of alcoholics. As a counter-move the strength of beer available at supermarkets from next July is to be reduced from the present maximum of 3·6 per cent to 2·8 per cent. It is aimed at the teenage drinker. Beer can be sold at supermarkets to anyone aged 18 or more. Export strength beer will still be available, but only through the State retail liquor monopoly, where the age limit is 20.

It was recommended by the Bright committee that the alcoholic strength of beverages be examined. In my view a massive educational programme to change the outlook of people, particularly young people, on the question of drinking is essential. Those of us who have teenagers know at first-hand from them and their friends that drinking is a major problem. The outlook on drinking alcohol in this day and age is different from what we were faced with when we were teenagers. The problem varies, of course, but the problem has accelerated in the past few years. It is a major problem for parents, the community, the nation and the developed world. Until Governments decide that they will do something about the problem and embark on a massive educational programme to change people's outlook on drinking and to try to get what is really a civilised view of the problem, this legislation will be only a drop in the bucket. Nevertheless I support the second reading.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): The two Bills before us are, in their way a measure of the relative importance of the matters we are considering. The first Bill is an Act to amend the Police Offences Act: it is a simple, straightforward Bill that repeals section 9 of the Act and virtually abolishes the offence of drunkenness. That is as it may be, but I would not support that legislation as it is without the other legislation amending the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act. It makes sense to abolish drunkenness as an offence, because it is an illness. Chronic alcoholism is one of the major scourges of our society and the Deputy Leader has dealt with that matter well indeed. We are now putting a Bill into effect with amendments that provide for the treatment of chronic alcoholics, for the provision of sobering-up centres and committal centres. The Bill gives police officers and any authorised person (I presume from the Community Welfare Department only) the right to exercise force if necessary to protect not only the population but the person affected from himself.

I think the definitions in the Bill do not really explain much. A "committal centre" means "an institution declared to be a committal centre". An "institution" means an "institution". A "sobering-up centre" means a "sobering-up centre", and a "voluntary centre" means a "voluntary centre". I am not sure where we go from there. Generally speaking, I could not agree more with the proposal that people in public in an inebriated condition, or comatose and in need of medical attention, can be taken to a home, a sobering-up centre, or premises approved by the Minister. I have heard it said, with some reservation, that if an alcoholic is taken to a country hospital he is placing a burden on the nurses at that hospital. I reassure people who have a fear that nurses may in some way be in danger from those people, that a police officer, or the officer who takes the person to the local hospital, is of necessity present, as provided in new section 32b as follows:

It shall be the duty of all members of the police force to assist the person in whose care or charge a person has been placed . . .

I can recall my days in the casualty section of the Wellington Hospital well indeed, and I know that those people do much better in hospitals or specialised centres than they do in police cells. I support the legislation.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I thank the Oposition for the support given this legislation. The Leader's final comments prompt me to reply that I remember only too well my days in the courts, seeing the drunk parade that used to appear every morning in the Adelaide Magistrate's Court; that is an equally sickening sight to the one referred to. The Deputy Leader raised the comments that have been made by Mr. Jim Stanley in the press recently following the publicity given to the fact that the Government was introducing this legislation. I did not say in my second reading explanation, nor does the Bill indicate, that the Government will necessarily be setting up these centres and it will most certainly be looking for co-operation from voluntary groups. The expertise in this area is largely in the areas of voluntary groups. One need only refer to the Archway Centre, the Kuitpo Colony and other such institutions to demonstrate this fact. The Government will be looking for co-operation from the Aboriginal community and other voluntary organisations involved in this area. Mr. Stanley said that no consultations had occurred between the Government and the Aboriginal community. The Government certainly was in contact with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement about this matter, and members opposite will realise that there are many Aboriginal groups in the community and it is difficult to deal with all of them. I understand that the Minister for Community Welfare will, when this legislation has passed the Parliament, be communicating with Mr. Stanley's group to see what sort of co-ordination and co-operation can be arranged with that group.

I support the Deputy Leader's concern about the enormity of this problem, and say to him that his approach of supporting an educative programme is one that the Government supports. The Government believes that the long-term solution to this problem is one involving the education of the population to a better approach to alcohol, and not the suppression of alcohol simply by limiting the hours during which it can be purchased, and so on. The Government believes it is past the time when such an approach, if it ever would have worked, would work. We have now reached the stage where an educative programme is the only one that can work, and it is an essential programme. The Deputy Leader also referred to the fact that a person can only be kept in custody under this legislation for a limited period. That, of course, is to protect a person's civil rights. It also reflects the Government's view that a person who is an alcoholic or who has an alcoholic problem can be treated successfully and satisfactorily only if that person is prepared to seek treatment himself. Certainly, appropriate guidance and counselling may be necessary for the person, but nevertheless the person's future is in his own hands. The Government proposes to provide sufficient treatment facilities for those persons who will seek voluntary treatment, but believes that that is the only real solution to a person's problem.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You think he ought to have the right to drink himself to death quickly.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not say that at all, but I say that medical experience is that it is almost impossible to treat a person who does not want to be treated; that is the only point I make about that. I believe

that this legislation is important and will have an important impact on the community. My final point is that this is part of a package; it is not seen by the Government as being a cure-all to the problem. This is part of a continuing programme.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney General made the point in his explanation that there would be no possibility of implementing these measures until there were sufficient detoxication or sobering-up centres established. What time scale has the Government in mind before the proclamation of the Bill? How long does the Government think it will take to establish suitable premises? I understand from the explanation given that police cells in country areas will probably have to be declared as sobering-up centres. Other centres are envisaged in the larger country towns. Certainly, in the metropolitan area, the Government has other premises in mind as sobering-up centres.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government hopes it will be able to implement this legislation by about the middle of next year.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on November 25. Page 2530.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I wonder why the Government opted for the term "sobering-up centre" rather than "detoxication centre", which I think is the term the Mitchell committee recommended. Is it because it is common parlance?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): It is the Government's view that the people who may well need the assistance of this Act might have understood "sobering-up centre" as a term of common parlance, as the honourable member suggested, rather than the term "detoxication centre".

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Enactment of Part IIIA of principal Act."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am puzzled by new section 29b. It seems to me that something must be amiss if a person is detained, taken off to a sobering-up centre by an authorised person and then seeks to appear before a court to declare that he was not in need of sobering-up facilities. I think I recall in the explanation that this is to protect a person for insurance purposes or for some other purpose. It seems rather incongruous that if somebody is picked up by this mobile unit, taken to a sobering-up centre, he then wants a court order to say that he did not need sobering up.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is necessary to have this provision. The reason for it is that certain other physical ailments can give the appearance of a person being drunk or under the influence of a drug; for example, a person could be suffering from concussion. A person might be taken to one of these centres and subsequently he might be able to prove that he was not under the influence of a drug at the time. The honourable member referred to insurance. Another situation could be where a person was on a bond not to drink intoxicating liquor, or something of that sort, where it would be desirable for him to have the opportunity to clear his name for some specific purpose apart from the general desirability of a person not wanting to have it known that he had been apprehended and taken to one of these centres.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is a reference in the Mitchell committee first report at page 211, as follows:

Finally, we recommend that persons who are able to do so should be ordered by the court to pay the cost of their conveyance to the centre, their accommodation and treatment there and meals. Under section 9 (2) of the Police Offences Act, 1953-1972, a person convicted of drunkenness may be ordered to pay a reasonable sum to cover the expenses of apprehension, conveyance, custody and medical examination.

I suppose we could describe that as being in the nature of a penalty or some contribution by the person who has been apprehended towards the cost of his detention. There does not seem to be in this legislation any suggestion that the person who has been taken in hand by the mobile unit or authorised people would in any way pay any of the costs involved. I ask the Attorney-General whether that idea was considered and rejected, or whether there is something that has escaped my notice. It did not seem an unreasonable suggestion from the Mitchell committee that, if a person is capable of making the payment, he should do so. If somebody is destitute (and there are some people who are charged almost every week, picked up in the parks in the city), there is not much sense in that recommendation. In cases where people who are detained can make payment, it seems that is not an inappropriate suggestion from the Mitchell committee. I see nothing in the legislation to suggest that that could be done.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This suggestion was considered by the Government and rejected on two grounds: first, the intention of the new legislation is to place the emphasis on treatment rather than on punishment. To some extent, the charging of a person in this situation was a penalty in the past. That really is more of a rationalisation of the situation. The basic reason was that an assessment of the economics of this indicated that it was not a feasible proposition. In most cases in the past, the bookkeeping and administration involved in collecting the money, keeping books and having the Auditor-General check the books was not worth the effort considering the amount returned. Further, the problem developed where it was difficult for the police in the past to determine who could afford to pay and who could not. In all the circumstances, the Government decided not to proceed with that suggestion. I move:

Page 4—After line 8 insert new section as follows:

29ba. (1) No member of the police force, or authorised officer, incurs any personal liability for any act or omission, on his part, in the exercise of his powers under this Part.

(2) This section does not relieve the Crown, or any authority or person from liability for acts or omissions of their servants.

The intention of this amendment is to provide protection for the police officers concerned and authorised officers under this Act who may, in exercising their powers under this Part, fall foul of the civil law. It is intended to give

some protection to them. This was raised by the Police Association, and the Government seeks to incorporate it in the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—"Enactment of ss. 32a to 32e of principal Act."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney has said that the police, who have been completely involved, will be relieved of their role of picking up drunks and locking them up for the night. Who will be responsible to take these people to the centre? Authorised officers will need to be specially trained, but it seems that people in the Community Welfare Department are relatively young and poorly equipped to handle difficult drunks. As it has been stated that the police will be involved to a minimum degree, can the Attorney give me information on these matters?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I said that it would be undesirable to have police involved and, over a period, we will try to ensure that the proposed transport units of the Community Welfare Department will become more and more involved. That will not take place without a proper course of training and the recruiting of properly qualified people to those units. Clause 9, which inserts proposed section 32b, places a clear responsibility on the police to assist in enforcing the provisions of this Act, but it is intended to transfer the responsibility to transport these people from the police to the Community Welfare Department as the units are set up and developed. It will not happen instantly: in the more remote areas, I doubt whether the responsibility will even be finally removed from the police. However, the Government intends to introduce administrative arrangements to have these powers transferred to the special units.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I hope personnel in the special units will have training akin to that obtained by the police. I know from conversations with headmasters that problems have occurred in schools concerning juveniles in regard to the attitude that has now been adopted in relation to juvenile aid panels.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill makes three amendments to the principal Act, the Water Resources Act, 1976, the need for which arises following the early stages of its operation. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 29 of the principal Act, which deals with the grant of licences to take surface water. The effect of the amendments is to enable the terms or conditions of a licence to be varied, with the consent of the holder of the licence.

It is not unknown that, during the currency of a licence, there arises a need to alter some of the terms and conditions to the advantage of the holder. Without a provision of this nature the holder would have to surrender his licence and seek a new licence, and this seems to be administratively cumbersome. Clause 3 amends section 43 of the principal Act which deals with licences to withdraw underground waters, and the amendments to this section are identical in form to those proposed in relation to section 29. Clause 4 amends section 64 of the principal Act by clarifying the powers of the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal to ensure that a successful appellant will receive the fruits of his victory.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 1, at 2 p.m.